

Comment Matrix from First Draft of the Rural Zoning By-law				
Date	Name	Stakeholder type	Comment	Project Team Response
February 17, 2022	Jim Russell	Resident	"I have reviewed the first draft of the Rural Zoning By-law Consolidation. Expected inclusions are not seen in the Plan.	The City acknowledges this comment. The Official Plan sets out policies related to Four Mile Lake that continue to apply.
			It is most important to residents of Four Mile Lake that the existing "Four Mile Lake - Special Policies" in the CoKL Official Plan (section 31.6.2) be maintained as-is, and reflected in the Zoning By-Law as-written."	
February 25, 2022	Kelly Susan	Resident	"Hi there, you have removed Institution I-2 from the rural bylaw and the group home option under the Agricultural bylaw. Please explain why or please place it back in with the growing number of seniors on the waitlist and the new move for shared living as done in Muskoka and in Southern Ontario, we are way behind on this. Section E of the Muskoka Plan speaks to seniors having the right to live with dignity and respect. You should be looking at this be it rural or Urban. THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX and future focused PLEASE."	Comment noted. The Rural Zoning By-law is required to conform to the City's Official Plan which directs group homes to the urban area and larger hamlets where servicing and transportation options are more readily available. The Rural Zoning By-law permits group homes within residential areas in the Hamlets in the HR zones.
March 16, 2022	Ham Keillor-Faulkner	Resident	(summary)	Comment noted. There are other tools at the disposal of the City to control invasive species. With respect to abandoned wells, the Rural Zoning By-law regulates source water protection.
			I am concerned about invasive species affecting the natural assets of CKL, especially invasive plants. Phragmites destroys natural habitat, wild parsnip is dangerous to humans (lasting for years), Garlic mustard, among others.	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see provisions to help control these damaging plants. I am concerned about abandoned water wells with the potential to contaminate ground water aquifers. Think of Walkerton. Can we include provisions to deal with abandoned wells? 	
March 23, 2022	Caitlin Port, MHBC, on behalf of Sunrock Canada LLC	Consultant	(summary)	The City acknowledges this comment. Several revisions to the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law have been proposed in response to these comments and other comments related to aggregate operations, and specifically the IX zone. A summary of changes is provided below:
			Our client operates an active quarry, licensed under the Aggregate Resources Act. The Burnt River Quarry is proposed to be zoned "IX", which permits pits and quarries.	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To be consistent with PPS, the term 'Pit or Quarry' should be replaced with the PPS term and definition for 'Mineral Aggregate Operation'. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term 'mineral aggregate operation' has been defined in lieu of 'pit and quarry' and updated accordingly;
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To be consistent with the PPS, 'Associated Facilities' are part of a 'mineral aggregate operation' and should be permitted in the IX zone without the need for a site-specific zoning By-law Amendment. The PPS p.14 and p.29 references these secondary uses as being equally important to mineral aggregate operations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside storage has been identified as an accessory use;
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The By-law should permit in the IX zone accessory uses such as processing, stockpiling, outdoor storage, maintenance buildings, offices, scale house etc. all of these uses would be regulated by the <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i> Site Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition of 'mineral aggregate operation' includes associated facilities; and
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All legislative and regulatory requirements of the ARA apply to pits and quarries; therefore pit and quarry land use controls and provisions should not be included in the draft zoning by-law and the ARA requirements prevail and are implemented on ARA Site Plans. We recommend the following be deleted from the Draft Zoning By-law: Table 5-1: Parking Requirements for Pits or Quarries; and; Section and Table 9.3: Minimum Lot Areas, Minimum Front Yard requirements, Minimum building setbacks, Minimum Water setback, Maximum Lot Coverage, Maximum Building height, Minimum Landscaped Open Space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review and revision of lot and building requirements which apply within the IX zone.

March 24, 2022	Neal DeRuyter, MHBC, on behalf of R.W. Tomlinson Ltd	Consultant	(summary)	The City acknowledges this comment. Several revisions to the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law have been proposed in response to these comments and other comments related to aggregate operations, and specifically the IX zone. A summary of changes is provided below:
			We are concerned regarding the permitted uses within the proposed industrial Extractive (IX) zones, as well as the lack of implementation of site-specific zoning.	
			Based on review of draft mapping, it appears the proposed zoning does not align with the approved 2008 by-law amendment. We understand that site-specific zones will be incorporated in a second draft, however we are concerned the current mapping may be misleading to the public. We request confirmation that the City will incorporate site specific zoning for the Brechin Quarry into the Zoning By-law and mapping ASAP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The term 'mineral aggregate operation' has been defined in lieu of 'pit and quarry' and updated accordingly;
			The definition for 'Pit or Quarry' is inconsistent with the PPS, which defines "Mineral Aggregate Operation". We recommend the draft be updated to be consistent with the definition of mineral aggregate operation provided in the PPS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside storage has been identified as an accessory use;
			We recommend that the permitted uses list permit associated facilities in accordance with part c) of the PPS definition. The draft currently does not permit associated uses, which in the PPS are explicitly part of a mineral aggregate operation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definition of 'mineral aggregate operation' includes associated facilities; and
			The RZBL provides lot and building requirements for the IX zone. We are concerned these requirements may conflict with the ARA regulations. Refer to Section 66 of the Aggregate Resources Act.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A review and revision of lot and building requirements which apply within the IX zone.
				Further, the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law incorporates the site-specific zoning for the Brechin Quarry.
March 25, 2022	Mike Jamieson	Resident	Just following up now that the Open Houses have concluded. Was there much discussion on shipping containers? And do you have a sense yet whether the wording on 4.33 will be tightened up so that what happened to us on Pine Park Road will not be allowed to happen again on a residential property?"	Comment noted. The Rural Zoning By-law contains provisions to regulate shipping containers in Section 4.33. These uses are considered accessory to a primary permitted use and several other requirements are applied to shipping containers.
March 26, 2022	Erica Hallet	Resident	(summary)	#1 and #2: Comment noted. The Project Team has introduced a new holding provision to the north portion of the property to require a site plan agreement in place to allow development to proceed.
			1. The mapping for the Alpine Resort on Alpine Street in Ops has a draft code of CC. Has a ZBA occurred, or is it in progress to make this change? The CC zone doesn't require any buffer or planting strip abutting any other zone. I find this odd, because it was previously a requirement. I think it is important to have some division between the campers and abutting residential property owners.	
			2. I don't see reference to the time frame in which campers can use properties in the CC zone. In the past, it was restricted from May until October. Changes to that would have a large impact on neighbouring residential property owners. I noticed it says it must close for 60 days. This is very different from the current requirement to close from October to May.	#3. Comment noted. The new Rural Zoning By-law now uses the term 'shoreline structure' to cover structures that were previously considered a 'marine facility' in the Ops By-law. Specific provisions for 'shoreline structures' are set out in Section 4.1.9 of the First Draft.
			3. Current Ops by-law allows for a marine facility. I want to build one. There is no mention of a marine facility in the draft by-law and I want to know if I can still go ahead with my project as is currently permitted in the Ops by-law.	

<p>March 27, 2022</p>	<p>Pat Warren, Char of the CKL Environmental Advisory Committee</p>	<p>Advisory Committee</p>	<p>(summary)</p>	<p>Setbacks. The Rural Zoning By-law follows a graduated approach to shoreline naturalization and water setbacks, including development closer than 15 m and between 15 m and 30 m. Where relief is granted from the 30 m setback, shoreline naturalization regulations remain in place to recognize the trade-off.</p>
			<p>A subcommittee of CKLEAC reviewed the RZBL as they pertain to waterfront/shoreline properties with the city's goals in mind. We also looked at Haliburton's proposed Shoreline Preservation By-law, among others. At March 24 meeting of CKLEAC, resolution was passed to submit these comments.</p>	
			<p>Setbacks: We support the 30 metre setback for new development on all shoreline properties. In the case of major renos or demolition and reconstruction within the 30 m setback we recommend that modifications of the existing footprint not be permitted, and would require a minor variance or zoning amendment. In the case of demolition and re-construction, this should only be permitted if there is no reasonable alternative for relocation beyond the 30 m setback and should be contingent on trade-offs to create a net environmental benefit. We believe the application of "established building line" as justification for reduction of a 30 m setback is inappropriate. "building line" cannot take into account shoreline irregularities, changes in elevation, spacing between lots, density of trees.</p>	<p>Site plans. The City acknowledges this comment. At this time, site plan control is not proposed for waterfront development.</p>
			<p>Site Plans: We recommend Site Plan control for waterfront development with one of the two following options: 1. All developments in properties that are within 30 metres of waterbody, 2. All developments within 100 metres of waterbody (as is the case in Rideau Lakes). All new development should demonstrate no negative impact, could be done through site plan control. Trees could be protected through site plan control, which we strongly recommend. Where trees are cut down, we recommend that stumps must remain to stabilize the soil. No fill/topsoil should be added or removed from within 30 m setback area except with permit.</p>	
			<p>Lot size/coverage: standard minimum lot size and frontage should be followed for any future severance/creation. Support for Kawartha Conservation recommendation: disturbed area of waterfront property not to exceed 25%, impervious surfaces not to exceed 10%. 75% should be natural vegetated state. Support their recommendation that a zoning category be included for undersized lots that are unable to accommodate the 30 m setback.</p>	<p>Lot Size/Coverage. The City acknowledges this comment. The Rural Zoning By-law implements the maximum 25% disturbed area requirement. Provisions have been included to recognize undersized lots that are unable to accommodate the 30-metre setback.</p>
			<p>New developments: Any new development proposal resulting in the creation of more than 3 lots with water access, a lake impact study should be required. Should also be required for any significant development proposal, for a non-residential use within 300 m of a lake. Approval is predicated on no negative impacts.</p>	
			<p>Shoreline Frontages: Minimum frontage for newly created waterfront lots should be 60 m. Minimums should be increased for narrow channel abutting properties.</p>	<p>New development. A Lake Impact Study would be a requirement of a Planning Act application identified through the pre-consultation process. Requiring a study would be beyond the powers of a Zoning By-law under the Planning Act.</p>
			<p>Home Industry: Section 4.15.3 prohibits home industry in lots abutting a water body. However, table 6-2 permits use in zones RR2 and RR3, which includes lots abutting a waterbody.</p>	
			<p>Rural Zones: Kawartha Conservation recommends distinction between seasonal and residential occupancy, we support this recommendation. We also recommend that an indication be given as the what indicators are employed to define a lot as one of the RR2 and RR3 zones. Table 2-1 is unclear – RR2 zones are not described to include lots abutting a waterbody.</p>	<p>Shoreline Frontages. Comment noted. The City will undertake a comprehensive review of waterfront and shoreline policies as part of a future Official Plan Review.</p>

			<p>Boathouse limitations coordination with KC standards: Section 4.34.1.5a implies that a maximum boathouse width of 23 m is permitted. We recommend the bylaw reference the KC policies permitting a maximum 80 sq. m.</p>	
			<p>Dark Skies: Implement “Dark Skies” policy where practical, in relation to waterfront properties.</p>	<p>Home industry. Clarification has been added to the permitted uses table for residential zones that home industries are not permitted on a lot abutting a waterbody.</p>
			<p>Ease of interpretation: Make document more readable with a section specific to waterfront lots, with references to other sections of the by-law.</p>	
			<p>Buffer to aggregate operations: We recommend that Table 9-3 requires larger setback from water than the 30 m currently shown.</p>	<p>Rural Zones. Clarification has been added to the Zone Descriptions. The new Rural Zoning By-law no longer distinguishes between seasonal vs. year-round uses.</p>
				<p>Boathouse limitations. A new Table 4-2 has been proposed which establishes maximum widths for boathouses.</p>
				<p>Dark Skies. This type of policy would be best suited for the City’s Official Plan and would exceed the powers of a zoning by-law under the Planning Act.</p>
				<p>Buffer to Aggregate Operations. The provisions related to aggregate operations have been review in the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law. It is proposed that the setback remain as-is.</p>
<p>March 29, 2022</p>	<p>Jeff Shall</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>“1. How do you deem a property LSR? In my situation I pay full residential Mil rate, but am deemed LSR. If based on the designation of the road, then my immediate neighbour is NOT zoned that way, just residential, and we have a driveway on the same road?”</p>	<p>The City acknowledges this comment. The Rural Zoning By-law Review project is a comprehensive review of all zoning within the Rural Area of Kawartha Lakes in part to establish a harmonized zoning regime across the rural area. The new Rural Zoning By-law no longer distinguishes between seasonality in residential zones.</p>
			<p>2. The relevance to the above question is based on Home Occupation and Home Industry allowances. In the former Carden Township, we are NOT allowed these designations based on LSR. Why is this? What is the foundation of the difference of why Residential and LSR have different rules? Again, in my example, an immediate neighbour on the same road, same lot size, and different zoning prohibits me from the same rights as an equal taxpayer, with the same Mil rate?</p>	
			<p>3. Why do the new proposals identify 0.4Ha as the minimum lot size for a Home Industry?</p>	<p>The Project Team have reviewed the provisions for home industries and have removed the minimum lot size requirement</p>
			<p>4. There are MANY current small businesses functioning now, without issue, on a lot size smaller than the proposed 0.4Ha. What will happen to them? These are law abiding, tax paying citizens who contribute to local economy, and are often an important part of these rural communities. We need them, and will these new bylaws force them into closing?</p>	
			<p>5. We are a township who lacks a lot of industry, and it appears we are forcing out some of those who are providing goods and services currently. Seems a bit backwards.</p>	
			<p>6. Will there be a township wide adjustment to zoning of property? To equal up the disparities between the former townships, and have a level and equal system for zoning of properties from one end of the City of KL to the other? And when would something like this happen? 5 years? 10 years? We are 13 or 14 years into the formation of the current City of KL, and nothing so far. I understand, the measures being taking, and the platform I am responding to, is a step in that direction, just want to gauge the previous 13 years to what the future timeline would look like”</p>	

March 29, 2022	Felix Winkelaar	Resident	"My concerns centre around permitted uses in agricultural zones.	Comment noted. Forestry is permitted in all Agricultural zones. Processing of timber resources (e.g., milling into boards) is considered an agricultural products processing establishment as defined in the By-law.
			Table 7-2 on page 94 lists uses that are permitted in the different agricultural zones. This is what I'd like clarification on, specifically permitted uses in the AG zone.	
			If I wanted to build an open sided shed for housing a stationary bandsaw, would that not be permitted?"	A new definition of sawmill has been added to provide additional clarity.
			...[definitions for 'Forestry' and 'Agricultural Products Processing Establishment'] ...	
			"What defines the development of a timber resource? Would milling a log into boards be considered the development of a timber resource? What is the difference between developing and processing said timber resources? The APPE definition seems to imply that a building housing a sawmill would not be permitted on AG land."	
March 29, 2022	Anne Hayter President of Four Mile Lake Association	Community Group	(Summary)	The Project Team acknowledges these comments. Under Section 31.3.3 of the City's Official Plan, Four Mile Lake is at-capacity for new recreational development and activities, as well as residential cluster and all commercial development. This is addressed in the Rural Zoning By-law, which only permits typical single detached dwellings. Uses absent from specific provisions/regulations in the RZBL does not mean that they are permitted or go unchecked.
			The OP identifies Four Mile Lake as an 'at capacity lake', but the RZBL does not. Include Four Mile Lake as an at capacity lake to reduce development.	
			Section 31.6.2.4 of the OP specifies that residential cluster development on backlots with access to the lake through private or publicly owned lands is not permitted. This is not addressed in the Draft RZBL, nor is backlotting defined. We would like this addressed.	
			There are parts of the lake area that are not identified as RR3A, two roads with water frontage, please confirm that this is to be corrected.	
			OP section 31.6.2.2 specific minimum lot frontage of 60 m and lot area of 0.4 hectares, the draft RZBL identifies a minimum lot area of 1850 sq. m. and lot frontage of 30 m.	
			OP section 31.6.2.2 prohibits new residential cluster development. Should a development of more than one lot be proposed, the zoning by-law lot and building requirements for single lots would need to be considered in all such proposed developments. Perhaps the inclusion of any 'new or existing lots' of record should be added to table 6.6 so that it is all inclusive and easily identified.	
			Nothing in the Draft RZBL on new development on waterfront properties. There is still portions of the lake which are undeveloped. The ZBL should identify requirements for any new development, as per the OP – SP1.	
March 30, 2022	Frank Heerkens, president of the Ontario Maple Syrup Producers Association	Ontario Association	(summary)	Comment noted. Maple syrup is identified in the definition of agriculture as a normal farm practice. The processing of maple sap to make the commodity saleable is considered a value-retaining use in accordance with Provincial guidelines. Value-retaining facilities are permitted as an agricultural use in all Agricultural zones. A notation has been added to the definition of agriculture to provide greater clarity.
			"We are concerned that:	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the possible restriction of agricultural processing could prevent the operation of new or existing maple operations within the City of Kawartha Lakes. restrictions on forestry, firewood processing, and lumber production could also interfere with operations that are integral to, or ancillary to maple operations. 	Forestry is permitted in all Agricultural zones. Processing of timber resources is considered an agricultural products processing establishment as defined in the By-law.

			I would like to point out that the province has amended the Ontario Reg. 282/98 in 2004 to state that land used to process maple sap shall be included in the farm property classification. For more information visit: https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/r04286 .”	
March 31, 2022	Brandeston Farm	Local business	(summary)	The City acknowledges this comment. The By-law defines ‘agriculture’ to include a wide range of normal farm practices, including value-retaining uses. It is not the intent of the By-law to limit the types of processing and storage units described in the comments as they are directly related to the farm use.
			Concerned with Table 7-2, “permitted uses in the agricultural zone”. Several uses are permitted in the AR zone, but not the AG zone, including “Agricultural products processing establishments, Agricultural products warehouses (storage), and Agricultural Research Facilities”. This change, while intended to protect Agricultural uses, is destructive in our context.	
			Our context is best described as “large scale gardening”. i.e. sustainable practice without heavy machinery and with an aim to protect/improve the environment.	A notation has been added to the definition of ‘agriculture’ to indicate that value-retaining farm uses located on farms serve to maintain the quality of raw commodities (e.g., crop storage, maple sap) produced on the farm to ensure they remain saleable – in line with Provincial guidelines.
			Our innovative (or more traditional) approach to small-scale farming seems to be at odds with the ZBL, which does not permit “agricultural products processing establishments and agricultural products warehouses as permitted uses. These are practices that are necessary for small-scale farmers as we do not seek to centralize these aspects of food production.	
			Permitting “cannabis Production and Processing Facility” as a permitted use in the AG zone is “an absurd exception”. This means that an agriculture processing facility is permitted if and only if it is for cannabis, not if it is for lettuce, onions and tomatoes.	The City’s cannabis production regulations were approved by the City in 2021 and integrated into the Rural Zoning By-law. The cultivation and processing of cannabis in the rural area would be considered a normal farm practice in accordance with Provincial guidance.
			We recommend that these three uses be permitted in the AG zone.	
March 31, 2022	Brian Bartley, president of the Haliburton-Kawartha Local of the Maple Syrup Producers Association.	Local Association	(summary)	Comment noted. Forestry is permitted in all Agricultural zones. Processing of timber resources (e.g., milling into boards) is considered an agricultural products processing establishment as defined in the By-law.
			Maple syrup production mostly takes place on land zoned AG, and some on land zoned as EP in the draft RZBL. Maple sap and syrup processing necessitate processing on-site (it is heavy to transport, spoils quickly). This appears to be defined as a Agricultural Products Processing Establishment, which is not permitted in the AG zone. Maple Syrup Processing does not appear to be covered as a “value-Added Farm Use”. We trust that this is an oversight and will be corrected.	
			There is also some confusion around forestry. The definition of Forestry includes ‘processing’, but what does ‘processing’ entail? Does it preclude cutting down trees? We request that the long established and presently permitted practices regarding harvesting and processing timber on farms is recognized and codified in the new by-law.	A new definition of sawmill has been added to provide additional clarity.
			(Summary) My family have had waterfront property since 1947, and until 2018 it was a seasonal residence. Our lot is configured in such a way that we would not have been able to build without a variance.	

<p>April 1, 2022</p>	<p>Douglas Willmot</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>1. Increasing the setback to 30 metres is a concern. The lakes are well developed, as more people move to the area, like myself, the new setback will be quite restrictive, if not impossible on many lots to renovate their houses. Also of note, waterfront residents pay more in taxes than non-waterfront property owners. Most lots are not configured to accommodate larger setbacks. There are instances where the building is further from the lake, but the septic bed is between the building and the lake. I recommend that development should be no closer than existing structure, if new development it must comply with 30 metre setback.</p> <p>2. Shoreline naturalization. I like this initiative, but It appears the onus is on waterfront landowners. Many waterfront owners have had to reinforce their shoreline from erosion because of the increase in volume and size of boats on the lakes. Our lake depth also fluctuates largely, making naturalization of the shoreline a difficult question.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan requires a minimum setback of 30 metres from the high-water mark, which must be implemented in the Rural Zoning By-law. The Rural Zoning By-law recognizes that this may not work on all lots and permits a buildings that closer than 30 metres to be reconstructed or altered, subject to criteria – which acknowledges that there are instances where the building or septic systems are closer to the lake.</p>
<p>March 31, 2022</p>	<p>Janet Wong</p>		<p>(Summary of comments in pdf of the draft RZBL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify the definition for “Established Building Line” (p. 18) - P.22, consider changing, ‘high water marks’ should be from “seasonal flooding”, not just flood events. - Minor Grammar errors: p.24 (include ‘and’), p.24 (remove comma in definition of water setback), 4.2.6 (grammar), 4.16.1.c (hyphen in ‘home based), 4.37.3 (permitted in the) - P.25 Consider expanding definition of “through lots” - P.36. Consider changes to definition of “shoreline naturalization buffer” - P.38. Consider defining “established grade” - P. 38. Clarify definition of ‘street’ for some edge cases. - P.46. consider the use of ‘required yard’, it may be used interchangeably with ‘minimum required yard’. - Table 4-1, does balconies use preclude steps in side yard? - 4.11.1, consider the case of the last house on a road. - 4.12.2.c, is it necessary to state what is considered front lot line when access if from public right of way? - 4.34.2.1, Clarify wording - 4.39.1, consider using list format or semi-colons. Clarify to what uses it applies. - Table 11-2, confirm if consideration has been given to including campsites in the definition of public park. 	<p>Comments addressed in revised Rural Zoning By-law.</p>
<p>April 1, 2022</p>	<p>Janet Wong</p>		<p>“I’ve attached a copy of the draft Zoning By-law with comments using Adobe noted for your consideration. You may wish to consider formatting the header (page numbers) and footer (Draft Rural Zoning By-law January 2022 City of Kawartha Lakes) and pagination for double sided printing for the few times a printed copy will be necessary.</p> <p>Congratulations to the Team on getting to this milestone.”</p>	<p>Comment noted. Thank you for providing comments.</p>
			<p>“As I sit to write I am undecided whether my concern is simply to various provisions or a larger concern that there is a lack of distinction within Agricultural Zones.</p>	

April 1, 2022	Paul Reed	Resident	I am blessed and fortunate to live in the north part of Kawartha Lakes (former Digby township) and while my lot is designated as Agriculture only 1/16 of the property is arable land and the remainder forested and alvar. Maple Syrup and Forest products are a substantial part of my sustainable farm operation but the provisions surrounding food processing and wood processing strike me as limiting my options. I wonder if there is a full awareness of this end of the spectrum when it comes to farm operations. It truly is not comparable to large workable fields common further south.”	Comment noted. Maple syrup is identified in the definition of agriculture as a normal farm practice. The processing of maple sap to make the commodity saleable is considered a value-retaining use in accordance with Provincial guidelines. Value-retaining facilities are permitted as an agricultural use in all Agricultural zones. A notation has been added to the definition of agriculture to provide greater clarity.
March 31, 2022	Steve Crighton	Cottager	<p>(summary)</p> <p>I’m concerned about the inclusion of ‘home industry’ as a permitted use in the residential areas of Sturgeon Point. People vacationing in Sturgeon point don’t want to live near any of the uses permitted as a home industry. I question whether Home Industry uses are appropriate in any HR zone.</p> <p>The OP does not appear to permit “home industry” as an accessory use in the waterfront designation in Sturgeon Point.</p> <p>The OP also has special policies for Sturgeon Point. I argue that “home industry” accessory uses in Sturgeon Point violates S.20.6 of the OP. The ZBL must conform with the OP. The Zoning By-law should not be more permissive than the OP. If a use is not permitted in an area by the OP it should not be permitted through zoning.</p> <p>I request that Home Industry is removed as a permitted use in the HR zone.</p>	<p>The City acknowledges this comment. A Home Industry is permitted by the Official Plan where a dwelling is permitted (Section 11). The Rural Zoning By-law prohibits a home industry on lots abutting a waterbody. Given that the majority of properties within Sturgeon Point abut a waterbody, there are limited lots where a home industry would be permitted.</p> <p>The Project Team will be reviewing the residential zone(s) which apply within Sturgeon Point.</p>
April 1, 2022	Brian Bartley	Resident	<p>(summary)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are concerned that we and our neighbours did not receive adequate notification of the ZBLR process. 2. Definition of ‘Agricultural Products Processing Establishment’ is problematic. For instance, does it include cutting and baling hay, storing it to feed animals. This definition would appear to prohibit this use, along with other uses, such as apiaries, wool processing, etc. 3. Definition of ‘Warehouse’ might include storage of Hay. Needs clarity as to the overlap between this and Agriculture. 4. Restrictions on the number of shipping containers on a lot. Shipping containers are economic and effective solutions for farmers. I request the limit be removed for lots zoned AG and Industrial 5. Dog Kennels on lands zoned for agriculture. Existing by-law 2017-039 places no limit on the number of dogs kept on lands zoned for agriculture, agricultural support, or agriculturally-related purposes. It seems inconsistent to prohibit properly registered kennels on such lands as defined in Table 7-2 of the draft zoning by-law. 6. Home industries. Draft wording in 4.3 would seem to prohibit Home Industries on most farm homes because they are not permitted on lots abutting a waterbody, but most farms abut a waterbody, as defined in the draft. I propose that this exclusionary clause be removed. 7. The mapping boundaries for AG and EP areas on our lots N Part of lot 11 Concession 9, Lot 12 Concession 9, and the East and West Halves of Lot13 Con 9 in Laxton Township deviate from the geographic reality. More land is zoned EP than should be. 	<p>The City acknowledges these comments.</p> <p>#1: The City has published notices regarding the Rural Zoning By-law in the newspaper, on social media, and on the project website over the past couple of years. The Project Team will explore further opportunities to provide notification about this project.</p> <p>#2: The examples provided in this comment would reflect normal farm practices that are permitted alongside agricultural uses on the same lot. Permissions are in place for agriculture-related uses that support the broader rural area.</p> <p>#3: Comment noted. Storage of hay would be considered part of agriculture/normal farm practices.</p> <p>#4: Comment acknowledged. The Project Team has reviewed all shipping container regulations and provided a revised approach.</p>

				#5: Comment noted. No changes are proposed to the permissions for dog kennels in the rural area. New kennels will require a site-specific zoning by-law amendment to apply the AR zone and permit the use.
				#6: Comment acknowledged. The Project Team has reviewed the definition and mapping and no changes are proposed at this time as the provisions relate to frontage on a waterbody.
				#7: Comment acknowledged. The project team have carried forward the previous EP zones from the LDL Zoning By-law. The extent of EP zones may be refined through subsequent planning applications.
			(summary)	The City acknowledges these comments.
			Farmers appreciate land base mapping, which recognizes classes 1-7 lands are valuable to farming. Also appreciate the definitions to agricultural and ag-related uses as they are clear and well-defined. Also appreciates on-farm diversified uses definition, but the slides were confusing.	
			Concerns:	#1: The Agricultural Consolidation (AC) zone has been setup to prohibit single detached dwellings on an agricultural lot following a severance.
			1. Clarify definition of Agricultural consolidation with criteria	
			2. On-Farm diversified uses: Table 7-2 lists specific uses which MAY have retail components. Reference to 'retail sales' in ag areas is too vague and does not conform with OP (16.3.3). Retail sales on farms on country roads is not consistent with OP, or PPS definition of Agricultural systems.	#2: The Province's guidelines set out that limited amounts of retail uses may be permitted as part of an on-farm diversified use. Section 4.25 sets out policies to limit the scale of on-farm diversified uses. A new provision has been added to further limit the extent of retail sales as part of an on-farm diversified use.
			3. Some confusion over Slide 35, agricultural zones permitting 'broad range of on-farm diversified uses, subject to criteria. Is 'broad range' in reference to table 7-2? What criteria does this mean? Ideally 'criteria' would follow definition from the PPS and the Growth Plan as well as two points below related to OMAFRA and OFA.	
			4. OMAFRA's "Agricultural Economic Development Guidebook" supports OPS and ZBLs that "support agri-food and related activities". Balancing good planning and ec-dev can be a challenge this guide can help.	#3: Section 4.25 of the Rural Zoning By-law sets out policies and criteria for on-farm diversified uses.
			5. The wording/criteria for on-farm diversified uses could also benefit from inclusion of the OFA suggested definition for 'Non-Agricultural Uses of Land' included in OFA's Consolidated Land Use Policy. (lists several policies that are included therein)	#4-6: The Project Team acknowledges these comments and will note them as part of any future updates to the City's Official Plan, particularly related to on-farm diversified and agriculture-related uses.
			6. OMAFRA and OFA are experts and can help roll out the new use defined as "on-farm diversified uses".	
			(Summary)	
			i. "Boathouses (Page 49) – are allowed provided they are less than 4.5 meters in height and are at least 4 meters from the lot line. They may contain a flat roof used as an open sitting area. Parks Canada and Kawartha Conservation regulations will also apply.	
			Any review of the current space on the backside of boathouses would show that this proposal will essentially create a bigger "junk" storage space and restrict the size of natural waterfront/recreation area. In our opinion this will also create a surge of variance requests which will further backlog the City's planning department which is a poor use of city resources.	
April 1, 2022	Darlene Callan	Resident		The City acknowledges these comments. The Rural Zoning By-law is required to implement the policies of the City's Official Plan, including the requirement for a 30-meter water setback. The Rural Zoning By-law recognizes that this may not function equally on all lots and has set out policies related to the reconstruction of existing buildings and structures within the minimum water setback (Section 4.34). This also
April 1, 2022	Nick Henley, Henley Contracting Ltd	Contractor		

			<p>Also on some smaller lakefront properties, the proposed 30m offset from waterfront, in combination with new septic size regulations will make reconstruction on smaller lots VERY RESTRICTED.</p> <p>Overall, there needs to be serious considerations on the negative impacts of these proposals for residents of the Kawartha Lakes, and also City staff on the number of variances that they are prepared to be handling.”</p>	<p>includes a shoreline activity area, with specific provisions for boathouses, with the goal of promoting shoreline naturalization along the waterfront.</p>
<p>April 1, 2022</p>	<p>Chris Galway, Sr. Land Manager, Lafarge Canada</p>	<p>Aggregate</p>	<p>“DEFINITION OF A PIT OR QUARRY - The pit and quarry definition should be deleted and replaced with the PPS definition of Mineral Aggregate Operation. Our position is that asphalt plants and concrete batching plants are permitted as “associated facilities” in licensed pits and quarries and not require a ZBLA.</p> <p>OUTSIDE STORAGE IN IX ZONING - Table 9-2, outside storage should be added as a permitted accessory use in the IX Zone. This table needs to be updated to reflect the uses permitted by the PPS definition of Mineral Aggregate Operation.</p> <p>RECYCLING OF AGGREGATES - Table 9.2 also needs to be updated to include the recycling of aggregates. This will allow the table to reflect the uses permitted by the PPS definition of Mineral Aggregate Operations. This will align the permitted uses with the recent changes to the Aggregate Resource Act Regulations”</p>	<p>The City acknowledges this comment. Several revisions to the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law have been proposed in response to these comments and other comments related to aggregate operations, and specifically the IX zone. A summary of changes is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The term ‘mineral aggregate operation’ has been defined in lieu of ‘pit and quarry’ and updated accordingly; · Outside storage has been identified as an accessory use; · The definition of ‘mineral aggregate operation’ includes associated facilities; an · A review and revision of lot and building requirements which apply within the IX zone.
<p>April 1, 2022</p>	<p>Catherine Medici, President, Sturgeon Point Association</p>	<p>Residents Association</p>	<p>“Will the new By-Laws supersede any of the provisions specific to Sturgeon Point in the Official Plan? I also understand that Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 339 will cease to exist once the new consolidated By-Law is enacted. Will the contents of Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 339 be incorporated into the new Consolidated By-Laws or will the new By-Laws supersede Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 339 and, if so, specifically what protections will Sturgeon Point lose, if any.</p> <p>Furthermore, one of Sturgeon Point's boathouses was taken out by the tornado that hit Sturgeon Point in July 2020. The existing Comprehensive Zoning By-Law 339 states that it can be rebuilt within two years. Will the new Consolidated By-Laws remove this ability?”</p>	<p>The City acknowledges this comment. The Rural Zoning By-law works to implement the policies of the City’s Official Plan. Once adopted by Council, the Rural Zoning By-law would supersede the Sturgeon Point Zoning By-law (339). The Rural Zoning By-law contains provisions related to the construction or re-construction of existing structures (Section 4.18).</p>
<p>April 4, 2022</p>	<p>Fiona McKay, Land Securement, Kawartha Land Trust</p>	<p>Association</p>	<p>Concerns regarding natural heritage conservation and protection provisions and regarding EP zoning Definition.</p> <p>“The definitions of Significant Drinking Water Threat do not consider changes to the surrounding environment that may increase the risk. For example, if an activity has a run-off component, and the surrounding natural landscape is modified, such as wooded areas or locally significant and/or ephemeral wetlands being cleared or filled, the risk from existing operations will be greater. This should be accounted for.</p> <p>The Shoreline Naturalization Buffer means all lands within the water setback maintained in its natural predevelopment state for the purpose of protecting natural habitat (definition from the draft document). However, there are no setbacks regarding existing “natural elements” that would be significantly impacted by construction/development activities, especially where these activities are permitted within the 30 m buffer (e.g., a buffer reduced because of existing neighbouring structures). For example, existing mature trees within the naturalization buffer should have setbacks that protect the root base from heavy equipment or materials. Compression of that root base, caused by driving over it or storing heavy construction materials on it, can kill the tree. This is contrary to protecting existing cover. Those features should have protection provisions as well; the existing provisions only address the final structures’ footprint, not the area impacted during construction. This concern would also apply to “fragile” features, such as steep shoreline grades that could be easily compromised by the construction activity itself.</p> <p>Environmental Protection (EP) needs to allow for sub-designations that reflect the potential for buildings or structures OR, alternatively, Public Parks need their own designation. This is because, currently, Public Parks are zoned EP yet they allow for many activities not generally associated with conservation and protection of the natural environment (i.e. may contain one or more athletic fields, field houses, bleachers, swimming pools, botanical gardens, zoological gardens, bandstands, skating rinks, tennis courts, bowling greens, boat liveries, bathing stations, refreshment rooms, or similar uses). This is extremely problematic for conservation groups with EP-zoned lands, such as Kawartha Land Trust, who apply for provincial funding because certain funding programs do not recognize EP lands as an eligible zoning when that zoning allows for buildings, structures or uses not consistent with natural heritage protection. The rationalization is that the zoning does not stop those activities or uses, which are detrimental to natural heritage conservation, from occurring on those lands. Therefore, funding cannot be provided.</p> <p>It would be extremely beneficial to these organizations if zoning could differentiate between lands with these substantially different permitted uses.”</p>	<p>Significant Drinking Water Threat. Comment noted. The provisions of the By-law address future and expanded significant drinking water threats (as defined terms). Through the development review process, the City will consider the cumulative impacts of development on natural features and drinking water.</p> <p>Shoreline Naturalization. The regulation of construction activities and minimum buffers around natural elements would be best regulated outside of the zoning by-law through other City standards and agreements related to site alteration, tree protection, and construction.</p> <p>Environmental Protection. Comment noted. In reviewing the locations of parks within the Rural Area, public parks are largely placed with the CU (Community Use) zone. This zone permits a range of different facilities as noted in the comment. If there are specific lands that the Project Team should be aware of, these can be looked at on a case-by-case basis.</p>
			<p>(Summary)</p>	<p>The City acknowledges these comments. The City’s Official Plan lists those lakes that are deemed ‘at-capacity’. This will be reviewed through the subsequent Official Plan Review.</p>

<p>April 24, 2022</p>	<p>Emma Collyer, Director, Integrated Watershed Management Kawartha Conservation</p>	<p>Public Agency</p>	<p>Generally, in support of the draft RZBL.</p> <p>Regarding 'At Capacity Lakes', recommend you confirm this is the most up-to-date list with planning staff from Ontario Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (Peterborough District).</p> <p>RE Environmental Protection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide definition of Environmental Protection, including what landscape features are within scope of definition. In addition, provide definitions for natural hazard and natural heritage features. 2. Updated information for mapping and boundaries is likely available for natural heritage/hazard features within the scope of the EP designation. Mapping and related information should be reviewed and shared among CoKL and KC staff to ensure the most up-to-date information is included. In addition, a mechanism/process should be put in place for the routine update, or data gathering/mining, where applicable of Environmental Protection related information (like water resources system and Key Natural Heritage Features) 3. Recommend the requirement of having in place a Forest Management Plan (by a certified Forester) as a condition of undertaking Forestry operations in EP zones. <p>Ensure Environmental Impact Studies (Scoped) are required for shoreline developments/activities in adjacent lands to Key Natural Heritage Features, Natural Hazards, and sensitive Water Resources System components as per the PPS and related land use planning guidance documents.</p>	<p>Environmental Protection is not a defined term as it is the name of zone that permits a limited range of uses. The existing boundaries of the Environmental Protection zone from the current rural zoning by-laws have been carried forward. As development applications are processed, the extent of the EP zone may be refined following completion of a site-specific environmental impact study.</p> <p>The Rural Zoning By-law is one tool available to the city to guide development. Provisions related to the requirements for Forest Management Plans and Environmental Impact Studies are best suited in the City's Official Plan.</p>
<p>April 14, 2022</p>	<p>Pat Warren, CKLEAC</p>	<p>Advisory Committee</p>	<p>summary) We hope to help improve Ag and Env sustainability for the future. We recommend that the OP be updated before the new by-laws are brought into effect. The By-laws must conform to the policies of the updated OP.</p> <p>The Agricultural Industry and the Environment: balance between agriculture and environment is important.</p> <p>The Impact of Land Development: the OP recognizes the value of wetlands. We recognize their importance for carbon storage and think this should be added as an important value.</p> <p>Zoning for Green Energy: We recognize the importance of solar and wind for meeting GHG reduction targets, and see it as an opportunity for CKL. We recognize that solar and wind have strong synergies with sheep grazing. And that wind and solar can make use of otherwise unproductive agricultural land.</p> <p>EP Zoning: EP zoning should NOT permit agriculture in a PSW as it presently does, as agriculture destroys wetlands. However, Ag in the Burnt River Flood plan seems fine. Suggest separating hazard lands from Natural Heritage lands in the Zoning. Suggest also separating the flood and hazard protection, putting it in a hazard zoning separate from an EP zoning to Natural Heritage Features. PSWs aren't always hazardous, but have high env importance.</p> <p>Updated Mapping of Features in new Zoning Maps and Schedule A and B Maps: We understand that Schedule A and B maps have not been updated recently. Numerous PSWs are not in Schedule A or proposed EP zoning. There are many discrepancies. Ontario Land Inventory Database (OLI) and MNRF Natural Heritage Make a Map site have more wetlands, our mapping should be updated to reflect this. Mapping where significant Woodlands overlap non PSWs, the Woodlands only are visible when both should be visible. Unevaluated wetlands are important. Consider the approach used elsewhere: any unevaluated wetland is PSW unless otherwise determined.</p> <p>Zoning and Conservation Acts Regulations and Policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The zoning must be supportive of the Conservation Authorities Act and the Regulations and policies under that act. 2. All wetlands must be protected from conversion <p>Mapping should be updated to the most current and most accurate mapping available.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The updated Rural Zoning By-law includes updated EP zone mapping that includes the latest mapping of Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSW) from the Province. The Rural Zoning By-law continues to map the Conservation Authority Regulated Area to indicate where a permit or further attention may be required.</p>

Comment Matrix from Second Draft of the Rural Zoning By-law

Date	Name	Stakeholder type	Comment	Project Team Response
March 14, 2023	Donald Kerr	Resident	Re: Section 13 – Exception Zones 614 and 686 are missing. Why?	Comment addressed. The exception zones have been reviewed and aligned. Our records indicate that exception zones 614 and 686 have been combined with exception zone 769 for the new Rural Zoning By-law because the zone provisions are the same. The current, in-effect zoning of these properties is Rural Residential Type Two Exception Fourteen – RR2-S14. The same zoning is applied across a few properties and, for the purposes of the consolidation, has become referred to as Exception Zone 769.
March 14, 2023	Jim Russell	Resident	How are the policies prescribed under the Four Mile Lake Special Policy Area incorporated into the RZBL?	Comment addressed. A new Exception Zone No. 1098 has been applied residential properties along Four Mile to address the front yard setback and bed & breakfast policies of the Special Policy Area. Many of the OP policies do not apply retroactively and pertain to new lot creation and development. The policies in the OP do not apply retroactively and pertain to new development (i.e., consent). In the event of new development, then the OP would be referenced and the applicable policies would be contemplated. The RZBL acknowledges what is currently built (does not pre-zone).
March 15, 2023	Mike Jamieson	Resident	How are shipping containers being considered in the RZBL?	Comment acknowledged. We built a section in to the General Provisions that addresses this. See Section 4.1.10. We are proposing to treat shipping containers like accessory structures (garage, shed, etc.) with some added emphasis on separation from adjacent residential properties. There is also a maximum of two permitted on a site.
March 27, 2023	Robyn Carlson (CKL City Solicitor)	CKL	The frontage requirements should be aligned between by-laws (some require assumption for maintenance purposes, others require only year round maintenance). Then, the actual road status as per the Roads Database should be considered when considering whether or not to change the zone. For example, Gillis Street is not assumed but is maintained in the winter only by the City and is a year-round residential area. This should be "limited service residential" accordingly.	Comment acknowledged. The By-law is no longer distinguishing between limited service residential and residential.
March 27, 2023	Erica Hallet	Resident	I have noticed at least 5 modular homes being delivered to Alpine Resort in May 2022..... I didn't really think these were permitted in this zone category. Wondering if you could please confirm.	Comment addressed. noted that this is comment is a part of a larger issue and that there is an enforcement component as well.

<p>March 27, 2023</p>	<p>Laura Carnochan</p>	<p>CKL</p>	<p>I am working on a Report to rescind the surplus declaration of a property the City owns on South Fork Drive/Lightning Point Road, Coboconk (Roll No.: 1651 310 050 26705). The property is zoned Community Facility and Robyn asked me to check to see if the property is on the radar for the Rural Re-zoning project to rezone the property to open space or residential. Also, there is a property to the north of the City's property, 47 Lightning Point Road (Roll No.: 1651 310 050 26700), which is also zoned Community Facility, but appears to have a private residence built on it. Robyn also inquired as to whether this property would be rezoned as part of the project?</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Both properties designated as Rural in the OP. City property proposed to be zoned Community Use. 47 Lightening proposed to be zoned CU-238 – All provisions of the CU zone shall apply except that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The minimum front yard shall be 30.0 m. 2) The minimum rear yard shall be 30.0 m. 3) The minimum side yard adjacent to a CU zone shall be 3.0m.
			<p>ARN 165102602009650</p> <hr/> <p>Thanks for the informative meeting tonight. Again I apologize I am late to this process. I am the property owner on county road 24, Con 8, lot 11 & 12 in Bobcaygeon. Tax role 1651 026 0200950. The rezoning proposal is from recreational to agricultural. I don't actively farm the property and never have. It is rocky, lots of gravel and trees. Approx 1/3 is zoned EP and is beautiful.</p>	

<p>May 5, 2023</p>	<p>Jenifer Quigley-George</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>I use the property recreationally and have a mobile home, log cabin, two storage structure for atv, snowmobiles and my boat. The property originally was part of the larger farm and town gravel pit to the immediate left. The property was split into three properties. My Dad purchased the larger property on the left next to the town gravel pit which the town retained and uses. We did actively farm the larger property with strawberries and apple orchard and cash cropped. My Dad passed away and that property was sold to new owners who I believe don't farm. That property is rezoned rural residential in the proposal and is the better property for farming than the property I own. I don't have any specific plans for the future on the property but wonder if it should be zoned rural residential to more accurately reflect its purpose? Same zoning as the original property my Dad purchased when the properties were severed.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. As part of the Rural Zoning By-law Review, the existing zoning on properties is not proposed to be changed. It is recommended that this request be considered as part of a site-specific zoning by-law amendment.</p>
<p>May 10, 2023</p>	<p>Andrew Veale</p>		<p>As per our conversation in council chambers after the meeting about the lodge, is it possible that 87 King St Woodville's zoning can be addressed through the rural zoning consolidation process. It is currently showing as community facility but should be the same as the other main street buildings. The masonic lodge has owned the building since the spring of 1905 and the bank became a tenant of the ground floor space in the fall of 1905, a bank has always operated out of that ground floor space except for a period of about 10 years beginning in the early 80's when the village of Woodville offices were housed there which is when I suspect the zoning was changed and then never changed bank when the village of Woodville moved from that location.</p>	<p>Comment addressed. The zoning of this parcel has been changed to C1, which aligns with the former proposed commercial designation in the former Woodville Secondary Plan.</p>
			<p>1) Map A - C24 - South of Elysian Fields. The mapping in this area is not close to being representative of actual land conditions with respect to wetlands or environmentally sensitive areas.</p>	<p>1) Comment acknowledged. There is no proposed change of zoning in this area. The hatched area in blue is the regulated area of the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority and is associated with general regulations in the RZBL. The properties continue to be zoned AG.</p>

May 11, 2023	James Webster	Owner and legal counsel for owner	2) Map A - B53 - The mapping in this area is not close to being representative of actual land conditions with respect to wetlands or environmentally sensitive areas.	2) Comment acknowledged. There is no proposed change of zoning in this area. The hatched area in blue is the regulated area of the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority and is associated with general regulations in the RZBL. The properties' existing zoning continues to be in-effect.
			3) Map A -B77 - There is a vacant residential building lot at the corner of CKL Road 48 and Balsam Lake Drive to the west side of the church/cemetery. The C Zone needs to be distinguished from the subject vacant residential lot. The residential lot needs to have a residential zoning.	3) To discuss. Roll 165134002005902. JD – rezone to residential. OP designation is Rural
			4) Map A - B78 - This area in the existing Bexley By-Law is zoned AP which reflects the deposit of sand/gravel and underlying quality bedrock. The new By-Law should have an equivalent zoning to protect and identify aggregate resources. Perhaps this could be an IX Holding zoning.	4) As part of the Rural Zoning By-law Review, all instances of the existing AP zone have been changed to the Agriculture zone unless used as an active aggregate operation. It is recommended that the zoning of this property change to IX through a site-specific zoning by-law amendment as it does not appear to be an active aggregate operation.
			5) Map A - C37 - The IX between the AG and the EP should be removed.	5) Comment addressed.
	Garry Newhook	Landowner	I started a project in Verulam last October 2022, to build a garage in the front yard of a waterfront lot. I was informed by the building department that a minor variance would be required for the garage as it is not allowed in the front yard. After discussing this with Leah Barrie in planning, she informed me of the new “Rural Zoning By-law” coming soon! The client has decided to wait rather than spend money on a minor variance. I did look into the “Jump In” web page and spring of 2023 was a date of execution that was mentioned. Below is an exert from the new rezoning that I am interested in. Looking forward to City of Kawartha Lakes new Rural Rezoning By-law. Trent Lakes has already combined the zoning into one and it is fantastic. Saves a lot of time. Can you tell me when we can expect the new rezoning bylaw?	Comment acknowledged. The Project Team is working to bring the Rural Zoning By-law forward for Council adoption in late 2023.
			My name is Jason, and I’m the GM of Eganridge Resort. I had reached out, possibly close to a year ago , raising some concerns over the recreational commercial zone, and what it permits. I never received a response. I have attached the email I sent back in February of 2022.	Notes from May 23, 2023 meeting: North part is golf course.

May 15, 2023	Jason Friedman	Egan Ridge Resort	Doing a re-review of the draft bylaw, I have the same concerns. Hotel rooms, banquet halls, assembly spaces, and personal service settings are all integral parts of tourist resorts. Greenhouses may be as well.	Golf course has a "practice Area"
				Main building - two restaurants, hotel rooms, banquet hall, spa, pool, pro shop, meeting rooms
			Furthermore, as it relates to my specific property, you have it spit between CR on the waterfront, and AG on the backside of the property. The part you have designated as AG, is currently, and has from a practical perspective, always fallen under the CR use. Those lands are the golf course, as well as our main building which comprise the hotel, banquet hall, restaurants, and spa. Are you able to revise the AG section to CR, to reflect it's past, present, and future uses?	There are cottages and rental units. Existing large house - historical building.
				As per the mapping, the building is within the AG Zone.
				Golf course present since the 40s.
				Main building had restaurant since the 50s/60s.
				Hotel rooms/banquet since 2000.
				Want to expand the building - to have more hotel rooms and an indoor pool rather than an outdoor pool.
				How did the zone line between AG and CR get drawn?
				The golf course will always be a golf course.
				Confirm the uses for a recreational commercial use -
				Hotel versus motel.
				Take the existing hotel and lengthen to the east.
				Did a pre-consultation.
30-40 rooms.				
Not zoned for the current, past and future use.				
Recreational commercial use.				
Consider site-specific rezoning? This would allow for schedule amendment. Roll this into the rural zoning by-law.				
Municipality required technical studies and a site plan.				
June 6, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	66 Riverside Drive – See Objection Letter in Comments folder	Comment acknowledged. Until such time as the property's designation is changed, it is not recommended that the zoning be updated to a Residential zoning category through the Rural Zoning By-law Review. Further, no changes are proposed to the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority overlay as this is not established by the City and is shown as a user-friendly feature in the By-law, without changing the zoning on the lands.
June 6, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	75 St. Albans's Road - See Objection Letter in Comments folder.	Comment acknowledged. At this time, it is not recommended that the property be re-zoned as Agricultural Consolidation (AC) prior to the approval of the severance. Upon further review, the parcel of IX zoning has been removed.
June 7, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	915 Lorneville Road - See Objection Letter in Comments folder.	Comment acknowledged. Not supportive of including this rezoning as part of the RZBL as it is related to a provisional consent and should be done separately. CKL has confirmed that a separate ZBA application has been submitted (August 15, 2023).

May 8, 2023	Chelsea Major (MHBC)	2638 Kawartha Lakes County Road 121 - Sunrock Canada LLC owns and operates an active quarry	See Letter in Comments folder.	Comment addressed. Exceptions 401 and 413 have been deleted from the final draft ZBL.
June 20, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	Vacant land, reg. plan 106, pt. Lot 1, 57R-704, pt. of part 1, 57R-3190, pt. of 3, Kirkfield, Eldon – See Objection Letter in Comments folder	Comment acknowledged and responded to – see Final Draft RZBL Comment-Response Matrix.
June 20, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	1639 Kirkfield Road, Part of lots 40 to 42, South Portage Road Range – See Objection Letter in Comments Folder	Comment acknowledged and responded to – see Final Draft RZBL Comment-Response Matrix.
June 22, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	Vacant Lot, Shadow Lake Road #4 & Sunset View Road, Part Lot 68, Front Range, 57R-1243, Parts 2 & 4, Geographic Township of Somerville – See Objection Letter in Comments Folder	Comment acknowledged and responded to – see Final Draft RZBL Comment-Response Matrix.
July 4, 2023	Doug Carroll	Consultant representing landowner	653 Hickory Beach Road, Conc. 2, Part Lot 12, 57R-6090, Part 1, Verulam – See Objection Letter in Comments Folder.	Comment acknowledged and responded to – see Final Draft RZBL Comment-Response Matrix.
August 10, 2023	Paul Azzarello	Member of the public	Did the rural zoning by law get passed by Committee? Pleasant Point seasonal section OUT - great. did i read this right?	The August 9, 2023 Committee Meeting was the Statutory Public Meeting for the Rural Zoning By-law. We will be returning in the fall (October, likely) with a recommendation for approval.
				Regarding “seasonal dwellings,” we did propose moving forward with residential uses that don’t necessarily distinguish between seasonal and year-round

<p>August 10, 2023</p>	<p>Paul Azzarello</p>	<p>Member of the public</p>	<p>swamp property behind 87 rose st and land to the south THIS IS HIGHLY SENSITIVE NATURE LAND and should be EPA OR OPEN SPACE, NOT RESIDENDITAL OR AGRICULTURE Swamp Property: Assessment Roll Number: 165121005114700 -proposed agriculture should be open space /epa lands this is a water lot. Assessment Roll Number: 165121005035800- proposed residential should be open space/epa land (area deer use property to access kennedy bay drinking water in winter)/ bird nesting and other animals. Street Address: PLAN 428 LOTS 19 TO 35 AND BLKS A B C AND E</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. 165121005114700 is KRCA Regulated Area and permits would be required prior to any development. Rezoning to an EP zone would be highly restrictive. Comment acknowledged. 165121005035800 is KRCA Regulated Area and permits would be required prior to any development. Rezoning to an EP zone would be highly restrictive.</p>
<p>August 22, 2023</p>	<p>Kent Randall</p>	<p>Planner on behalf of resident</p>	<p>See letter saved in file.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged and responded to – see Final Draft RZBL Comment-Response Matrix.</p>

Comments from Public Open Houses - March 1, 3 and 9, 2022

Name	Comment	WSP Response
James R.	(summary)	
	Our lakes have “manmade tides”. Mitchell Lake. Goes up and down, changes the shoreline by 10-15 feet.	Comment noted. A new User Guide has been added to the beginning of the Rural Zoning By-law to provide greater clarity on how the high-water mark is measured.
Nancy L.	Is there anything in the ZBL that addresses Short Term Rentals?	Comment noted. The Rural Zoning By-law does not address short-term rentals. There are other tools at the disposal of the City to regulate these uses.
Chris A.	Shoreline – likes 30 m. What is native veg and species? Does it include manicured lawn and armour stone shoreline? Consider defining “naturalization”.	Comment acknowledged. The Rural Zoning By-law defines the term ‘shoreline naturalization buffer’ and sets out provisions in Section 4.34.1 to speak to the type of vegetation, including native vegetation and plant species.
	The Shoreline buffer must be quite strict to work.	
Mike B	Conservation authority requires only 1 m for shoreline naturalization, so 30 m seems odd.	Comment noted. The City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan requires a 30-metre water setback, which must be naturalized, except for certain areas where shoreline structures and other minor encroachments are permitted.
William O.	Inconsistencies between zoning and OP – sturgeon point, exceptions in OP not in the hamlet residential category. Are exceptions going to be ironed out?	Comment acknowledged. The Project Team has reviewed and revised the zones which are applied in Sturgeon Point to ensure conformity. Changes have been proposed in the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law.
Barry S.	There are disagreements between conservation authority regs and the Agriculture zones. Reg protect wetlands from just about any agricultural activity. Again, the PSW are completely protection by the CA Regs but is not protected from agricultural uses in the EP zoning	Comment noted. The mapping of Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) has been included in the EP zone to protect these features.
Mario	How do you measure setbacks from the high watermark if your building is on a hill. Do you follow the distance, or the orthographic?	Comment noted. The water setback is measured along the horizontal and does not account for vertical elevation. A key objective the City’s Official Plan is to support shoreline naturalization; therefore, it is desirable to encourage planting and naturalization regardless of elevation, which varies along the shoreline. Section 4.34.2 of the By-law sets out provisions for the replacement and enlargement of existing buildings within the water setback. These types of considerations may also factor into the City’s design and engineering standards.

Doug D.	Where property is on a cliff with water 5 metres further out, how would the setback be measured? Consider the ways the setbacks are measured in odd cases.	Comment noted. The water setback is measured along the horizontal and does not account for vertical elevation. A key objective the City's Official Plan is to support shoreline naturalization; therefore, it is desirable to encourage planting and naturalization regardless of elevation, which varies along the shoreline. Section 4.34.2 of the By-law sets out provisions for the replacement and enlargement of existing buildings within the water setback. These types of considerations may also factor into the City's design and engineering standards.
Doug L.	the application of an "established building line" as justification for reduction of a 30 metre setback cannot take into account shoreline irregularities (bays & peninsulas), changes in elevation, spacing between lots, or density of trees, all of which reduce the checkerboard effect which the "building line" is intended to address How would you comment on this? Consider tweaking the specifics of 'shoreline'.	Commented noted.
Dave B.	How is the "high water mark" determined when setbacks are concerned? Is a high-water mark from a very rare flood included?	Comment noted. A new User Guide has been added to the beginning of the Rural Zoning By-law to provide greater clarity on how the high-water mark is measured.
Don van W.	Is there any allowance for elevation to permit adding to a structure that is already within the 15 m setback? eg. if a structure is 20 m elevated from the high-water mark, could a structure be expanded within the 15 m setback to the high-water mark?	Comment noted. The water setback is measured along the horizontal and does not account for vertical elevation. A key objective the City's Official Plan is to support shoreline naturalization; therefore, it is desirable to encourage planting and naturalization regardless of elevation, which varies along the shoreline. Section 4.34.2 of the By-law sets out provisions for the replacement and enlargement of existing buildings within the water setback.
Debbie W	Who or what determines the high-water mark with the current flooding and water recession that we experience in the spring. Shadow Lake	Comment noted. A new User Guide has been added to the beginning of the Rural Zoning By-law to provide greater clarity on how the high-water mark is measured.

Comments from GIS Tool

Parcel ID	Address / location	Comment	WSP response
1551, 1230	21 MORNINGSIDE DR	rezone to permit a residential use.	Comment noted.
7116	26 FRANCIS ST	Flagging for future discussion: The City is interested in rezoning this to an industrial zone that permits only dry/light industrial uses so that water consumption and septic design do not become major issues. Note that this is addressed 574 Hartley, not 26 Francis.	Comment noted. City reviewing.
23635	5101 DUNDAS ST W UNIT 610	I am the owner of this property. Please correct my address from 5101 Dundas to 28-1701 Finch Avenue, Pickering, L1V0B7 We own 19 3rd and 12 4th street in Sturgeon Point and this waterfront property is linked to 19 3rd street. Happy to chat if you require more information, 416-206-0210. 19 3rd street is also a listed property in the Kawartha Lakes. Mary Newton	Comment noted. Interactive mapping has been updated.
175	21 ALVAR RD	Zoning is correct, this is a working farm. Question is other existing activities. Example Maple syrup, honey production. Bottling and storing occurs here. Plus farm gate sales of the above produces as well as eggs. I also have a sawmill on the property that custom work is done for others and cutting for myself.	Comment noted. It is not the intent of the Rural Zoning By-law to limit normal farm practices. Uses such as maple syrup and honey production and farm gate sales would not be limited under the By-law.
24258	215 BANBURY RD	There is a beautiful tree covered hillock that adds beauty to the landscape, habitat for wildlife, and property value for residents a mile around it. However, it appears someone is decimating the forest on the northeastern corner. Are there no protections for forests, hillocks and drumlins that can protect this visual and natural site? City of Kawartha Lakes in this region has few such 'mountains'. Yet is not protected under the by law, nor zones as such. If it is aggregate, when is enough, enough? When is the remaining forest and surrounding landscape protected? This should be a conservation reserve in CKL - no tree cutting, no roads, no aggregate retrieving. It needs to be examined and inspected and zoned under Protected status to prevent deforestation and removal by aggregate retrieval. It helps to protect what little water and water table we have left in this area (Cameron). Water is poor quality, full of iron and sulphur at levels closer to the surface than ideal. This hillock and its vegetation, and the aggregate that needs to remain in the ground, all serve to protect the water table. It also serves to ensure Cameron remains a vital community for all of these reasons.	Comment noted. The Zoning By-law carries forward the existing environmental protection mapping and does not pre-zone for aggregate uses, which are subject to Provincial legislation.
20412	95 CAMERON RD	This property has a tree encircled pond. Does the By-Law protect such bodies of water that contribute to maintaining the low water table in this (Cameron) area? Across the road is a farm that destroyed the small wetland across the road that also protected the water table and the pond, but while small, nevertheless was destroyed to make space for agriculture, for a few heads of corn. Are there protections, therefore, to prioritize natural bodies of water and the vegetation surrounding them, and the wetlands that feed and filter? Ecological protections without needing a full 'wetland' status?	Comment noted/addressed. The Rural Zoning By-law has been updated to implement new mapping of Provincially Significant Wetlands within an Environmental Protection (EP) zone.

22358	456 COUNTRY LANE	Unable to obtain zoning designation on my property A1 changed to AG no description available. KRCA jurisdiction layered over property no info available. Concerned that restrictions are being imposed on my property restricting the use of my property previously enjoyed as A1 zoning. Please provide required information as soon as possible, thanks you for your attention on this matter.	Comment noted. The AG zone reflects a consolidation of the previous A1 zone, which has specific provisions set out in the By-law. The KRCA layer indicates that the lot is within the regulated area of the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority and that a permit may be required prior to work being undertaken.
-------	------------------	--	--