

April 3, 2016

Members of the City of Kawartha Lakes Planning Committee
c/o Ron Taylor
Director of Development Services
City of Kawartha Lakes
180 Kent Street West, 2nd Floor
Lindsay, Ontario K9V 2Y6

Dear Planning Committee Members:

We are writing to address the Planning Department's recommendation to adopt a Zoning By-Law Amendment, with conditions, in connection with the application submitted on behalf of (Lonesome Pine Resort) 567957 Ontario Limited (O/A Parkbridge Lifestyle Communities, Inc.). We submitted letters in opposition to this application on June 1, 2015 and again on September 7, 2015, and we appeared at a Public Meeting of the Planning Committee on June 10, 2015 and September 9, 2015 to voice our opposition in person. Our properties – 282, 280 and 278 Lakeshore Drive – are in the immediate vicinity of or contiguous to the subject property.

Parkbridge's decision to remove the waterfront parcel (284 Lakeshore Drive), zoned LSR, from the application and to relocate the proposed Recreation Centre to existing C4 zoned property resolves most of the objections we previously expressed concerning the application. We very much appreciate the Planning Department's and Parkbridge's careful consideration of these objections in the modified application. We do, however, have a few remaining concerns:

1. A right of way exists across 280 Lakeshore Dr. to the LSR property. In his June 10, 2015 presentation to the Planning Committee, Parkbridge's Planning Consultant "stated that there is no intended use of the existing right of way by the resort now or in the future." (Planning Committee Report, p. 46) We expect that this intention has not changed.
2. We understand that the proposed Recreation Centre will be subject to site plan approval, which should presumably address such matters as noise attenuation, lighting and landscaping, among others. As we have expressed in prior letters, we have significant ongoing concerns regarding issues of noise, privacy, trespassing, drunken behavior of tenants and garbage these tenants periodically leave behind on private property. The new Recreation Centre will draw more park tenants to the area near residential property and will undoubtedly exacerbate the nuisance. We ask that the Building Department be fully apprised of our concerns as it addresses the site plan, because there does not appear to be a formal process for area residents to comment during the site plan approval process.

3. As a further step toward addressing concerns about noise, privacy, trespassing, drunken behavior and the like, we request that Parkbridge supply us with contact information for their onsite property manager and security personnel, if any. With such information, the residents contiguous to the park can attempt to address any nuisance concerns directly and informally with park personnel, without having to involve the authorities.
4. Parks Canada – Trent Severn Waterway has “strongly recommended” that demolition of the two existing buildings on the site plan not harm or result in the removal of mature trees in the vicinity. (Planning Department Report, p. 47) We have the same concerns. The proposed amended By-Law contains no such restriction. If such a restriction is more properly the purview of the Building Department during site plan approval, we ask that our concerns in this regard, together with Parks Canada – Trent Severn Waterway’s strong recommendation, be conveyed in an appropriate fashion.
5. Parkbridge has placed large barrier stones at the entrance of the right of way to 280 Lakeshore Dr. to discourage golf cart travel from the park across the property of 280 Lakeshore Dr. We appreciate this effort, but park tenants continue periodically to walk across the right of way into private property to access Lakeview Estates. The residents of 280 and 282 Lakeshore Dr. will be constructing a fence between the northwest corners of their respective properties and the LSR property. In the location where the right of way exists, a gate large enough to accommodate vehicles will be installed. The gate will be closed but not locked and will hopefully ameliorate the ongoing problem of park tenants walking through the right of way into private property.
6. The Planning Department Report states that the 4.5m setback illustrated in the site plan for the new Recreation Centre must be increased (Planning Department Report, p. 47), but there is no reference to this requirement in the proposed By-Law amendment.

We understand that the Planning Department has recommended that the By-Law Amendment include a Holding Zone to ensure that a site plan is properly registered and approved, including Ministry of Environment and Climate Change approval of water and wastewater systems, and that a detailed Environmental Impact Study is conducted to ensure appropriate construction mitigation measures are implemented between the building and the shoreline.

We want to thank the Planning Department and Parkbridge for their consideration of our previous objections to Parkbridge's application for a By-Law Amendment. As indicated above, we believe that the modifications to the application resolves most of those objections. We ask that the remaining concerns discussed above be considered as the Planning Department addresses the removal of the (H) Holding designation and as the Building Department addresses site plan, demolition and construction permits. Representatives of the signatories to this letter have requested an opportunity to address the Committee on April 6 as a delegation.

Very truly yours,

Therese McLaughlin
280 Lakeshore Dr.
Bobcaygeon, ON K0M 1A0

Larry McLaughlin
Douglas McLaughlin
David McLaughlin
278 Lakeshore Dr.
Bobcaygeon, ON K0M 1A0

David Calzone
282 Lakeshore Dr.
Bobcaygeon, ON K0M 1A0

cc: Mark Lahay, Planner II
Planner II
City of Kawartha Lakes
180 Kent Street West,
2nd Floor
Lindsay, ON K9V 2Y6
mlahay@city.kawarthalakes.on.ca

cc: Councillor Gerard Jilesen - Ward 14 gjilesen@city.kawarthalakes.on.ca