

The Corporation of the City of Kawartha Lakes

Additional Agenda

Regular Council Meeting

CC2021-09

Tuesday, May 18, 2021

Open Session Commencing at 1:00 p.m. - Electronic Participation

Council Chambers

City Hall

26 Francis Street, Lindsay, Ontario K9V 5R8

Members:

Mayor Andy Letham

Deputy Mayor Patrick O'Reilly

Councillor Ron Ashmore

Councillor Pat Dunn

Councillor Doug Elmslie

Councillor Tracy Richardson

Councillor Kathleen Seymour-Fagan

Councillor Andrew Veale

Councillor Emmett Yeo

This will be an electronic participation meeting and public access to Council Chambers will not be available. Please visit the City of Kawartha Lakes YouTube Channel at <https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofKawarthaLakes> to view the proceedings.

Accessible formats and communication supports are available upon request. The City of Kawartha Lakes is committed to accessibility for persons with disabilities. Please contact AgendaItems@kawarthalakes.ca if you have an accessible accommodation request.

6.	Deputations	
*6.1.	CC2021-09.6.1	3 - 5
	Report PLAN2021-024, Being a Telecommunications Facility Concurrence Application (64 Highway 7A) (Item 11.1.10 on the Agenda Cyrus Ghassabeh	
7.	Correspondence	
*7.1.	CC2021-09.7.1	6 - 22
	Correspondence Regarding the Recommendations from the Off Road Vehicle Use of City Task Force (Item 9.3.13 to and including Item 9.3.20 on the Agenda)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• John Main• Derek Anderson• Phil Hunt• * Heather Stauble• * Gail Kivela• * William Steffler• * Kerri Keates	
*7.2.	CC2021-09.7.2	23 - 24
	Correspondence Regarding Report PLAN2021-024 (Item 11.1.10 on the Agenda) Cyrus Ghassabeh, FB Connect	



Request to Speak before Council

Request to Make a Deputation/Presentation to
Council/Committee
City of Kawartha Lakes
City Clerk's Office
26 Francis Street, PO Box 9000
Lindsay, ON K9V 5R8
705-324-9411

Name: *

Cyrus Ghassabeh

Address: *

482 South Service Road, Unit 130

City/Town/Village:

Oakville

Province: *

Ontario

Postal Code:

Telephone: *

905 808 0073

Email: *

cghassabeh@forbesbrosLtd.ca

There can be a maximum of two speakers for each deputation. Please list the name(s) of the individual(s) who will be speaking. The names that are listed here will be included on the Council Meeting Agenda.

Deputant One:

Cyrus Ghassabeh

Deputant Two:

First Name, Last Name

Please provide details of the matter to which you wish to speak: *

Report PLAN2021-024 Telecommunication Application - Xplornet - 64 Hwy. 7A Manvers Twp. (Maltheb Farms) on May 18th, Council

Please attach any additional supporting documents you wish to provide and submit with this completed form.

Have you discussed this matter with City Staff?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If yes, Which department and staff member(s) have you spoken to?

What action are you hoping will result from your presentation/deputation? *

To be available to answer questions the council may have about the telecommunications tower/application

By signing this form you are acknowledging that all of the information you are providing on this form is true, and giving the City permission to collect your personal information for the principal purpose of a request to make a deputation to Committee or Council as outlined below.

Signature:

Cyrus Ghassabeh

Date:

5/14/2021



The personal information is being collected by the City of Kawartha Lakes for the principal purpose of a request to make a deputation to Committee or Council pursuant to the City's procedural by-law. This information, including all attachments submitted may be circulated to members of Council, staff, the general public and posted on the City website. Questions about the collection of this information should be directed to the City Clerk or Deputy Clerk at 705 324-9411 ext. 1295 or 1322.

Do you agree to the publication of your name and contact information on the City's website and the City Council agenda? *

☒ Yes

☐ No

Please complete this form and return to the City Clerk's Office by submitting it online or:
Fax: 705-324-8110 Email: agendaitems@kawarthalakes.ca

From: J. Main
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Andy Letham <aletham@kawarthalakes.ca>
Subject: COPY - CITY OF KAWARTHA LAKES - OFF ROAD VEHICLE TASK FORCE 2021

cc. Mayor Andy Letham

Dear Mayor Letham

RE: OFF ROAD

VEHICLE TASK FORCE 2021

I only recently became aware of the establishment of a Municipal Task Force; “to provide advice and recommendations to Council on the use of off road vehicles (ORVs)” Noting that the decision for the Task Force was made October 2020, during a time when the community is preoccupied with COVID restrictions, interruptions of social dialogue, it does not surprise me that I am not the only individual unaware of this activity. Since there appears to be potential for the results of this task force to impact on every citizen of the Municipality I believe it deserves a higher degree of consultation. This is not a matter of urgency, making it such smacks of ingenuity. I trust that you will include this in your recommendations. From my perspective I have concerns with what is being proposed here and the methodology being employed to address the issue.

General

Observations

On reading the terms and mandate of the Task Force I find:

Except for public consultation, it completely lacks terms requiring minimizing the impact on the community.

Although the word “consultation” is used, the objectives are already established i.e., to expand ORVs on as many municipal roads as possible.

There is no declaration of assurance that the Task Force members must undertake their work in an impartial and objective manner. Citizens need to be aware that the advice given to council may not be free of prejudice, indeed the interests of residents appear to be secondary to the ORV interest group(s). The following extract from the City website makes this clear “The goal is to provide Council with recommendations based on research and public consultation that will help expand and enhance ORV use activity across the municipality”. Bias is built in, the word “consultation” has limited significance.

There is no express or explicit request to consider economic or financial opportunities. The correspondence between Laurie McCarthy, Economic Development Officer –Tourism and, on invitation of, Councillor Kathleen Fagan-Seymour exceeds task force terms. Citizens of built up areas such as Bobcaygeon should read this correspondence as it uses economic arguments to justify ORVs in residential and down town areas. This changes the initial understanding of the initiative, to provide ORV trail linkages, significantly. Heads up Bobcaygeon Citizens.

It appears that primary objective of the initial terms of this Task Force, i.e., to seek linkages between ORV trails, have been revised to serve commercial interests thus creating a moving target citizens may not be aware of.

Despite the obvious, there is no consideration or assignment of a cost benefit analysis or management of change process.

Whilst the global community is finally coming to terms with the fact that environmental pollution is a real threat, it obviously has not resonated with Politicians and Council leadership and some segments of the population. Either way one cuts it, increasing ORVs over an above regular traffic is not stellar thinking. This is not a small matter, some are considering this as a significant financial market opportunity in a country that is considered one the worst polluters per capita. Surely our learned Council has greater priorities than finding more roads for ORVs over and above existing trails.

Excluding those in remote communities and farms, etc., I recognize that ORVs are primarily used for recreational activity. This is consistent with the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) description e.g., “vehicles not designed or intended to be used on highways and vary in configuration”. I admit that this form of recreation is not a personal choice of mine as I strive to limit my recreational activities to those that have a lower environmental footprint. However, pending enlightenment or technical advances replacing IC engines I believe that it is possible to come to solutions that do not encroach on the broader community. There are lots of space outside the built up communities for ORV recreation.

One of the assets of the the Kawarthas and, Bobcaygeon in particular, is that it is an opportunity for city dwellers from Toronto and other high density populated areas to enjoy relatively pollution free air and quietness. Surely the smart move is to capitalize on this quality, not impair it. Allowing ORVs to routinely enter Bobcaygeon so that visitors and residents can enjoy more road congestion, exhaust fumes, dust and noise with their meals, barbecues and other activities is unlikely to enhance the reputation of the area. Do not confuse the foregoing with the ‘one-off’ events like Bike Fest.

Although not part of this Task Force work, citizens need to be alert to the possibility that acceptance of ORVs within the context of this recommendation could later be extrapolated to include snowmobiles within built up communities.

AND IMPACTS

ISSUES

1 - ORV Compatibility with highways, city roads, rural roads, trails.

Is there a compelling reason to allow ORVs general access to all of the above. The answer should be no.

Trails excepted, The City of Kawartha Lakes has often stated that it must maintain more roadways than any other municipality. This is very evident by the sad state of some of our roads. Clearly there are proposals that have the potential to worsen this situation.

It has already been established by various bodies that ORVs are unsuitable for use on paved roadways. Main arterial roads should be beyond consideration. OPP, City of Kawartha Lakes Detachment, offer the following in their letter to the ORV Task Force, i.e., “... To encourage ORV operators towards permitted trails and away from using the roadways for general transportation”.

I encourage the Task Force to take the foregoing very seriously.

ORVs, where permitted, can travel on the road, and on the road shoulder. Obviously there are no road shoulders in most built up communities. It should also be obvious that, if permitted, traffic congestion and pedestrian interaction will increase in built up communities.

A few of our roads have bicycle lanes. Some of these are already fragmenting at the paved / gravel shoulder boundary. ORV use on these roads will accelerate degradation of bicycle lanes. A similar situation is predictable at the paved / gravel shoulder boundary on regular paved roads.

Many rural roads are unpaved, uneven, with blind rises and turns. ORVs can and do generate dust and mud in considerable amounts depending on weather conditions. Higher prevalence of ORVs will exacerbate this situation. Clearly this will create visibility issues and respiratory issues for people on or in proximity to roads. These roads are used by other vehicles creating interaction hazards. Selection of roads designated for ORV linkages should require careful consideration to minimize impacts on non ORV users and to reduce interactions with other vehicles, at minimum alert users that ORVs can be encountered.

Some trails are used by and suitable for pedestrians, bicycles and ORVs. Unfortunately it is not unusual to encounter misuse by ORVs. If more ORVs will become users of these trails this can not be anticipated without management issues, be it maintenance or supervision. It should not go unnoticed that the joy of ORV recreation for some comes from gouging and tearing up trails.

Broadly, it should follow that proliferation of ORVs will not come without impacts, safety, health, supervision, maintenance costs commensurate with the degree of unfettered control.

Will the Task Force commit to restricting ORV traffic to limited linkages between trail routes?

2 - Access to ORV Trails

According to the minutes of the third ORV Task Force Meeting Minutes, the considerations now being under review and promoted no longer relate to selectively identifying linkage ORV routes between established trail areas but a Municipality wide allowance for ORVs everywhere with some exceptions.

“1. Open up all rural roads, for use of ORVs excepting those deemed unsafe by the City Staff and Committee.

1. That the operation of ORV's be permitted on all roads within the Village of Bobcaygeon, save and except for Bolton Street between Canal Street to King Street.”

This effectively means that the intention is to allow ORVs on all residential streets as there is no provisions made to respect the rights, health and wellbeing of citizens. This would mean taking the shortest route between A and B, be along our streets or public pathways.

I strongly object to any such proposal. Furthermore, realizing that this now a Task Force, serving a specific interest group, that its work should only be considered in that light and that no decision should be made without consulting each citizen of the municipality with recognition of majority opinion in villages / residential communities.

The same minutes contain the following statement:

“ORV's are not for general transportation but are to encourage the use of permitted trails”.

This appears in conflict with the intent of the Task Force recommendations or lacks clarification of context.

Will the Task Force commit to establishing ORV staging points on trail route linkages and eliminate ORV movements in all residential areas or other areas where deemed necessary? (Staging Point - A location provided with temporary parking where ORVs can be unloaded / Loaded or temporarily parked.)

3 - Maintaining Public Order

In an April 9 letter from the Kawartha Lakes Police Service to the following was noted:

ORV speed conflict with motor vehicle traffic.

Access to ORV from the City, (Lindsay.) A necessity to mitigate risks

Incapacity to provide oversight services

Difficulty in enforcing compliance where OVRs allowed to travel on roads between residences and trails. (Lindsay)

It is reasonable to presumed that the same issues would exist in other communities.

OPP concerns have already been noted.

The current position of policing services appears to be, at best, in limbo or, business as usual. It is highly probable that this situation will not be sustainable.

There will always be entitled people that believe that their recreation supersedes the rights of others to their enjoyment of their community. These people will have followers and before long, what was once considered ‘recreational transport’ mode could very quickly morph into general commuter transport.

Left unattended or, inadequately addressed, this could lead to undesirable outcomes, the most vulnerable being affected first e.g., the elderly, single occupants, socially challenged.

Will the task force take this into consideration and recommend an impact study, action plan, cost implications and public report for resident consideration and input prior to any decision making?

4 - Establishment of a Pilot Program

The following is noted in the third ORV Task Force Meeting Minutes:

“2. Establish a two-year Pilot Program regarding the use of ORVs, to be reviewed and amended after the first year.”

This recommendation might be acceptable if it was introduced in the form of linking trail routes. Without limitations and appropriate time and place boundaries it is premature,

In the context of the recommendation being considered here, I recognize it as a well worn strategy of furtively introducing questionable policy with an end agenda of compromising the ability to reverse such policy. Bad decisions are easy to make but difficult and costly to rectify.

Will the Task Force commit to recommending introduction of Pilot Programs only after all inputs and studies are complete?

5 - Economic Financial Interest

Whilst there is no express or explicit requirement for the Task Force Terms to consider business interests, economics, it appears to have been adopted by the Task Force as justification for opening up the entire Municipality to widespread ORV travel. This should not come at the expense of, or the the rights, safety and quality of life of residents at large.

The cautionary wisdom of economist Adam Smith should apply (gender expression comes from and earlier century):

“The interest of [businessmen] is always in some respects different from, and even opposite to, that of the public ... The proposal of any new law or regulation of commerce which comes from this order ... ought never to be adopted, till after having been long and carefully examined ... with the most suspicious attention. It comes from an order of men ... who have generally an interest to deceive and even oppress the public”

Tobacco industry, food industry health implications of sugar, salt, fossil fuel industry, asbestos industry.....often with complicity of governments in power in this country, be they of one political ideology or another. The scale might be different here, but the agendas are often the same.

Will the Task Force be recommending a cost benefit analysis that confirms positive benefit for the communities affected?

6 - Safety & Health

Whilst there is no implicit or explicit requirement for the Task Force Terms to consider safety and it is recognized that some input has been sought. My only comment here is that this form of recreation has its problems, more users probably means more problems as I doubt that zero incidents is a discipline practiced among a portion of his group. Disregard for personal safety does not come without cost, not only to the person suffering casualty, but also the community at large.

Health issues associated with IC engines in congested environments is well documented and understood.

Will the Task Force make every effort to evaluate and eliminate these concerns in built up communities?

7 - Public Consultancy

There is the possibility that the recommendations coming from the Task Force could be much broader than casually understood and impact across the entire community if accepted by Council without due regard for complete community awareness.

Will the Task Force recommend that every household be given formal opportunity to provide input before any decision is made?

As I am late in providing input and since this process appears to be nearing completion, please confirm receipt of this email correspondence.

Respectfully ,

John Main
Citizen, City of Kawartha Lakes

May 10, 2021

When a little 15 year old Swedish girl stands before world leaders at COP24 (2018) and tells them that:

“.....we have not come here to tell world leaders to care, you have ignored us in the past, and you will ignore us again, we have run out of excuses and we are running out of time, we have come here to let you know that change is coming whether you like it or not, the real power belongs to the people”.

What are we to think about your vision, your leadership, with regard to respect for future generations?

FYI: No, I am not a Green Party hack or like lobbyist. I did however learn during my formative years about the work of scientists during the 1800s that were the first to warn that atmospheric pollution could have serious effects on climate and also experienced the end of the great smogs in Europe.

This message, including any attachments, is privileged and intended only for the addressee(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information contained in this e-mail. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone, fax, or e-mail and shred this confidential e-mail, including any attachments, without making a copy. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorized.

From: DEREK Anderson <

Sent: Friday, May 7, 2021 8:54 AM

To: Andy Letham <aletham@kawarthalakes.ca>; Patrick O'Reilly <poreilly@kawarthalakes.ca>; Pat Dunn <pdunn@kawarthalakes.ca>; Andrew Veale <aveale@kawarthalakes.ca>; Ron Ashmore <rashmore@kawarthalakes.ca>; Kathleen Seymour-Fagan <kseymourfagan@kawarthalakes.ca>; Tracy Richardson <trichardson@kawarthalakes.ca>; Emmett Yeo <eyeo@kawarthalakes.ca>; Doug Elmslie <delmslie@kawarthalakes.ca>

Cc: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>; Bill Steffler >;

Subject: Council Meeting May 4,2021

Mayor Letham & Deputy Mayor O'Reilly, I would like to thank you both for standing up for the citizens of the Town of Lindsay during the above referenced meeting. It was refreshing to see you both acknowledge that the recommendations being made by the ORV Task Force did not take into consideration the impact of the residents of Lindsay and even more so the residents on the proposed route through town.

From the onset and repeated on numerous occasions, it has been pointed out that the citizen portion ORV Task Force is made up of strictly ORV enthusiast that only represents a small segment of the population of the town of Lindsay. The other interest groups were not allowed to participate as Pat Dunn didn't want to have to deal with any opposition to the narrow minded approach he has taken to this Task Force. As a matter of fact, he accused people on numerous occasions of making false claims about the situation were in fact, he was one of the worse people in this area.

Councillor Seymour-Fagan, I saw and heard your concerns about the perception that you are not taking the task seriously, both you and Councillor Richardson were the only members of the task force who did exhibit care and concern for the people of CKL. Councillor Dunn and the rest of the task force had one thing in mind, that was to force ATV access on the rest of the population of the CKL. This was never more evident than at the conclusion of the March 19th public meeting where Councillor Dunn and the rest of the task force immediately moved to adopt the force's recommendation with out even discussing the points brought up by the public. Only you and Councillor Richardson offered an amendment based on the feedback received. Steve Lane actually showed surprise and disappointment that the roads would not be open by May 1. It was also evident in Councillor Dunn's reactions and comments during the May 4th meetings as it became obvious that the recommendations were not moving forward as he expected.

I would like to once again state that **I am definitely not in favour of allowing ATV on any more streets or roads in the City of Kawartha Lakes**. I believe the ban on roads south of Glenarm Road should continue and we should re-visit the use north of Glenarm Road and possible remove that as well.

Having said that if we must provide a route though town, then the previously recommended route from Logie to Lindsay, Lindsay to Mary Street, Mary to Angeline and Angeline to Thunder Bridge Road is the most direct route. Here are my reasons for this recommendation. I understand Kent and Angeline is a busy intersection be it is well controlled with traffic light including advance turn signals in all directions.

1. It provides opportunity to buy gas, food and other supplies along the route.
2. It is the most direct route through town.
3. Enforcement will be easy as there are limited streets for the KPD to deal with and ATVs on other streets within town would be subject to penalty through the KPD or ByLaw.

4. At each major turn there are traffic lights with the exception of Logie to Lindsay.
5. This is the least populated route through town and would have the least impact on town in general.

Once again, whatever is presented to Council on June 4, I recommend that the final decision should be made via a referendum at the next municipal election where the residence of Lindsay, the people most affected by and ATV use in town, will be able to voice their belief without the lobbying of the KATV

Derek Anderson CD

From: Jane & Phil HUNT <
Sent: Friday, May 7, 2021 1:33 PM
To: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>
Subject: Orv taskforce

I know there is a lot of concerns about travelling through Lindsay. My concern is allowing side x sides on the rail trails. I'm disabled & have a side x side to get around on in the outdoors. I can't use a atv very well, but my side x side is easy to get in & go. I would like to see access to the rail trail to go to ken reid park or up to the Kinmount & Haliburton area.

If I remember correctly, the trail was given to all the people in the region. I have lived here for over 60 years & paid taxes for over 35 years. I would like to think that if dirt bikes are allowed on it, why can't my Kabota side x side go on it. It only goes 25 mph top speed. I currently walk my dog on the trail south of Fenelon & have no problems with utvs. Snowmobiles are a different thing. They fly down the trails at very high speeds. It dangerous to walk dog in winter in some areas.

Thanks for listening.

Phil Hunt
Cameron

Deputation
RE: PW2021-002
Off Road Vehicles Task Force Recommendations
Committee of the Whole
May 4, 2021

Mr Mayor and Council,

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Council is considering recommendations to open all 2500 km of roads to machines designed to be OFF ROAD ONLY.

Safety is by far the most important consideration.

HKPR

In 2013, our health unit warned that ATVs were a *“significant source of injury and death for ATV users and often involve collision with another vehicle”* and recommended that Council *“not implement a bylaw that would allow road access for ATVs.”*

In 2019, Public Health Ontario reported that this health unit had the highest number of ATV accidents in its peer group.

Now, 2021, HKPR reports Kawartha Lakes ATV accident rate is 5 times the Ontario rate – and:

“there are higher rates of fatalities and serious injuries for ORV riders on roadways compared to off-roadways,

being on roadways increases the risk of collisions with other motor vehicles,

design characteristics of these vehicles, particularly ATVs, make them unsafe on roadways”.

The Health Unit states: “Restricting ORVs to trail use only would be the preferred best practice from a public health standpoint”

In 2015, CKL ATV accidents represented 30% of the total ATV accidents in this health unit. By 2019, it was 60%.

This is without allowing ATVs south of Glenarm Rd and primarily in rural areas.

Off Road Vehicles present an even greater risk on roads *today* than in 2013.

Manufacturers such as Polaris, Kawasaki, Yamaha and Honda all have warnings about gravel roads such as:

<p>“Always avoid operating an ATV on any paved surfaces ,including sidewalks, driveways parking lots and streets,” and “[n]ever operate an ATV on any public street, road or highway, even a dirt or gravel one” Yamaha Raptor 350</p>
--

Rural roads are not safer.

ORVs would be on roads with school buses, traffic, gravel trucks, farm equipment, children, bikes – in the dark, with no sidewalks, no lights, and speed limits up to 80kmh.

These roads are busier by the year - the lull that we are currently experiencing will not last much longer.

Insurance and Risk Management:

Warned that the City's insurer advised: "A claim or poor claims experience related to ORV use will however have a direct effect on future premiums."

Due to the City's high self-insured retention (deductible), the costs incurred to investigate and defend any such claim(s) would largely be the responsibility of the City.

If the ORV owner was uninsured or has insufficient liability limits, joint and several liability would apply which would further expose the City to increased costs, claims expense and future premium increases." They then included an extensive list of safety review considerations from the City's insurance provider.

Public Works:

Recommend that "*the matter should be deferred* and reviewed in conjunction with the relating master plans (Trails Master Plan and the Transportation Master Plan)." They stress that public safety is paramount and warn that incidents on municipal roads would increase; experts recommend *against* the use of ATV/ORVs on roads; and manuals for ORVs and ATVs recommend against it.

No amount of insurance removes the safety risk to others of ORVs on roadways.

If Council approves these recommendations there WILL be more accidents; more hospitalizations and inevitably, more deaths.

The high, and escalating, rate of ATV related accidents in Kawartha Lakes shows us there is a problem. It needs to be addressed as the safety issue that it has become.

No pilot. No changes to the current bylaw.

Accessing the trails can be done – safely and legally - using a trailer.

Thank you.

Heather Stauble

ORV Crash Test <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yCKBcMr0fGU>

Global News Peterborough KATVA https://globalnews.ca/video/5459601/collisions-involving-off-road-vehicles-on-the-rise/?fbclid=IwAR0lwbcq--U03uLz6-5H-ZOTpu92Rvo25dp8O4_cspTyMTKfDVXooL4b0pA

The Epidemiology of All-Terrain Vehicle and Snowmobile-Related Injuries in Ontario, Public Health Ontario, 2019

<https://www.publications.gov.on.ca/CL29309>

Consumer Federation of America <https://consumerfed.org/pdfs/ATVs-on-roadways-03-2014.pdf>

More fatal all-terrain vehicle crashes occur on the roadway than off: increased risk-taking characterises roadway fatalities

<https://injuryprevention.bmj.com/content/19/4/250>

Specialty Vehicle Institute of America (SVIA): POSITION IN OPPOSITION TO ON-ROAD OPERATION OF ATVs

Recreational Off Highway Vehicle Association (ROHVA): POSITION IN OPPOSITION TO ON-HIGHWAY OPERATION OF ROVs

AMO, Joint and Several Liability: <https://www.amo.on.ca/advocacy/municipal-finance/municipal-liability-and-insurance-costs>

Frank Cowan Municipal Insurance: <https://www.frankcowan.com/centre-of-excellence/view/risk-management-considerations-for-off-road-vehicles-on-municipal-roads>

TD ATV Insurance <https://www.tdinsurance.com/products-services/recreational-vehicle-insurance/tips-advice/atv-eligibility-and-restrictions>

MTO email

Highway Traffic Act <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90h08>

Off Road Vehicle Act <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o04>

From: Gail Kivela < >
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 2:19 PM
To: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>
Cc: Kathleen Seymour-Fagan <kseymourfagan@kawarthalakes.ca>
Subject: A Suggestion for Bobcaygeon

If one of the reasons to allows ORV's on our streets is bring people into our town to boost our economy, in my opinion a better way to do this would be to close Bolton St to all vehicle traffic on weekends. This would allow businesses to expand onto the street, providing more social distancing options and drawing people into these local, struggling businesses. This would emulate the very successful and popular annual Midnight madness.

I saw an unauthorized ORV on our streets last weekend...noisy, dirty and driven by young people out fir a ride, who would not be the audience who would help to boost our economy.

Regards
Gail Kivela
A Concerned Bobcaygeon Resident.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kerri Keates <
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 1:02 PM
To: ORVTaskForce <orvtaskforce@kawarthalakes.ca>
Subject: ORV use in Lindsay

Dear members of the ORV taskforce.

I am writing to strongly oppose the purposed use of ORV's in Lindsay on any route. As a Lindsay resident living on a proposed route I have seen a tremendous increase in vehicular traffic even though we are in a lock down situation due to the pandemic. There are major new house builds that are being built right now off Angeline St North. All those new houses will have people who will have cars that will drive to wherever using Angeline St. The proposed route also includes King and Colborne streets which are very busy with traffic and cars parked on the streets. The Wellington St bridge is an absolute nightmare on a good day. Has a traffic flow analysis been completed and if so when? Since we have been in a lock down situation for the majority of the last fourteen months the traffic flow might have been underestimated due to a stay at home order. Kawartha 411 wrote an article March 18, 2021 on the most unsafe stops for children ridding the school bus. Angeline St North was one of the worst. I have witnessed cars blowing past stopped school busses with flashing lights. The last thing any of these busy streets need is ATVs weaving in and out of traffic around parked vehicles trying to avoid cyclists, school busses and pedestrians. I cant understand why safety does not hold a bigger weight with this task force. My other concern is that who will be enforcing any person who doesn't follow the rules on an ATV? The city's legal council did not think that a membership to the Kawartha ATV would be a requirement according the last virtual meeting. I really don't understand the urgency to address this matter while we remain in a pandemic and will be for the foreseeable future. Any injuries sustained from any motorized vehicle could put additional stress on our currently overwhelmed healthcare system. I do not want to have any off road vehicles on any street in Lindsay. Off Road Vehicles are just that, they are for off road uses and do not belong on city roads.

Kerri Keates

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

My comments will focus on two aspects of the task force:

1. Financial analysis.
2. Procedure and Fairness.

I have a degree in economics and a 28 year career in personal financial planning. In effect I spent 28 years providing clients with Personal Economic Impact Studies. Two common elements in any financial impact study are:

1. Revenues.
2. Costs.

Both of the above have to be quantified, sources named, and rationales given.

The only financial references given by this task force for the City of Kawartha Lakes are vague statements such as, “Restaurants will sell more food” and “Gas stations will sell more gas. No sources. No quantification.

Costs? Nothing. The Heath unit supplied data on ER visits, hospitalizations etc. Yet we have no estimate of health care costs. Enforcement was discussed. Yet we have no estimate on potential enforcement costs. There are no road maintenance cost estimates. There are no cost estimates period. Nothing in life is free.

All costs have to be identified and quantified.

Now restaurant owners won't mind not having a study – they get the revenues and the tax payer gets the bill. Same for the gas station owners and the ORV manufacturers.

Industry funded studies are infamous for their blatant pursuit of profits. The classic case is the Tobacco Industry funded studies that proved smoking is harmless. The ORV Industry repeats this tactic with its 2010 York University Study that claimed ORVing improves health. This was thoroughly discredited in a peer review – Health Promotional International – March 2013.

Quoting from the Peer Review:

1. The motorized recreation industry and user groups seek maximum access to the public domain with minimal restrictions on their activities. That industry has often tried to use economic analysis to demonstrate the social

rationality of leaving motorized recreation largely unregulated. These analyses, however, are based on **a peculiar economic alchemy that seeks to transform private interests and public costs into public benefits (Power, 2009).**

2. **“...and when healthcare costs are also factored in, claims of economic benefits appear unfounded.”**

To comment on the financial impact, you need an Economic Impact Study. So to protect the tax payer Council should require that, “Before any decision is made, we need an economic impact study”. The study must thoroughly consider all costs, as well as revenues.

PROCEDURE AND FAIRNESS

It's not right that one group gets to impose its recreational preference on the entire City. It is a preference, not a necessity. Many Urban and Rural residents do not share this preference for motorized recreation.

I'm speaking up for the interests of those citizens and groups who were excluded from the task force.

We don't really have a task force. Given the citizen selections, we have a lobby group disguised as a task force.

This council has to protect the interests of rural and urban citizens and groups like Environmental Action Bobcaygeon who want:

1. Active Transportation Plans.
2. A reduction in GHG emissions.
3. This Council has to protect Urban and Rural residents who do not want their roads to become motorized recreational trails.

YOU SHOULD NOT SANCTION SUCH A FLAWED AND ONE-SIDED PROCESS.

Why isn't this part of the upcoming Trails Master Plan? It is a blatant attempt to exclude the interests of a large portion of Rural and Urban citizens.

In closing I'll remind you of two things:

1. People entrust financial advisors to invest their money using sound, data driven decision making, and your constituents expect the same sound, data driven decision making from their elected officials. I urge you to move away from the unsupported and unsubstantiated economic promises before you now. Stop. Think. Do your due diligence by getting a complete and comprehensive economic impact report before any further discussion on this matter.
2. And while you contemplate that, take the time to reflect on the Task Force you, and you alone, have created. The bias of its composition is so blatant that it would never withstand the scrutiny of an outside agency. That needs to be addressed.

William Steffler

City of Kawartha Lakes
26 Francis Street
Lindsay, Ontario K9V 5R8
Attn: Ian Walker, B.Sc. Planning Officer, Large Developments
P: (705) 324-9411
E: iwalker@kawarthalakes.ca

May 11th, 2021

Dear Mayor and Council,

On behalf of Xplornet Communications, I would like to submit a request for a Statement of Concurrence for the proposed communication installation located at 64 HWY 7A, ON L0B 1K0.

The document will provide a summary of the municipal and public consultation process.

MUNICIPAL & PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY:

PROTOCOL

We have confirmed that the City of Kawartha Lakes has a locally enacted land use protocol for towers, and we were therefore required to comply with the procedures as described in CP2-18-014

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Under the City of Kawartha Lakes Telecommunications and Antenna System Siting Policy, we provided formal notice allowing 30 days for comments to any property owners within three times the tower height (45m X 3 = 135m). We asked that you assist with contact/mailing addresses for the property PINs identified in the notification radius, and there were eight (8) unique addresses provided. Under CPC Section 4.2.4, synchronized notice was placed in Kawartha Lakes This Week and The Promoter on April 1st, 2021 in accordance with the criteria established therein.

PUBLIC RESPONSE

Under Section 4.2.2 of CPC 2-0-03, we are to respond to all reasonable and relevant concerns raised during the 30-day notification period of Section 4.2. What is considered reasonable or relevant (or not) is specifically defined under the CPC section entitled "Public Reply Comments". The 30-day notice period concluded May 10th, 2021.

- The Municipality has not advised us that they have received any comments or concerns which we were to address.
- Xplornet did not receive any comments or concerns.

MUNICIPAL CONSULTATION

Consultation with the municipality included the following:

- Submission of a pre-consultation application for internal review
- Follow-up consultation by email
- Submission of a full application for review

- Discussion about the proposed property and installation
- Request for assistance with properties in the Public Notification Radius
- Request for the City's choice of newspaper
- Submission of the final Public Consultation Package (for your records)
- Request to identify any other municipal requirements
- Request for Municipal Concurrence

OTHER MUNICIPAL CONSIDERATIONS:

As we are regulated under federal policy, provincial legislation such as the Ontario Building Code Act and the Planning Act including zoning by-laws and site plan control do not apply to these facilities. Our installation is not required to submit application for a building permit. We also asked you to outline formally any other local requirements, and there were none

CONCLUDING LAND USE AUTHORITY CONSULTATION

Under CPC Section 4.3, we have satisfactorily met the consultation requirements.

Xplornet feels that the proposed site is well situated to provide and improve internet and data services in the targeted area. The proposed site has been situated and designed to have minimal impact on surrounding land uses.

At this time, we respectfully request the formal Statement of Concurrence by the City of Kawartha Lakes' Council. A copy of your concurrence will be sent to ISED Canada as they require this to confirm our compliance with the ISED Canada's default protocol CPC-2-0-03 Issue 5 (July 2014) "Radiocommunication and Broadcasting Antenna Systems" prior to moving forward with the installation of the proposed communication facility.

On behalf of Xplornet, we look forward to providing better internet and data service to this area. We thank you for your attention to this request and should you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 905.808.0073 or by email at cghassabeh@forbesbrosLtd.ca

Sincerely,

Cyrus Ghassabeh

Cyrus Ghassabeh,

FB Connnect.

482 South Service Road East, Unit 130

Oakville, ON L6J 2X6