

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
22-Aug-23	See "2023 08 22 Letter re Comprehensive Rural Zoning By-law - Woodland Hills"	Kent Randall, EcoVue	Director Holy followed up with EcoVue. Not supportive of the suggestions made in the letter due to the complexity of the application.
24-Aug-23	<p>1) The table "Table 9-2: Permitted Uses in the Industrial Zones" shows the only permitted uses for zone IX are Agriculture, Forestry, and Mineral Aggregate Operation. W.G. Jackett and Sons Construction operates a mineral aggregate operation as well as a landscaping and heavy infrastructure construction business. We would ask that "Contractor's Shop" and "Contractor's Yard" be included as accessory permitted uses on the IX zone.</p> <p>2) After reviewing Section 9.3 Lot and Building Requirements in the Industrial Zones, we've noticed that the yard and water setbacks have all been set at 30m for zone IX, where the existing by-law has 15m for rear and side yards. Most of our pits have 15m setbacks where it was allowed previously, and at least one instance along a residential property where the pit predated the Aggregate Resources Act. We think there should be a provision for existing circumstances and provisions for what's been approved through the Aggregate Resources Act Licences</p>	WG Jackett & Sons Construction Ltd.	<p>1. A key factor in determining the permitted uses in the Rural Zoning By-law is conformity with the Official Plan and ensuring the zone provisions and permitted uses are not more permissive than those within the Official Plan. The Official Plan Aggregate land use designation is intended to facilitate aggregate and resource extraction uses and does not permit contractor's yards or contractor's shops.</p> <p>2. The setbacks proposed in the Rural Zoning By-law will apply to new development on lands. Legally existing permitted uses and structures may continue.</p>
24-Aug-23	<p>For our property at 5065 Hwy 35, Pit Lic. #17771 made up of 3 lots:  Conc: 7; Ward: 03; Ptlot: 22 West Half; Fenelon Township  Conc: 7; Ward: 03; Wptlot: 23 Cty Rd 8; Fenelon Township  Lot 32; Block: C RCP 545; Plan 312; Conc: 7; Other: PT; Wart: 03; Ptlot: 12 To &amp; 21 &amp;; Fenelon Township</p> <p>1. After review of the second draft Schedule A-C52 of the Draft Rural Zoning By-law, we object to the area shaded with the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority. There is shading in the farm fields and gravel pit face that appears to be in error and these properties also make up a licenced pit (Lic. #17771) under the Agregate Resources Act and they're administered by the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNR). We would ask that the area shaded under the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority be removed from the licenced area.</p> <p>2. On review of schedule A-C52, we noticed the lot lines have not been updated. In 2021-2022, a portion of Conc: 7; Ward: 03; Wptlot: 23 Cty Rd 8; Fenelon Township was severed by the Ministry of Transportation, registered as Part 1 on Plan 57R-10917 but this new parcel is not indicated on the new schedule. Find attached survey of the severed part.</p>	WG Jackett & Sons Construction Ltd.	<p>1. The shaded area described delineates Regulated Area under the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority. The extent of this area is not changing through the Rural Zoning By-law Review Project. Concerns regarding the application of the Regulated Area should be directed to the Conservation Authority. Showing the Regulated Area on the Zoning Schedules is intended to be a user-friendly feature.</p> <p>2. While we are not revising lot lines as part of the Rural Zoning By-law Project, these details have been shared with the City to consider.</p>
24-Aug-23	<p>For our property at the corner of Hwy 35 and CKL Road 8:  Lot 34; RCP 545; Part of Lots 1-9 and Part of Block D, Plan 312; Being Part 3 on Plan 57R-10935;  Fenelon Township</p> <p>1. This lot is currently zoned AP (aggregate protection). The zone consolidation matrix indicates lots zoned AP will become either AG or IX. We request that you rezone this lot as IX with a Hold rather than as AG now indicated on schedule A-C52. The Hold would act as a protection, criteria being that it can't be removed until there is an Aggregate Resource Act Licence in hand. This property was operated as a wayside pit in the past by the province and W.G. Jackett and Sons Construction intends to rezone and license this lot as a gravel pit. By zoning it IX with a Hold it would save a lot of bureaucratic effort for both parties; while ensuring there will still be public consultation before it can become operational; and W.G. Jackett and Sons Construction will still be required to go through the process of licensing the pit under the MNDMNR (and all the scrutiny of study that entails (environmental, traffic, noise etc..)).</p> <p>2. On review of schedule A-C52, we noticed the lot lines have not been updated. In 2021-2022, this lot was sub-divided as part of an agreement with the Ministry of Transportation registered as plan 57R-10935, but these new property lines are not indicated on the new schedule. Find attached survey of the property.</p>	WG Jackett & Sons Construction Ltd.	<p>1. The subject lands are designated as Prime Agricultural in the City's Official Plan. This designation only permits gravel pits/wayside pits for use by a public authority.</p> <p>2. While we are not revising lot lines as part of the Rural Zoning By-law Project, these details have been shared with the City to consider.</p>
24-Aug-23	<p>For our property at 1207 Northline Road:  Con: 5; Ward: 02; Ptlot: 22; Somerville</p> <p>1. On review of schedule A-B68 we noticed an error that the property is to be zoned AG. We also found that on the existing zoning by-law the property is zoned Rural General. Part of this lot is a licenced gravel pit (Lic. #433) and should be zoned IX. Please correct this on the Draft Rural Zoning By-law. Find attached existing Township of Somerville Zoning By-law Schedule "A", Schedule A-B68 of the Draft Rural Zoning By-law, and a copy of the pit licence.</p>	WG Jackett & Sons Construction Ltd.	Comment acknowledged. The schedule has been revised to correct this error.

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
24-Aug-23	<p>For our property at 17 Walmac Shore's Rd: Con: 19; Ward: 06; Part: 1; Ptlot: 10; Rp: 57R1516; Verulam</p> <p>1. After review of the second draft Schedule A-D16 of the Draft Rural Zoning By-law, we object to the area shaded with the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority. This property is a licenced pit (Lic. #3369) under the Aggregate Resources Act and they're administered by the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (MNDMNR). We would ask that the area shaded under the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority be removed from the licenced area.</p>	WG Jackett & Sons Construction Ltd.	Comment acknowledged. The shaded area described delineates Regulated Area under the Kawartha Region Conservation Authority. The extent of this area is not changing through the Rural Zoning By-law Review Project. Concerns regarding the application of the Regulated Area should be directed to the Conservation Authority. Showing the Regulated Area on the Zoning Schedules is intended to be a user-friendly feature.
28-Aug-23	<p>Hi, I am concerned about this buffer with respect to property values, reduced future property taxes for the city and overall enjoyment of properties in the city.</p> <p>I believe this to be a significant over reach in the overall consolidation of zoning bylaws. I commend this project but could you please provide the reference to Shoreline Naturalization Buffers in a previous zoning by-law? Is this a new concept that has been added to the consolidated bylaw?</p> <p>Although I understand that existing properties will be "grandfathered" I feel this will have a significant negative impact on future waterfront properties. I am also concerned this could be the thin edge of the wedge and be introduced for existing properties at some time in the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	Bruce Hooley	Comment acknowledged. Under the current zoning by-law framework, the zoning by-laws require a 15 metre setback from the highwater mark. Since then the City's Official Plan has been updated to require a 30 metre setback from the highwater mark and sets out policies for naturalization within this buffer. The new Rural Zoning By-law recognizes that 30 metres may not be achievable on all existing lots, such as shallow lots and those with existing structures, and provides flexibility in those cases.
26-Aug-23	<p>I have just tonight been able to fully review your reply by e-mail on the 22nd of August, to my questions sent to Leah on the 7th of August and forwarded to you , prior to your presentation at the 9 August PAC meeting.</p> <p>Following my question for you at the PAC meeting asking where the requirement for a 30 metre shoreline naturalization came from, although you couldn't find the section in the CKL OP, you said that it was in this OP and that you would get back to me.</p> <p>Following that, I searched the CKL OP to try to find the requirement. Not finding it, I wrote the e-mail below outlining the sections that I had found that made any references to naturalization or shoreline vegetation. And found nothing that stated a requirement for a 30 metre shoreline naturalization.</p> <p>Then, on the 22 of August I have received some answers to my first e-mail that seems that you hadn't read my second e-mail of the 14th (below) giving sections referring to naturalization in the CKL OP that you use as a rationale for including a 30 metre naturalization in the newly merged rural by-laws.</p> <p>You refer to section 30.1 that talks about a 30 metre setback for buildings and structures – not for naturalization</p> <p>You refer to section 20.5 (that I reference below) that talks in general terms about naturalization where possible and in particular 20.5.2 about 25% or 23 metres for structures or dock on a shoreline, not anything about naturalization, 20.3.7 wherever possible and 20.5.3 to retain as much as possible.</p> <p>Please read my previous e-mail as attached and please let me know if I am missing the mark or misreading the references to naturalization. I cannot find any reference to a 30 metre shoreline naturalization in any of the Township by-laws or the CKL OP.</p> <p>Your e-mail of the 22nd and mine of the 14 (attached) are in conflict. I don't see either of the sections that you refer to as being the basis for including a 30 metre shoreline naturalization requirement in the Merged Rural By-laws. If I am wrong, please straighten me out.</p> <p>Appreciate your thoughts and comments,</p>	Mike Barkwell	Comment acknowledged. Section 3.11.1 of the CKL Official Plan requires that all buildings, structures, and septic systems be located a minimum of 30 metres from the high water mark and that this setback be maintained in its natural state with no disturbance of the vegetation and soils - in addition to the policies noted in previous emails.

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
06-Jun-23	See "2023.06.06-66-Riverside-Dr-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB" in Comments folder	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and response provided. 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.
06-Jun-23	See "2023.06.06-75-St.-Albans-Rd-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB" in Comments folder	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and response provided. 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.
20-Jun-23	See "2023.06.20-2474798-Ont-Inc-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB" in Comments folder	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Consent Application submitted to CKL in December 2022. ZBAs required as a condition of consent are to be carried out through their own application and not through the RZBL Project.
22-Jun-23	See "2023.06.21-D.Marsh-1703579 Ontario Inc.-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB"	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and response provided on November 13, 2023. RR3 Zone can be accommodated.
21-Jun-23	see "2023.06.21-Wm.-Ballam-Estate-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB"	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and response provided on November 13, 2023. We do not support the rezoning of the subject lands given that the majority of the lands are inside of the Hamlet Settlement Area.
04-Jul-23	see "2023.07.04-653 Hickory-Beach-Rd-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB"	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and response provided. Not supportive of including this rezoning as part of the RZBL as it is related to a provisional consent and should be done separately.
09-Jun-23	see "2023.06.09-915-Lorneville-Rd-Objection-ltr-CKL-Dft-RZB"	Doug Carroll on behalf of landowner	Comment acknowledged and issue addressed. City received and processed a ZBA pertaining to these lands. This comment has been addressed through that process.
08-Aug-23	Conservation Authority Regulated Areas are different shades of blue--can these be changed to distinct colours.	Susan Sladky	Comment acknowledged and issue addressed.
09-Sep-23	<p>I'm concerned the draft By-law will be given 3 readings and passed this fall. This process was started in 2006, with a draft text prepared by MHBC, which was referenced and revised by planning staff for 10 years. It wasn't until 2019 that a budget to finalize this project was approved and progress commenced, only to be delayed by the pandemic.</p> <p>The lack of in-person meetings to discuss concerns, to answer questions, to provide transparency, to inform others with the same or similar concerns, together with an apparent haste to pass the August version in less than 2 months, has caused many people to question the sincerity of the city's efforts to consolidate and harmonize the rural zoning by-laws.</p> <p>I urge WSP and the CKL (staff &amp; council) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•recommend only 1st and 2nd reading be given to the By-law;</li> <li>•extend the review and comment period to January 31st, 2024;</li> <li>•during that period, 1 or more public open house meetings shall be held, during which the public will be invited to express their concerns and ask questions, and senior planning staff will listen and answer questions;</li> <li>•that input will inform which, if any, changes are to be made to the By-law;</li> <li>•then staff will recommend a final version of the By-law for 3rd reading.</li> </ul> <p>I suggest that extending this 17-year-long project for 4 more months will not negatively impact its success. More importantly, such actions are likely to assist the public's understanding of the current constrained public participation process; to result in fewer appeals; and garner greater credibility with the OLT.</p> <p>Currently, due to the pending passing of the By-law, my clients are aware they have to appeal portions of the By-law to the OLT in order that their comments, concerns and questions are heard and considered before the By-law is approved.</p> <p>I'll not have time to prepare a list of my comments and concerns for you before I leave the country tomorrow.</p>	Doug Carroll	Comment acknowledged and response provided.
03-Sep-23	<p>I'm wondering why the change is about accessory building can't be used for a home occupation? And are you going to grandfather in the ones are existing ? , Seeing that you can have two living quarters on the same property what's the problem with fixing a few kids bikes or repairing shoes or screen doors in an out building ? Hoping for a reply thanks Terry Rae</p> <p>"An accessory building or structure, or any part thereof, shall not be used for a home occupation. However, an attached private garage shall be permitted to be used for a home occupation, provided that the minimum number of parking spaces as required by this By-law are complied with."</p>	Terry Rae	Comment acknowledged. Section 11.1 of the Official Plan directs that home occupations must be "wholly contained within the dwelling unit." Home industries, however, must be located within a detached accessory building (Section 11.2).

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
03-Sep-23	<p>My name is Gene Balfour. My wife Cynthia and her mother Dorothy (now 92) moved into a custom build home about 5 KMs north of Fenelon Falls in 2016. We bought 2 acres of land, cleared the lot of trees, hired a builder to design a home with a “granny flat” on the ground floor for my wife’s mother and her dying husband who had suffered with progressive prostrate cancer for 8 years.</p> <p>Our experience dealing with the City of Kawartha Lakes over the span of time from land acquisition through to eventual inhabitation was a nightmare. This unforgettable and unforgivable experience motivated me to learn more about the Zoning Consolidation project which had only come to my attention two weeks ago.</p> <p>In my retirement, I have become an amateur writer and “citizen journalist”. You will find my writing at <a href="http://www.Substack.com">www.Substack.com</a> under the bulletin name MY LIFE LENS. Writing helps me to collect my thoughts and craft a message that is cohesive and well-considered. This is why I am submitting my feedback in this link.  <a href="https://open.substack.com/pub/gbalfour/p/zoning-by-law-is-too-authoritarian?r=16emgc&amp;utm_campaign=post&amp;utm_medium=web">https://open.substack.com/pub/gbalfour/p/zoning-by-law-is-too-authoritarian?r=16emgc&amp;utm_campaign=post&amp;utm_medium=web</a></p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Gene Balfour	Comment acknowledged.
05-Sep-23	<p>Just a question: are there any areas in the draft consolidated bylaw that would limit specificities currently needed in areas of the City e.g. cookie-cutter taking away very local needs/interests?</p> <p>Thanks for letting me know...</p>	Councillor Mike Perry	Comment acknowledged and Response provided on October 4, 2023.
30-Aug-23	<p>Hello                      I live at 1100 Eldon rd north of Oakwood.                      I have read everything that I could find on this.                      I still do not know what this means to my property.                      Could you give me a simple explanation of this change?                      Regards                      Belinda Taggart</p>	Belinda Taggart	Comment acknowledged. The property is currently zoned A1 - Agricultural as per the Mariposa Zoning By-law. The new RZBL proposes the AG - Agricultural Zone. The new AG zone offers additional permitted uses with some minor changes to zone provisions. Attached is a document that contains both the Mariposa provisions and the new provisions for your reference.
31-Aug-23	Request to be added to mailing list	Adam Gall	Comment acknowledged and issue addressed.
28-Aug-23	I have a property that is currently zoned Residential-Agricultural and it will become Agricultural only under the new by-law and it must be noted and I need an answer as to why this is. I have over 56 homes around this 20 acre parcel that I want to subdivide. I have paid larger taxes for many years to keep this zoning.	Jeffrey Armitage	Comment acknowledged and response provided.
27-Aug-23	<p>Hi, I am concerned about this buffer with respect to property values, reduced future property taxes for the city and overall enjoyment of properties in the city.</p> <p>I believe this to be a significant over reach in the overall consolidation of zoning bylaws. I commend this project but could you please provide the reference to Shoreline Naturalization Buffers in a previous zoning by-law? Is this a new concept that has been added to the consolidated bylaw?</p> <p>Although I understand that existing properties will be "grandfathered" I feel this will have a significant negative impact on future waterfront properties. I am also concerned this could be the thin edge of the wedge and be introduced for existing properties at some time in the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	Bruce Hooley	<p>Comment acknowledged. Shoreline Naturalization regulations are new to the City's zoning framework and have been implemented as part of the exercise of bringing the Zoning By-law into conformity with the Official Plan. The City's Official Plan contains shoreline naturalization policies that have been implemented through the Zoning By-law.</p> <p>You are correct in that these requirements will only apply to new development and that existing lots/homes are "grandfathered" in.</p>
23-Aug-23	can you advise me what changes will occur to the zoning rural platform. Will it effect property address located at Roll number 165111001083400	Angie Smith	<p>Comment acknowledged. The subject property is currently zoned Environmental Protection Exception 3 and Exception 4 Zone as per the Mariposa Zoning By-law. Proposed in the new Rural Zoning By-law is the Environmental Protection Zone</p> <p>EP-3 Zone states that a single detached dwelling is permitted subject to criteria. EP-4 states that the lands may only be used for Conservation Uses; Bird or Wildlife Sanctuaries; Flood and Erosion Control Works and Forestry.</p>

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
22-Aug-23	<p>The bylaw in 4.6.1. gives overreaching power to Conservation Authorities with regards to regulation. Allowing Conservation Authorities to create the zoning maps, interpret the boundaries and issue permits is to promote the abuse of power far beyond the core mandates of the role. This tier of governing delays development and is an unwarranted expense in many instances where the Conservation Authority inserts its interest in private property for financial gain and land control.</p> <p>Hold the power of private property in the hands of land owners with only the most critical interventions warranted by governments and secondary offices to mandate and charge fees, lest the motivation for stake becomes unethical.</p> <p>Conservation Authorities are mandated to manage government lands with particular focus on risk of natural hazards. There is no legality for expropriation and/or extortion in the use of assumed power to dictate private land use, delay development and charge permit fees by their own contrivance. The municipality may and should use the Conservation Authorities for guidance in obvious applications, but not give over an abundance of power to this entity.</p>	Kari Tyler	<p>Comment acknowledged. No increases to Regulated Area or Conservation Authority requirements are being introduced or proposed as part of the Rural Zoning By-law. The Regulated Area as shown today will be carried forward. Should you have questions and concerns about the Municipality's working relationship with the Conservation Authority, please contact the City of Kawartha Lakes Planning Department.</p>
22-Aug-23	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I was reviewing the DRAFT CKL Rural Zoning By-law v1 and here are my comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Section 6 lists the permitted uses for "Residential Zones" and nowhere does it mention Short Term Rentals; Bed &amp; Breakfast are permitted in "Residential and Commercial Zones"; and we all agreed that Short Term Rentals are businesses but they are not listed anywhere.</li> <li>•Section 4-"Home Occupation"-again Short Term Rental Businesses are not listed.</li> <li>•"Cabin Rentals" in section 3 specifies that Cabin Rentals are allowed within "tourist resort" areas</li> </ul> <p>In my opinion, since Short Term Rentals are identified as businesses, the city needs to clearly identify areas that Short Term rentals are allowed or prohibited. Residentially zoned areas are for family homes and as per section 4.8 (page 64) of the draft document: "The home occupation shall not create or become a public nuisance due to noise, dust, traffic, or parking". In this case STRs are not "Home Occupation" (they don't meet the criteria) but they create nuisance due to noise, dust, traffic, etc. in the neighborhoods.</p> <p>I would like to see a clear definition of STR in the new Zoning by-laws; and a by-law that limits the number of STRs in residential areas. As well as easily identifiable way for future investors and buyers (who are not investors) considering buying properties in Kawartha Lakes to know which areas are quiet and family based neighborhoods versus the ones that are accommodating transients/tourists and are suitable for investors and STRs.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing me to participate and comment on the draft.</p> <p>Liba Radovski-Levin</p>	Liba Radovski-Levin	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>We purposely did not include Short Term Rentals in the new By-law. This followed discussions with staff and the City's direction to pursue a separate Short Term Rental Licensing Study. Information and documentation on this study can be found here: Short Term Rentals - City of Kawartha Lakes.</p> <p>We certainly did mull over short term rentals extensively while working on this project and understand that other municipalities do include applicable provisions in their Zoning By-laws. The municipality may wish to amend the Zoning By-law in the future to incorporate Short Term Rental regulations.</p> <p>Let me know if you have any further questions on the By-law.</p>
30-Aug-23	<p>I live in an area zoned AG but my lot area is about 8ha. Table 7.3 indicates "No person shall within any Agriculture zone use any lot, or erect, alter, or use any building or structure except in accordance with Table 7-3." A minimum lot area of 40 ha is listed in Table 7.3. How do the zoning regulations apply to AG zoned properties that are less than the minimum lot area? My frontage on the road is also less than the minimum of 120 meters. Am I restricted with erecting buildings or structures in my case? I can easily meet all the other minimum requirements in Table 7.3.</p>	James Rogers	<p>Comment acknowledged. Section 4.17.1.3 of the proposed Zoning By-law exempts undersized lots existing at the time of the By-law passing from being required to meet new provisions:</p> <p>"A lot in existence prior to the effective date of this By-law that does not meet the lot area and/or lot frontage requirements of the applicable zone, may be used and buildings thereon may be erected, enlarged, repaired, or renovated provided the use conforms with the By-law and the buildings and structures comply with the requirements of this By-law"</p> <p>Provided you comply with setbacks and other zone provisions, a deficient lot area and/or lot frontage is generally ok.</p>
06-Sep-23	Add to contact list	Ron Mason	Comment acknowledged and issue addressed.

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
06-Sep-23	<p>This letter serves to express and describe my objections to the recently published “final” version of the Rural Zoning By-law for the City of Kawartha Lake.</p> <p>To those of you who have not yet seen the document or been able to comment on it, follow these instructions: “Access your copy of Final Rural Zoning By-law Consolidation proposal by visiting <a href="https://jumpinkawarthalakes.ca/">https://jumpinkawarthalakes.ca/</a> and click on the Rural Zoning By-law Consolidation button “View Project”. Select the link <a href="https://jumpinkawarthalakes.ca/21059/widgets/158853/documents/109876">https://jumpinkawarthalakes.ca/21059/widgets/158853/documents/109876</a>. After reviewing the proposal’s 380 pages of content, email your feedback using <a href="mailto:ruralzoningbylaw@kawarthalakes.ca">ruralzoningbylaw@kawarthalakes.ca</a> and cc your Ward Councillor.”</p> <p>Reason for taking action.</p> <p>I am currently reviewing the 380 page document that became publicly available as the “final” Rural Zoning By-law Constitution proposal in July 2023.</p> <p>Many constituents of the City of Kawartha Lakes have only recently become aware of this document and have expressed their concern that insufficient time has been allowed by City Council to assess and offer feedback.</p> <p>The window for citizen input was established on August 29 by City Council and it will close on September 15.</p> <p>Some people suspect that City Council intends to pass this proposal into law as early as the next public City Council meeting. It is scheduled for September 29. They rightfully ask “what’s the rush?” when they consider that it has taken four years to produce the final version.</p> <p>What I have learned in the last few weeks.</p> <p>The document in question represents the culmination of four years of effort by City staff and a consulting company, WSP, that was engaged by the City in 2019.</p> <p>The purpose of this undertaking was to consolidate 14 sets of legacy by-laws that are still in use and are the county-level land zoning rules. They originated before the sprawling City of Kawartha Lakes was created as a corporation to amalgamate the 17 former unique and diverse counties over two decades ago.</p> <p>My assessment so far, and my objections.</p> <p>I object to this proposed Rural Zoning By-Law in its current and “final” version. My objections are both specific and broad in scope. They pertain to omissions and points of definition clarity that have concerning implications which I will address.</p> <p>Report PLAN2023-039 is the reference name of this document. Its length is 380 pages and it is full of arcane rules, standards and charts designed to be applied to any and all plans that a farmer, cottage-owner, home owner and business owner may have for their rural property.</p> <hr/> <p>The will of the majority must be served and preserved by City Council.</p> <p>While nearly everyone wants Energy Security, a small subset of citizens favour “Green Energy” due to their climate change beliefs. This latter group promotes unsightly and expensive wind turbines and land-wasting solar farms for our energy supply. This is a serious infringement to the property rights for everyone who wants Energy Security as well as the desired uses for public and private property.</p> <p>Ideally, a referendum would resolve the question of whether the majority of our citizens prefer Energy Security over “Green” policies like carbon taxes and restrictions to land use in order to address their alleged threat of future global warning attributed to the burning of fossil fuels. City Council is unlikely to approve such a referendum.</p> <p>Instead, this threat can be neutered by imbedding protections into the Rural Zoning By-law to lock property rights provisions into the statute. In so doing, overzealous citizens may not easily impose their self-serving goals on our communities using political means.</p> <p>To explain specially why this is a property rights issue, I argue that reliable and affordable energy is a vital resource (like clean air and water) required to sustain human survival and prosperity in the modern era. We pay for it with the money (an asset, property) we earn with our persons (body, mind and effort) to secure access to the energy that is so essential to us.</p> <p>This explains why legislative protections must be in place to defend our property (person and assets) from people who threaten to jeopardize our Energy Security. Ideally, such protections must recognize, acknowledge and in be written into all City statutes, including the Rural Zoning By-law, to make very clear how essential Energy Security is to every person and property owner.</p> <hr/> <p>My Proposals.</p> <p>I object to the Final Rural Zoning By-law released in July 2023. As promised at the outset, I have explained my reasons above and trust that all readers understand and will consider them.</p> <p>Also expressed earlier, The City of Kawartha Lakes has an ideal opportunity to establish a positive reputation with all property owners. This can be achieved by adapting the tone, spirit and content of the proposed “final” Rural Zoning to be less autocratic and more democratically collaborative in a manner that shares responsibility and decision-making authority for many zoning matters with the property owners themselves. The City can simultaneously achieve the efficiencies intended when the Consolation effort began in 2019.</p> <p>While the “consolidation” and “harmonization” of 14 books of county by-laws is a worthy goal, the “final” result is one large compendium of standards and uniform rules that may, or may not, be appropriate to apply strictly to every unique zoning issue that enforcement personnel may encounter.</p> <p>Room for discretion must be more generous. Allow the defined property rights of owners to supply a legal base from which they can negotiate (if needed) to reach reasonable zoning compromises. Long, protracted and frustrating “variance” requests will largely become unnecessary thereby saving valuable time and labour resources under the City’s management. Positive outcomes, through good faith negotiation, can be achieved and preserve both the spirit and fact of community interests.</p> <p>There is no reason that the City’s stated “modernization” objective cannot include the recognition of the property rights of owners too!</p> <p>What can be more “modern” than a progressive “public-private partnership” between City personnel and constituent landowners? This will surely earn the City of Kawatha Lakes the advantageous reputation as one of the safest and more investment-friendly jurisdictions in Ontario. It starts with City projecting an open, welcoming and accommodating posture to all interested parties and future stakeholders. The City can takes steps towards this vision by showcasing a set modern and progressive Rural Zoning By-laws.</p>	Gene Balfour	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Rural Zoning By-law Review project began in 2019 to consolidate the City’s existing zoning by-laws and bring zone provisions into conformity with the City’s Official Plan. In 2019 and 2020, Reports were prepared and made publicly available which document key local issues, options, and a methodology for consolidating the existing zoning by-laws. Public consultation was conducted throughout all phases of the project. The authority to establish a zoning by-law is set out in Ontario’s Planning Act, which is the primary land use legislation in the Province. The proposed Rural Zoning By-law has been prepared to conform to the City’s Official Plan, which contains a wide range of policies to guide growth and development, and addresses topics related to agriculture, economic development, and natural protections, amongst others. The proposed Rural Zoning By-law broadly permits public uses by the municipality or other public authority in all zones.</p>

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	<p>DISCRETION means guidelines, not rigid rules.</p> <p>The progressive vision described above requires further elaboration.</p> <p>The current proposal contained reams of rules and standards. Why not designate most, if not all of them, as guidelines based on best practices? After all, the City just completed a long and detailed study of its existing bylaws and learned what worked and what was useful from studying their applied history. Also, bylaw lessons learned from other jurisdictions can also be incorporated and trial-tested in the rural zoning compendium of best practices.</p> <p>This 'guidelines' approach to zoning allows for the discretion that is required to apply reason and good judgement to a property owner's interests and their unique situation while considering the expressed interests of neighbours and the community at large.</p> <p>Nimby discussions are bound to be more common between City residents, a positive outcome. This will certainly evolve into a rewarding, engaging and democratic climate for stakeholders' to get more involved in City matters, especially at the grassroots level. It is certainly preferable to the "stone wall" and "run-around" that many property owners encounter when attempting to reason with City staff who are known to abide "by the book" at all times. Professional arbitration can be used as a last resort.</p> <p>Summary of my proposals:            Create new definitions for 'person', 'personal representatives', 'constituent property rights'.            Revise the allocated authority of bylaw rules from being strictly enforceable to somewhat discretionary 'guidelines' based on established best practices. Encourage good faith negotiations between relevant stakeholders. Employ professional arbitration to resolve intractable disputes funded entirely or partially by the disputing parties.            Define protections within the Rural Zoning By-law to protect property rights and discourage "special interest" lobbyists who possess ideological or anti-democratic objectives and who may try to politically exploit bylaw rules for their self-serving ends at the expense of the majority.</p> <p>"The will of the majority" is, theoretically, the basis upon which lawmakers are supposed to create policy. If it is unclear, consider using a referendum (commonly used in Switzerland). Note that, if strict 'rules' become discretion 'guidelines based on best practices', and if constituent property rights are clearly defined to be weighted in favour of the most immediate stakeholders over any third parties who possess limited or no direct stake, then concerns of special interest groups like Green Energy advocates will find little (if any) room at the bargaining table.</p> <p>I might be otherwise tempted to apologize for such a lengthy submission, but my options to express these objections in detail have been curtailed by a feedback process of the City's design.</p> <p>I plan to spend more time reviewing all the rules that may have pertained to my situation in 2016 since they are most relevant to my personal experience and property stake.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my submission. I look forward to your thoughtful reply to my suggestions before the public City Council meeting of September 29 and, ideally before the September 15 date after which you have declared that no additional feedback will be accepted.</p>		
07-Sep-23	can you provide me with a link to Schedule A you refer to in the document, thanks	Peter Lindsay	Comment acknowledged and issue addressed.
07-Sep-23	<p>Hello and good morning,</p> <p>I was wondering if you could shed some light on the meaning of "Future Development Zoning" please.</p> <p>I have checked out the newly proposed Zoning map and my property has changed from Agricultural / Residential to Future Development Zone. What exactly does this mean and what does the City of Kawartha have planned for these properties under the zone?</p> <p>The property number is 165131005035901.</p> <p>Thank you and kind regards, Ruth</p>	Ruth Llyod Roberts	<p>Comment acknowledged. The subject lands are currently zoned Rural General (A1) Zone as per the Somerville Zoning By-law. Proposed is Future Development (FD) Zone. The purpose of this zone is to distinguish lands within a settlement area that are currently undeveloped. Legally existing uses are permitted to carry on however new uses have been limited. This has been done with the understanding that, in the future, these lands will likely be developed. There are currently no development applications or plans for the subject lands.</p>
08-Sep-23	<p>I was chatting with Pat Warren and she suggest that I reach out to you to ask who could help me with this.</p> <p>I was looking at the new zoning map that the CKL is working on and am a bit perplexed by how they have our house 24 Lochan Lane and our one cottage 26 Lochan. See attached. The bold blue line, which according to the map indicates the boundary of the CKL, runs along the lake in our area. For our two properties only, it dips up and to the back of the property instead of following the lake. To me it looks like these two properties are being excluded from the CKL boundaries and are part of the lake? Our other property at 26 Lochan seems to be fine and the large acreage we have behind the house seems okay too – though the whole things seems shifted a bit as Lochan Lane runs entirely on our property. The satellite maps show that too and I was advised by the CKL years ago they are off a bit so not worried about that.</p> <p>Please advise why the boundary line for the two properties does not run along the lake side, as it does for all the other properties in the area, or let me know who to contact.</p> <p>Thanks for any insight or help you can offer.</p>	Ann Adare	<p>Comment acknowledged and issue addressed.</p>

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
07-Sep-23	<p>I am a residential taxpayer within the City of Kawartha Lakes and I would like more information regarding the new Rural Zoning By-Law Consolidaton. I do understand that current policies are dated and need updating however, the manner in which this information has been provided to taxpayers has not been forthright as many residents are not aware of these changes and how it will affect them personally. This is evident by the current push back council is seeing from many residents and the need for the recent extension to September 15 for more public consultation. If streamlining Rural Zoning By-Laws is necessary, then it is vital that how this will affect taxpayers be transparent.</p> <p>My questions and concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Please explain how this will affect current residential home owners, both positively and negatively?</li> <li>-How and when was public input sought in the decision making process? I do not feel it should be my responsibility to subscribe to online news, websites and research any and all initiatives that may or may not affect me as a resident. I do not want to comment on online forums and wait days for a possible response. Elections are held to put in place representatives that are to be a voice for those they represent. Elected officials should be making decisions in the best interest of their constituents and should do their due diligence to inform and educate those they represent. It would appear that climate and housing initiatives are being put in place with little public input in order to meet provincial policies and therefore compromising good governance</li> <li>- What is the advantage/disadvantage to farmers?</li> <li>- Will this limit rural food processing plants and if so why? What defines a rural food processing plant (Dairy farms, meat, slaughter facilities)?</li> <li>-How does WSP, a global organization make informed decisions that benefit the citizens of this community? What is the cost to taxpayers to hire this consulting firm? If the WSP consultant was a previous employee of the City of Kawartha Lakes could this task not have been done with current staff?</li> <li>-Initially \$100 000 was allocated for these changes with a timeline of completion within 2 years. I understand COVID19 has prolonged this process because we are now in year 4. What is the actual cost to tax payers to-date for this rural zoning by-law consolidation? What is the expected final cost to taxpayers?</li> <li>-With cities in a current state of chaos, rising violence and crime I worry about any new policies whose end goal is to force people to move from rural areas to settlement areas that are unsafe and unaffordable. Will these by-law changes in any way be a first step in making it difficult for people to live in rural communities, increase settlement boundaries and encourage settlement into 15 minute cities?</li> <li>- It would appear to me that municipalities are creating policies that are sold to the public under the guise of building 'affordable housing' when in fact it is solely an opportunity for</li> </ul>	Glenn and Brenda Mills	<p>1) Please explain how this will affect current residential home owners, both positively and negatively? As part of the consolidation and harmonization exercise undertaken with the 14 current Zoning By-laws, uses and zone provisions were reviewed. Lands currently zoned for residential uses have been proposed to remain for residential uses. In some geographical areas (i.e., lots abutting a waterbody), to achieve conformity with the City's Official Plan, standardized water setbacks and shoreline naturalization requirements have been introduced. These setbacks, depending on the lot, generally require that new buildings and structures be no less than 30m from the high water mark of the water body. Two important notes: In some in-effect zoning by-laws, this setback already exists; and, one objective of this project is to bring forward a by-law that conforms with the City's Official Plan. These requirements will apply to new development and lot creation in the waterfront areas and will not apply retroactively.</p> <p>The By-law acknowledges that there are currently many lots that do not comply with the zone provisions of the proposed Rural Zoning By-law. There are also many lots that do not comply with the in-effect Zoning By-laws. To permit the continued uses that are legitimately established, a provision has been included in the Rural Zoning By-law that has the effect of exempting these non-complying lots/structures from zone provisions and allows them to continue.</p> <p>What is the advantage/disadvantage to farmers?</p> <p>The Rural Zoning By-law introduces On-Farm Diversified Uses and Agriculture-Related to the municipality. The intent of these uses is to allow farmers to diversify their income stream by establishing value-added and value-retained processes on their lands. Examples include micro-breweries, market stands and small-scale restaurants/cafes. Agricultural permissions have generally not changed. Agriculture uses are proposed to be permitted as they are today.</p> <p>Will this limit rural food processing plants and if so why? What defines a rural food processing plant (Dairy farms, meat, slaughter facilities)?</p> <p>The Rural Zoning By-law recognizes Abattoirs and Agricultural Products Processing Establishments. These uses are defined as follows:</p> <p>Abattoir: means the penning and slaughtering of live animals and the preliminary processing of animal carcasses and may include the packing, further processing, and storing of the product on the premises.</p> <p>Agricultural Products Processing Establishments: means premises in which agricultural products are preserved, graded, stored, or processed for consumption by humans or animals, and may include a flour mill, dairy processing, sawmill, egg grading, fruit and vegetable storage, or grain elevator, but does not include an abattoir.</p> <p>How does WSP, a global organization make informed decisions that benefit the citizens of this community? What is the cost to taxpayers to hire this consulting firm? If the WSP consultant was a previous employee of the City of Kawartha Lakes could this task not have been done with current staff?</p> <p>WSP was retained through a public procurement process in 2019. WSP has been working closely with City Staff throughout this process.</p>

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	<p>realtors, investors and developers to make astronomical amounts of money from the province. Are these changes to the by-laws necessary solely for the municipality to meet provincial targets and "cash in" as a response to Bill 23 and Bill 97 or are they in the best interest of its residents?</p> <p>- Who are the 6500 homes targeted to be built for in the City of Kawartha Lakes and will they be truly 'affordable'? Currently new homes are simply unaffordable to most middle class, working citizens. It would appear that most new builds are rapidly being purchased by investors for rental properties or new Canadians. Will these new homes be true 'affordable' homes for hard working Canadian families and first time home buyers?</p> <p>-Do these By-Law changes include policy and zoning regulations with regard to development of renewable energy uses and structures? If so, explain and will these changes affect current home owners e.g., elimination of natural gas?</p> <p>I am very tired of the lack of accountability, lack of fiscal responsibility and lack of transparency from every level of government. I am also concerned about decisions being made by our elected officials that are negatively impacting our communities now and in the future, at exorbitant costs to taxpayers and despite having the infrastructure to support some of these initiatives. I am doing my best to be informed because I have lost total trust and confidence in every level of government and their ability to do what is right for its citizens.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving answers to my many questions and am hopeful this initiative can be extended past September 15.</p>		<p>Initially \$100 000 was allocated for these changes with a timeline of completion within 2 years. I understand COVID19 has prolonged this process because we are now in year 4. What is the actual cost to tax payers to-date for this rural zoning by-law consolidation? What is the expected final cost to taxpayers?</p> <p>CKL</p> <p>With cities in a current state of chaos, rising violence and crime I worry about any new policies whose end goal is to force people to move from rural areas to settlement areas that are unsafe and unaffordable. Will these by-law changes in any way be a first step in making it difficult for people to live in rural communities, increase settlement boundaries and encourage settlement into 15 minute cities?</p> <p>The Rural Zoning By-law is being undertaken to implement the policies of the City's Official Plan. Growth and development is happening and will continue to happen. The Rural Zoning By-law is a tool used to support and manage growth.</p> <p>It would appear to me that municipalities are creating policies that are sold to the public under the guise of building 'affordable housing' when in fact it is solely an opportunity for realtors, investors and developers to make astronomical amounts of money from the province. Are these changes to the by-laws necessary solely for the municipality to meet provincial targets and "cash in" as a response to Bill 23 and Bill 97 or are they in the best interest of its residents?</p> <p>The Rural Zoning By-law is being undertaken to update zoning by-laws that pre-date the City's current Official Plan. As previously mentioned, a key objective of this project is bringing forward a Zoning By-law that conforms to the Official Plan.</p> <p>Who are the 6500 homes targeted to be built for in the City of Kawartha Lakes and will they be truly 'affordable'? Currently new homes are simply unaffordable to most middle class, working citizens. It would appear that most new builds are rapidly being purchased by investors for rental properties or new Canadians. Will these new homes be true 'affordable' homes for hard working Canadian families and first time home buyers?</p> <p>CKL</p> <p>Do these By-Law changes include policy and zoning regulations with regard to development of renewable energy uses and structures? If so, explain and will these changes affect current home owners e.g., elimination of natural gas?</p> <p>The Draft Rural Zoning By-law includes provisions that acknowledge solar energy and wind energy. Said provisions do not require that property owners install infrastructure but offer direction should they wish to.</p>
07-Sep-23	<p>It's beyond comprehension why any municipality would continue to destroy the land, by continued with outdated garbage disposal, polluting the land, that people use for drinking water, and other duties.</p> <p>I have traveled throughout Europe, even the smallest European countries have proper incinerators. The best one was from the Netherlands. No pollution, the residue was recycled. It also employed people.</p>	Anna Vallier	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Rural Zoning By-law does not establish garbage and waste collection processes and practices in Kawartha Lakes</p>
07-Sep-23	<p>Hello Glenn and Brenda thank you very much for your email and the questions that you've asked regarding the proposed Rural Zoning By Law Consolidation</p> <p>Council did support this extension myself and Councillor Warren and Council passed the extension until September 15th</p> <p>You have a lot of good questions here especially the on-farm processing one and I'll work on those other answers for you as well and get back asap.</p> <p>thank you</p>	Councillor Ron Ashmore	<p>See correspondence from Glenn and Brenda Mills.</p>

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
07-Sep-23	I support the waterfront setback and shoreline naturalization provisions of the proposed bylaw. These provisions have been recommended by expert panels for years, and this is a once in a lifetime opportunity to enact them. They also align with the City's strategic objectives about a healthy environment, as well as with the Bee City concept of supporting native pollinators.  I urge Council to enact these important environmental provisions as drafted.	Chris Appleton	Comment acknowledged. Thank you for your comment.
07-Sep-23	Good Evening Ms. Mills  Thank you for submitting your questions to the Rural Bylaw email address which goes directly to the project team and part of the public record. It was great speaking to you last evening reviewing your concerns and sharing some conversation. I am still trying to track down an email address for you to submit you concerns to the Kawartha Lakes Environmental Advisory Committee directly, will confirm by tomorrow, have a wonderful evening.	Tracy Richardson	See correspondence from Glenn and Brenda Mills.
07-Sep-23	I submitted comments about the proposed zoning by-law last week and my wife and I just want to make sure that they were received by your Project Team.  I did find it somewhat difficult to figure out what the zoning symbol is for our property on Balsam Lake as I could not find a proper map. Our address is 31 Woodfern Rd. I would be grateful if you can let us know the Zone Name and Symbol of our property.	Peter Petrosniak	Comment acknowledged. This property is zoned Rural Residential 3A (RR3A).
08-Sep-23	To all concerned, (Charles McDonald CKL councilor, CKL planning department- rural zoning bylaw)  As a landowner owner south of Lindsay I am very concerned about the direction of the planning department at CKL. I thank my neighbour for letting me know that CKL is updating their bylaws and is open to feedback.  I strongly believe rural landowners should have full authority over their land unless they are ruining their neighbours use of their land.  I was told by the planning department in an email that I could sever a lot from my 100 acre farm (there has never been a severance) because I was a retiring farmer. I am a 62 year old farmer registered with the OFA. Then I was told that email sent by the planning department was incorrect and out of date. I contacted Laurie Scott's office and they looked into it and told me there was no provincial legislation preventing CKL from letting me sever a lot from my land. Somebody has bad information which is causing my family a great deal of stress.  Rural landowners, including farmers, need control of their land.  I hope the updated rural zoning bylaw recognizes whose legal land (from crown patents) it is and does their utmost not to restrict landowners from innovation and creativity with their land.	Don Wood	Comment acknowledged. For specific development inquiries, it is recommended to contact the City's Planning Department who can confirm the requirements and standards that would apply.
11-Sep-23	I object to the City of Kawartha Lakes Rural Zoning By-Law Final Draft for our property at 112 Fishog Trail, on your map as Street Address: FISHOG TRAIL, Assessment Roll Number: 165142000166800. The Map is incorrect and gives this address to a different property. The elevation lines on the map of the property are also incorrect as the land rises steeply from the water's edge, especially along the south side of the Fishog River. The lot is high and dry and is used as a sister property to Crooked Lake Wilderness Lodge (Part Lot 11 Conc 9 Digby). Guests arriving by vehicle park here and await boat transportation through the system to the Lodge on North Fishog (aka Crooked Lake) which has been in continuous operation for over 150 years. The lot also contains a 73.7 sq m boat house which is over 50 years old, a driveway, a dock and a house trailer used as a reception center. The entire property would more appropriately be zoned CR Commercial Recreation as is the Lodge to reflect the historical and current use of the property. We would also request an E (exception) designation to continue to allow client parking. We trust you will correct these issues prior to passing this. Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter!	Robert Kelly	Comment acknowledged. The Draft Rural Zoning By-law shows Environmental Protection (EP) Zone and Agricultural (AG) Zone applied to the lands. The current LDL Zoning By-law applies Open Space (O1) Zone and Rural General (A1) Zone. The boundaries of the proposed EP and AG zones mirror those of the existing O1 and A1 Zones and have not changed. Legally existing uses may continue.  CKLOP designation is Rural and use could potentially be permitted. Additional information required and a separate ZBA process is recommended. New Exception Zones are not being applied or proposed through the Rural Zoning By-law and should proceed through a Zoning By-law Amendment.

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
11-Sep-23	<p>We, Robert Neil Kelly and Kerstin Kelly , object to the City of Kawartha Lakes Rural Zoning By-Law Final Draft for our property at 683 Skyline Road, Oakwood. Street Address: 683 SKYLINE RD</p> <p>Assessment Roll Number: 165111003028300</p> <p>We object to the proposed zoning on this property for the following reasons. This property is and has been for at least 30 years high and dry agricultural land due to being subject to 4 separate and extensive Agricultural Drain projects in the area for which we have personally been assessed over \$70,000. The property should now be totally agricultural AG with the exception that the Oakwood Airport( Registered with Transport Canada as COK3) shares part of the property including a hangar, helipad, and turf runway. There is also a residence, equipment building and Hardwood Lot. None of the property should be EP. We thank you, in advance, for your attention to this urgent matter!</p>	Robert Kelly	<p>Comment acknowledged. The subject lands are currently zoned Agricultural (A1) Zone and Environmental Protection Exception 4 (EP-4) Zone under the Mariposa Zoning By-law. Proposed by the Draft Rural Zoning By-law are the Agricultural (AG) Zone and Environmental Protection (EP) Zones, respectively. The boundaries of the proposed AG and EP Zones mirror those of the in-effect zones and have not changed.</p> <p>Attached are excerpts from the Mariposa ZBL and the Draft RZBL detailing the permissions of each zone.</p>
11-Sep-23	<p>We, Robert Neil Kelly and Kerstin Kelly , object to the City of Kawartha Lakes Rural Zoning By-Law Final Draft for our property between 618 and 683 Skyline Road, Oakwood. Street Address: SKYLINE RD</p> <p>Assessment Roll Number: 165111003028120</p> <p>We object to the proposed zoning on this property for the following reasons. This property is and has been for at least 30 years high and dry agricultural land due to being subject to 4 separate and extensive Agricultural Drain projects in the area for which we have personally been assessed over \$70,000. The property includes a small run-in-shed, a large riding arena and stables/barn, a horse field, area cleared and drained for pastures and agricultural uses and mixed mature bush. The center of the property also includes an 80X 1000 foot runway extension to the adjacent COK3 Oakwood aerodrome for safety and maneuvering . This property should not be EP but should all be in the AGR zoning except for the Aerodrome exception. We thank you, in advance, for your attention to this urgent matter!</p>	Robert Kelly	<p>Comment acknowledged. The subject lands are currently zoned Agricultural (A1) Zone and Environmental Protection Exception 4 (EP-4) Zone under the Mariposa Zoning By-law. Proposed by the Draft Rural Zoning By-law are the Agricultural (AG) Zone and Environmental Protection (EP) Zones, respectively. The boundaries of the proposed AG and EP zones mirror those of the in-effect zones and have not changed.</p> <p>Attached are excerpts from the Mariposa ZBL and the Draft RZBL detailing the permissions of each zone.</p>
12-Sep-23	66 Kennedy Bay Road zone provisions	Debbie Timbers	Proposed to be AG Zone - currently A1 Zone - responded via phone call on September 12, 2023
15-Sep-23	<p>To Whom it may concern , I have several concerns about the draft plan among them is section 7:2 the permitted uses in agricultural zones. Agricultural products and warehouses. I believe we should have expansion in all those zones , not limited and not just "exceptions". I have concerns about not being able to sever my 133 acres when I want to retire. This is a broad and extensive plan. I have spoken with many rural residents. We had a meeting Monday Sept 11 with over 80 attendees. We have a petition with over 200 signatures gathered in just two weeks -and we need more time to examine it and determine how it effects us, our properties and the future of our small towns. Sincerely , Angel Godsoe Ps please see the petition. We are asking for an extension for the time of approval</p>	Angel Godsoe	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Zoning By-law provides development standards including minimum lot area and minimum lot frontages. While new lots must meet these standards, there are other criteria that must be met in order for a severance/consent to be approved. Such criteria is described in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and Official Plan. A consent application must be evaluated for conformity/consistency with the policies within these documents. Generally, the proposed zoning by-law has minimal effect/affect on potential consents to sever as this direction is provided in the aforementioned policy documents.</p>
15-Sep-23	provide current zoning and proposed zoning for comparison - 390 Northline Road	Caroline Nobuto	Comment acknowledged and response provided.
14-Sep-23	<p>Good day to all. I am voicing my opinion on the above topic. I have it from reliable sources that this bylaw, as written, is not property owner friendly. It is hard to read and therefore complex. Rights of property owners are minimized tipping the bylaw heavily in favour of the CKL. There is not clarity in a paper that represents the biggest financial investment of most of this population. It is vitally important to get the rural portion correct, to help set the standard for the Urban Zones and the Oak Ridges Moraine zoning Bylaw. This area is already under attack from developers in the south with the assistance of the Provincial Government. Recently zoning bylaws in ward 3 have been sent back for review due to concerns of the changing of zones in support of recreational and residential developments. The confusion that the rural bylaw is creating will impact zoning changes there. How can one proceed without clarity of the bigger bylaw ? I am advocating for the rural zoning bylaw to be clearly rewritten in a manner that is fair to all ! Thank you, Rick B.</p>	Richard Blackwell	<p>Comment acknowledged. The project team welcomes suggestions on how to make the By-law more user-friendly and accessible. If you have concerns about specific zones or properties, please let us know and we will investigate.</p>

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
15-Sep-23	<p>(Thank you for reading this, I know everyone is busy)</p> <p>How do we make our community better?</p> <p>I was unaware the rural zoning in City of Kawartha Lakes (CKL) was being updated until last week. I appreciate the chance for this input. I have been to a citizen's meeting with Councilor Ashmore in attendance this week and members of my family have spent time reading this document in the last week.</p> <p>Here is our feedback:</p> <p>1.The document is written in vague language. I am the end user as a rural property owner and I find the language vague and confusing.</p> <p>2. This document is designed to create conflict between the city, by-law officers and rural property owners. An example would be the repeated use of the word permission. It reads like the CKL owns my land and I am a 15th century serf, not a partner in the community. If you follow the work of the Ontario Landowners Association you would realize that this rural zoning document has regulatory power not legal power. For example, the OLA has taken conservation authorities, who were trying to regulate where houses should be located on private property, to court and won. The judge clearly said that rural landowners have power over their lands not conservation authorities. Conservation authorities have power on public lands and are a great educational resource but should have no regulatory power on private lands. So, the point is how do we minimize conflict in the community with rural landowners? We transform by-law officers into conflict resolution officers between rural landowners so they can go home smiling at the end of the day instead of creating stress and tyranny in the community like they do now. Under no circumstances should by-law officers be entering private land without trying to contact the landowner ahead of time.</p> <p>3.The elected officials should re-write this document, not consultants or staff, to recognize the small rural property owner needs to be able innovate and create on their property. So, a great deal of the Soviet style central planning currently in this document needs to be removed. Rural landowners, including farmers, also need to be able to sever up to 3 lots as Premier Ford suggested in Bill 97. Why should wealthy developers from out of the community make all the money in real estate development? That does not create a caring community. For example, 1 acre lots where homeowners might opt to build a greenhouse, or raise chickens, would be more productive "farmland" then what is currently being practiced on most monoculture farmland in CKL. We need more choice in land use.</p> <p>4.The classification of "farmland" into 3 categories is vague and confusing and takes away private property rights. We need to move to a voluntary opt-in style of land use instead of a top-down central planning style. For example, I would designate my property as a farm on a voluntary basis because it creates a win/win situation for me, my family and the</p>	don wood	<p>Comment acknowledged. Responses have been prepared using the same numbering as your questions.</p> <p>1) Thank you for this comment. We continue to look for ways to streamline language in the By-law and make it more user-friendly.</p> <p>2) The word 'permission' does not suggest that the municipality owns your land. 'Permission' is used to describe what types of uses and structures can be placed on your property. The authority to implement these permissions is established by the Ontario Planning Act. Conservation Authorities, through other Provincial legislation, can also establish Regulated Area in which, prior to development, permits or clearances are required.</p> <p>3. Thank you for your comment. Provincial policy direction is changing and we are anticipating a new Provincial Planning Statement at the end of this year or early next that may change severance permissions for farm land.</p> <p>4. Thank you for your comment. The City's Official Plan designates farm land based on the Canada Lands Inventory soil designations. Prime Agricultural Land is generally applied to specialty crop areas and Class 1-3 soils (as determined by Canada Lands Inventory). Classes 4-7 are generally designated Rural. The Rural Zoning By-law reflects these designations as well as establishes a zone that applies to lands that have been created through a consent application.</p>
15-Sep-23	<p>Dear Sir or Madame.</p> <p>I'm at a loss how any Canadian citizen that works for Kawartha lakes could come up with such ludicrous amendments. I just learned this the other day from a neighbor. That being said I'm thinking this was meant to get little response from the public.</p> <p>These amendments will slowly destroy our way of life and privacy with extreme government overreach and there crazy agendas. Example 15 minute citys. This is Canada not china.</p> <p>Thankyou Sincerely Gordon Mazanek.</p>	Gord Mazanek	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
15-Sep-23	<p>Hello</p> <p>I am appalled by this situation and how a very important by-law is being pushed. The draft was made available this July and now it is being made final??</p> <p>How can this be?? As a tax paying citizen of Kawartha Lakes, I need, I deserve time to educate myself on the impact this will have to me, my family and kids.</p> <p>It was just several days ago I learned about this and now, I just found out the deadline is today.</p> <p>I am NOT happy with how this is being imposed. We the people, the citizens have the right to have access and time to read this 380++ page report</p> <p>I have not see a single article informing the dispersed public of Kawartha Lakes about the details of what is happening.</p> <p>I respectfully demand that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More time be given for the public to educate themselves of the changes</li> <li>2. For the public to have a voice/vote of whether or not is should be implemented</li> <li>3. I understand that 78 people attended the last council mtg where a request to have a period of 2 mths. Yet, only 2 weeks where granted.</li> </ol> <p>I need, I deserve answers.</p> <p>Thank you Monica Sotirakos</p>	monica sotirakos	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Rural Zoning By-law Review has been ongoing since 2019, when in-person public meetings were first held. The First Draft Rural Zoning By-law was released in January 2022, following two technical reports and additional consultation. Three public meeting were held to seek input on the First Draft Rural Zoning By-law. These comments were considered in the Second Draft Rural Zoning By-law which was released in March 2023. The third and Final Draft Rural Zoning By-law was released in July 2023 for additional comments and Statutory Public Meeting of Council.</p>

Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix			
Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
15-Sep-23	<p>Dear Rural Zoning by Law Project Team,</p> <p>My property is on Canal Lake (RR3A) on the water and it's length is 50m approximately. Therefore a 30m shoreline naturalization buffer would take up more than half my property. Currently the area that is not covered by my cottage, is covered with grass. This grass is naturally maintained, I've never used fertilizers nor weed killers but have kept the grass short. I've had the property almost 40 years.</p> <p>1. I would like to keep the grass and keep it short due to possible tick infestations in long grass/weeds. Over the past 2 years I have had 3 tick incidences in long grass areas (Queen Elizabeth II Wildlands Provincial Park, Grant's Loop in Orillia, and on Yorkville Avenue in Toronto).</p> <p>2. Lately, I've had a poison ivy encroachment, most likely from the public lot next door which the City does not maintain (although it's on their list of to-dos). In general naturalization should permit grass and not permit noxious/poisonous species of plants. Resulting diseases from ticks or giant hogweed could potentially kill someone.</p> <p>Tomiko Murk</p>	Tomiko	Comment acknowledged. The shoreline naturalization regulations in the Rural Zoning By-law do not apply retroactively. These requirements will come into effect following lot creation or new building permits along waterfront areas.
15-Sep-23	Why is there no mention of a settlement area?	Nancy Harrington-Ferris	Comment acknowledged. The Rural Zoning By-law implements the City's Official Plan policies related to settlement areas. There are no direct references to settlement areas in the Rural Zoning By-law as this is not an applicable zoning term.
15-Sep-23	See "Submission for Draft Zoning Changes City of Kawartha Lakes Sept 15, 2023"	Neil Thompson	Comments acknowledged. Response being prepared under separate copy.
15-Sep-23	<p>Hi.</p> <p>Way back at the online town hall sessions I had mentioned that Mitchell lake near Kirkfield has man made tides and should be classified as a flood plain. Each year at Thanksgiving ,and again on May long weekend, the Trent Severn canal system is closed/opened and Mitchell lake's water level raises or drops 2ft. The shorelines can recede up to 20ft making them hard to define. Property owners have voiced difficulty in understanding whether bylaws to prevent human shoreline damage can override the damage done to species and flora by the man made tides.</p> <p>The people in our association are curious about these considerations in the enforcement of new bylaws</p> <p>James Riches North Taylor Rd Cottage association</p>	James Riches	Comment acknowledged. Our direction on floodplains and water levels are generally taken from the Conservation Authorities.
16-Sep-23	<p>I know this is late but please do not penalize me. Question: How do you stop persons buying waterfront housing solely for Air B&amp;B. This nearly happened in my waterfront residential area that only has one private driveway for ingress and egress to the property in question. This is a new concept which I had not even thought to bring up in this zoning update.</p> <p>I hope that this question can be dealt with in the new by-laws.</p> <p>Sincerely H.B. Walsh.</p>	H.B. Walsh	Comment acknowledged. The City explored options to regulate Short Term Rentals during 2017-2023. It was determined by staff that this subject should be reviewed separately from the Rural Zoning By-law Project. Information on the history and the outcomes of this process can be found here on the City's website ( <a href="https://www.kawarthalakes.ca/en/things-to-do/short-term-rentals.aspx">https://www.kawarthalakes.ca/en/things-to-do/short-term-rentals.aspx</a> )
18-Sep-23	<p>A couple of questions about the rural zoning bylaw:</p> <p>1. does the draft make it harder to build new/replacement abattoirs than it is currently? I see new ones would only be allowed on AR land; and</p> <p>2. does the draft bylaw's provisions (e.g. severance) make it harder to build homes or subdivisions outside of the OP settlement areas?</p> <p>Many thanks! Mike</p>	Councillor Mike Perry	Comment acknowledged and response provided.
11-Oct-23	<p>I'm emailing to ask a few questions about the permissions in the draft Rural Zoning By-law Consolidation Project.</p> <p>The above-referenced property is zoned Rural Residential 1A Exception 514 in the Draft By-law (Rural Residential Exception 6, existing ZBL) and I am unsure whether the new RR1A classification in the draft ZBL would permit a Home Industry in an accessory structure on the property. The lot area is 0.4ha (or greater) and not have a GFA greater than 80m2, and no outdoor storage. The home industry is proposed to be a wood cabinetry shop.</p> <p>In Section 6.0 (Residential Zones), the RR1 zoning permits Home Industry, however in Section 13.0 (Exceptions), #514 states that 1) The permitted uses shall include a single detached dwelling. Does this mean that the only use permitted is single detached dwelling, and that a home industry will not be permitted? I am not sure if the parent RR1A Zone permission would continue to permit the uses listed in Table 6-2 of the Draft ZBL in the RR1A Exception 514 classification, or if it is strictly limited to a single detached dwelling.</p> <p>Thanks for the assistance to clarify.</p>	Christian Chan	<p>Comment acknowledged. Exception 514 states that: "all provisions of the RR1A Zone shall apply except that:</p> <p>1) The permitted uses shall include a single detached dwelling.</p> <p>2) The minimum lot area shall be 3,000 sq. m"</p> <p>Item One above uses the term "include" which indicates that, in addition to the RR1A Zone permitted uses, a single detached dwelling shall also be permitted.</p> <p>As per Table 6-2 in Section 6.2 of the Draft Rural Zoning By-law, Home Industry is permitted in the RR1A zone <b>unless</b> the lot abuts a waterbody.</p>

**Final Draft Comment-Response Matrix**

<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Response</b>
17-Oct-23	<p>Further to our phone conversation of last week.                      I am writing to request that the zoning on my farm property at 17 Farmstead Road be changed from its current zoning designation to straight Agricultural with no exceptions.                      Thank you for your consideration of my request.</p> <p>Confirmation of receipt of this email would be greatly appreciated.</p>	Jonathan Peck	<p>Comment acknowledged. Subject land is currently zoned A1-26 (Mariposa) which prohibits residential dwelling, livestock use within existing barn, and manure handling facility within existing barns. Proposed zoning carries forward this Exception.</p>