Comments Received from the Public Following Circulation of Public Notice on March 19, 2024

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
19-Mar-24	Hello Jonathan, Please send to me the most up-to-date version of the CKL Rural Zoning Bylaw Project Report. I have seen the original version that was published last July and would like to see the changes made since then, if any. The upcoming meeting on April 10 will come fast and concerned local property owners need time to review this new version. Also, if changes have been made, please indicate where in the document. I presented a deputation to Council last Fall with change requests and recommendations. I hope to see if they were considered.	Gene Balfour Fenelon Falls,	Please find the proposed Rural Zoning By-law and schedules using the links below. Rural Zoning By-law: https://zendto.kawarthalakes.ca/pickup.php?claimID=NBPz8zH5FqEkYrjj&claimPasscode=5tEBezEKhwZxZQwD Claim ID: NBPz8zH5FqEkYrjj Claim Passcode: 5tEBezEKhwZxZQwD Schedules: https://zendto.kawarthalakes.ca/pickup.php?claimID=7x2xygVg7rM2yFCD&claimPasscode=wKyyqgpS2YqTaTQb Claim ID: 7x2xygVg7rM2yFCD Claim Passcode: wKyyqgpS2YqTaTQb The changes between the version presented in August 2023 and the current proposed version are primarily corrections to typos and grammar. There were instances were regulations were re-worded for clarity as well. We do not have a version highlighting these changes.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
20-Mar-24	Jon, As you know, for several years we have been engaged in continuous communications with the City regarding the development proposed for Kings Bay by Kings Bay Golf Club Limited/Geranium Homes. With that now resident at the OLT, and since the City has taken a Party Status position of opposition at the OLT, as a community we are now focussed on the proposed Rural Zoning Bylaw. I have done some research at the website for the Bylaw and wonder if you could help with clarification. 1. Schedule A-E45 and A E59: I noticed that on both noted schedules the previous golf course area zoning is CR-797 (H). Could you offer some insight as to why the "Hold" criteria? Does it have anything to do with the current Appeal at the OLT, or are there other plans for this property that we should be aware of? 2. 12.0 Future Development Zones: This section of the Bylaw indicates a "Table 12-1 List of Future Development Zones" but I have yet to find the location of these zones. Could you refer me to the right location so we can identify these zone locations? This section appears to be very explicit regarding what can be done within these zones, and to what standards. This is it for now. Please feel free to call me directly if that would help. Thanks...Mike Wilson	Mike Wilson	Thank you for the details you've provided. I think you flagged something here that we need to revise on the schedule. Since there have been no zoning by-law amendments approved for the King's Bay lands, the existing zoning (under the Mariposa Zoning By-law) has been carried forward into the new Rural Zoning By-law but with a new zone symbol – CR rather than C3. The current zoning is C3 Exception Zone 4 = C3-4. The proposed zoning is CR Exception zone 797 = CR-797. The specific provisions remain the same. In the current zoning, it looks like the Holding Provision only applies to a small piece of the area. I think that through the massive GIS work undertaken, we accidentally applied the H to a greater area as shown on the two schedules you described. So, the short answer to your first question is that, no, there are no Geranium-related zoning provisions being applied through the Rural Zoning By-law. The existing provisions are being carried forward but with some new labels. The Future Development Zone is generally applied to the outside of existing settlement areas like Little Britain – see Schedule E6.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
21-Mar-24	See attachments titled Gavin Taylor 1 and 2.	Gavin Tyler, O.L.S.	Thank you for providing your detailed objection to the proposed Rural Zoning By-law. It has been recorded and will be mentioned in the Staff Report. Please note that we have received various requests from landowners to include zoning by-law amendments tied to consents over the course of this project. We are not in support of undertaking these types of amendments through the Project as they involve agency circulations and commentary. It has been the City's direction to proceed with zoning by-law amendments related to provisional consents through a separate process. Please let me know if you have any questions.
24-Mar-24	I've reviewed staff's final version of the Rural Zoning By-law (RZB) dated March 2024, more specifically Schedules A-C57 and A-C71. Please see the attached documents. On June 6, 2023, I objected to Schedules A-C57 and A-C71 as they applied the AG Zone symbol to his land (copy attached). In that letter I provided you with relevant background information. It was then and continues to be my professional planning opinion that the Planning Act permits, and it is appropriate for city staff to recommend the city's RZB apply the Agriculture Consolidation (AC) Zone symbol to the agricultural land to be retained. On November 8, 2023, the city's other planning consultant recommended provisional consent be granted to this Committee of Adjustment granted provisional consent to my client's application D03-2023-038. Condition 2 of that decision required the land to be re-zoned to prohibit residential use on the agricultural land to be retained. Therefore, a new use is not being permitted on the residential lot to be severed nor the agricultural land to be retained.	Doug Carroll, RPP,MCIP DC Planning Services Inc.	Please consider this confirmation of receipt of this email. I understand and appreciate the sentiments you have expressed. At this time, Zoning By-law Amendments related to Provisional Consents are not being considered through the Rural Zoning By-law Review project and are to be carried out through a separate ZBA process. Should PAC or Council provide alternate directions, subsequent actions will be undertaken.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	And a residential use is to be prohibited from the agricultural land. This application was circulated to review agencies, city staff and owners of abutting and adjacent land, in accordance with the Planning Act. Consequently, no concerns or objections were raised by any agency staff or neighbouring landowner. This application is uncontested, is consistent with the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement, conforms to the 2020 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and complies with the city's Official Plan. Unfortunately, despite my letter of objection, and there being no concerns from any person, city staff or review agency, the March 2024 version of the RZB has not applied the Agricultural Consolidation (AC) Zone symbol to the agricultural land to be retained. Consequently, the owner and I have had to spend time discussing this matter and again, providing our written concerns to you. My objection to the March 2024 RZB continues. I hope to resolve this matter through a discussion with the Planning Advisory Committee during the public meeting on April 10, 2024. Kindly acknowledge receipt of this email.		

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
24-Mar-24	Hello Mr. Derworiz, Further to the notice received regarding the upcoming Rural Zoning By-law Public meeting. Could you please provide me with a written description of the City's rationale for objecting to the removal of the conditions attached to the current zoning of my property at 17 Farmstead Road, in particular the condition prohibiting the building of a residential dwelling on the property, as is permitted under standard agricultural zoning. I would like to have my facts straight for the upcoming meeting.	Jonathan Peck	Phone call with Jonathan Peck on Monday, April 1, 2024. Indicated that the OP requires that lands severed through a consent are rezoned to prohibit residential uses.
22-Mar-24	Summary - subject property was not zoned through the RZBLR.	Josh Malcolm	RR3A-1098 applied to be consistent with adjacent lands.
02-Apr-24	The city of Kawartha Lakes Web site states that: A copy of the proposed Zoning By-law may also be obtained from the project lead Jonathan Derworiz, Jonathan.derworiz@wsp.com. Please forward same ideally with a map indicating all locations zoned as AR.	Brian Bartley	Attached the Rural Zoning By-law and Exception Zones. We don't have maps or schedules highlighting specific zones. The zone schedules reflect all zones there are quite a few schedules. They can be accessed here: Rural Zoning By-Law Consolidation | Jump In Kawartha Lakes Please refer to the schedules located under the "Proposed Rural Zoning By-law" heading on the right side of the page.
04-Apr-24	If you recall, in December 2023, on behalf of our client, R.W. Tomlinson Ltd., we provided a comments letter on the Final Draft of the City of Kawartha Lakes Rural Zoning By-law. In our comments letter we recommended to change the definition of a Mineral Aggregate Operation to be consistent with the PPS definition. Specifically Part C of the definition stating "associated facilities used in extraction, transport, beneficiation, processing or recycling of mineral aggregate resources and derived products such as asphalt and concrete, or the production of secondary related products."	Jared Vegter	Definition revised to align with PPS.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	We also recommended that if the definition of a Mineral Aggregate Operation cannot be changed, then we recommend including Concrete and Asphalt Plants as a permitted use within the Industrial Extractive Zone. I have attached our comments letter we provided in December 2023 for reference. On December 22, 2023, you had replied to our comments letter, stating that you will "incorporate the PPS' definition of Mineral Aggregate Operation as requested". See email thread for reference. In the proposed Rural Zoning By-law, dated March 2024, neither of the comments that we provided in the letter were included in the most recent draft. Can you please shed some light on what happened and how this matter can be addressed? If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to myself, or Neal DeRuyter (CC'd in the email).		
05-Apr-24	request for By-law and schedules	Fiona McKay	link to jump in page sent
09-Apr-24	Good evening Jonathan, Thank you for the call today. In March of 2023 I submitted a Consent Inquiry to CKL Planning Department in the initial steps of determining a severance and build at 28 King St., Woodville (ARN 165114000006705 - screen capture attached). In preliminary discussions with LSRCA they have indicated that I would need to demonstrate a proposed build site above their floodplain hazard elevation of 282.3m. For this reason I have a potential build site on this parcel of land immediately	Brent Drew	Thank you for providing these details. I looked at the differences in zoning and understand your concerns. The Rural Zoning By-law appears to have replaced the R1(F) Zone with the EP Zone, which as you said, would prevent any residential use on the land. Some screenshots are below for reference. The lot is currently split-zoned A1, R1(F) and EP Zone under the Woodville Zoning By-law. The proposed Rural Zoning By-law shows FD and EP Zones. The R1(F) zone has been replaced with the EP Zone.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	east of what is noted as 22 King Street and abuts CKL Road 9 (Woodville Road) at an elevation that is above LSRCA's noted 282.3 m. My concern with the proposed Rural Zoning bylaw interactive map for this ARN is that it indicates most of the parcel as EP which, according to my understanding , would preclude the building of a dwelling anywhere noted as EP. I guess I am somewhat confused now given my dealings to date with LSRCA and their requirement to provide a building site outside their flood hazard elevation (which through survey shows higher elevations) and the potential implications of this Proposed Rural Zoning Bylaw for this parcel indicating the areas higher than the floodplain hazard as EP zoning. The 1998 Woodville zoning did refer to this section of the land parcel as R1(F). My question I guess would be if the Rural Zoning bylaw is adopted as presented, does that sterilize the ability to build above the LSRCA's floodplain elevation on a severed portion of 28 King Street now all of the land, regardless of elevation, carries the EP zoning designation? Or, is that a continued discussion with LSRCA to revise the EP zoning based on survey data provided?		
10-Apr-24	I meant to include the attached LSRCA floodplain mapping in my email last night showing the proposed build site outside the LSRCA floodplain and adjacent to CKL Road 9. As noted, my concern with the zoning indicating EP on the proposed Rural Zoning Bylaw interactive map is that this would preclude any building in the area above the LSRCA floodplain hazard elevation of 282.3m.		

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	Regards, Brent Drew		
09-Apr-24	Looking at Schedule A-B24 has this lot been changed for the owner as was recommended last year? They would be looking at building a dwelling on it. Roll # 1651 420 001040010.0000, Brittney Mills	Councillor Yeo	Thanks for the note. Yes, this is something flagged from a while ago and we will be confirming implementation following tonight's meeting.
10-Apr-24	Summary - discussion about specific lands, the RZBL project and the City's Planning process/	Rob Belair	No action or follow-up required.
10-Apr-24	Site-specific inquiry regarding 315 Centreline Road	Mary Fitzpatrick	response provided.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
06-Apr-24	Thanks very much for your helpful response. I have now looked over my and your comments against the pertinent parts of the March bylaw. Congratulations on nearing the finish line (even though you've lost Matt in the process)! My comments in response using the same numbering (and if you want anything further from me before the public meeting, let me know ASAP), #1, exception – all good! #2, parent bylaw: Longford has no further concern on these points as its interests will be adequately protected. That said, as a colleague, I have to offer some further comments on the zoning of the water bodies, fully recognizing this is a City- and bylaw-wide matter not specific to Longford. You confirmed that the bylaw does not say whether the waters are zoned or unzoned. The usual practice is (a) zone the waters on the schedule, or (b) say in the text how the waters are zoned (e.g. all waters are OS unless shown otherwise on the schedule), or (c) say in the text the waters are not zoned. I have also seen bylaws that say that they do not apply to waters. My initial reading was that yours does apply, as per sec. 1.2, unless some smart person claims that waters are not lands. But then on a closer reading of sec. 2 and the "defined area" definition, it appears that the "defined area" is not all the rural lands and waters, but only those areas that are assigned a zone symbol on Sched. A. And in responding to #3 below, you say that unzoned road allowances are not part of the "defined area". Therefore, what is the regulatory power of the bylaw, even the general provisions of sec. 4.1.9, over shoreline structures over water? Or of any part of the bylaw over any structure in the Longford-owned unzoned road allowances that remain on the	Anthony Usher	Longford Reserve Exception Zone and Schedules to be revised as described by Anthony. Regarding the road allowances and GIS mapping, there do not appear to be zoning implications with this request. We cannot accommodate this request at this time.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	schedules? #3a, original road allowances along shorelines: I fully appreciate that this is a mapping problem which may be beyond what you can do at this time. Therefore, and also in light of the anomaly described above, I would like to propose the following, and subject to my client's OK (haven't reviewed with LRL yet) I would be happy to put this in a letter if you wish: That the following be added to Exception Zone 342: iv) Notwithstanding the definition of defined area and the provisions of Sections 1.2 and 2.1, any original road allowance of the geographic township of Longford that is shown as unzoned on Schedule A is deemed to be part of the defined area and to be zoned the same as are the lands abutting it. (Since all such unzoned RAs are along the shoreline and therefore there are zoned abutting lands on one side only, do not have to worry about different zoning on two sides. Note that this does not affect the so-called Victoria Road as this is not an original allowance.) #3b & 3c, mapping corrections: I appreciate this has been a herculean task on your and my sides, and that it will never be 100% perfect. However, still a few points. I hope this email is sufficient but if you want something more formal, let me know. i. There are still several places where stray OSS-342 and EP-342 labels are sitting on the shoreline or in the waterbody. Hard to tell but it may be that in some places these are intended to represent where the GIS believes there is some micro-area between the shoreline and the next, different landward zone. However, no matter how much you enlarge the schedule, there is no actual visible area. If it's too small to map and therefore too small to identify or to interpret by the		

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	interpretation rules, then (using the zoning equivalent of "if a tree falls in the forest"), can it actually exist for zoning purposes? These are, and again may not be complete, - A14 – lakes in NE quadrant; - A16 – Murphy L., E end; Thrasher L., S end; - A18 – SE quadrant, middle lake of the 3 lakes E of Black R. ii. A23, SW quadrant – everything on W side of Black River should be EP-342 except for the southernmost OSS-342. iii. A25, NW quadrant – line between RR2B-342 and smaller RR2B-342 N of it, that runs along former road allowance, shouldn't be there (sorry I missed this on the last runthrough). Thank you!		

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
10-Apr-24	This is further to my letter to you dated June 21, 2023, (copy attached), in which I objected to the Rural Zoning By-law, Schedules A-B76 and A-C6, because the Agriculture (AG) Zone symbol is applied to the land shown on the attached Property index Map. Relevant planning background information accompanied that letter. I have again reviewed the relevant Schedules in the March 2024 version of the RZB (copies attached). Unfortunately, despite my letter of objection, the March 2024 RZB Schedules continue to apply the AG Zone symbol to the subject land. As now proposed by staff, these Schedules do not implement and are contrary to the city's 2012 Official Plan. The Victoria County Official Plan, dated March 1978, designated the subject land Resort Estate on Schedule A-7. The July 20, 1998, update to the VCOP proposed the land be redesignated to Hamlet. The 2010 CKL OP designated the same land Development Policy Nine (DP-9) on Schedule A-4. Each of these designations established the principle of residential use of the land. The Planning Act does not prohibit the land from being zoned HR1. Policy 2.2.6.1 of the 2020 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GP) permits the draft RZB to apply the HR1 Zone symbol to the land. To apply the HR1 Zone symbol to the land also conforms to and implements Section 19 Hamlet Settlement designation, of the city's Official Plan. To summarize, the application of the HR1 Zone symbol to the subject land is appropriate given its historical residential land-use designations; it implements the city's 2012 Official Plan; it conforms to the 2020 GP; it is not contrary to the 2020 Provincial Policy Statement and is not contrary to the	Doug Carroll, RPP,MCIP DC Planning Services Inc.	Following further review of this request, we have learned that there is a related consent application with a recommendation that requires an exception zone be applied to acknowledge a 20 m lot frontage. As this would be a site-specific rezoning, we are not proposing to accommodate it as part of the Rural Zoning By-law.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	Planning Act. You've noted the DP-9 policies require "the submission of technical studies or supplementary justification". I agree and I note these studies and others, are required by the Planning Act, to accompany the subsequent applications for either a plan of subdivision or a plan of condominium. The information in those studies informs the design of the draft plan by the proponent and their review by the city staff and agencies informs possible red-line revisions to the draft plan. The subsequent and associated rezoning of the land is required to implement the city's draft approved plan of subdivision or condominium. Accordingly, my objection to the Agriculture (AG) Zone being applied to this land continues. I appreciate that WSP is not able to revise the schedules in time for the PAC meeting tonight. However, I trust you'll be consistent and flag this required change and provide me with a copy of the revised schedule. I look forward to speaking with you tonight about this matter.		

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
09-Apr-24	Comments for CKL Bylaw Kawartha Haliburton ag federation submitted comments in the last intake period. We did not receive any follow up and it looks like our comments have not been addressed. We are re-submitting and have added a couple more concerns. Hamlet boundaries and resulting FD areas: It appears that the boundary used for the hamlet areas is incorrect, possibly a layer used for large scale map display or someone digitized a layer to select parcels in the hamlet areas. The hamlet boundary used does not follow the parcel layer and arbitrarily crosses over properties, sometimes over building and houses. The shape of this boundary does not make sense for future services, lot sizes or layouts. Undeveloped areas captured by this arbitrary boundary are then assigned the FD designation. Many of these properties are either currently or could be used for agriculture in the future, however this would be restricted with the FD designation only allowing for existing uses, therefore any change would require rezoning. Therefore, we request that the proper hamlet boundary and resulting FD areas be used which take into account existing property boundaries and future intentions for development of the municipality allowing for proper layout and servicing of future developments. List of Ag uses: We appreciate the allowance for diversified on farm use, however the list seems to be fairly specific and doesn't allow for common sense exceptions which may occur in the future. We would recommend listing types of farm diversified uses allowed while including wording to allow for additional uses on a case by case basis. This would avoid forcing someone to rezone a property for a diversified on farm use which was not foreseen at this time.	Paul Buckley - Kawartha Haliburton federation of agriculture	The boundaries for Hamlets and Settlement Areas areas have been informed by the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan Schedules. The purpose of the Future Development Zone is to act as interim development zone for lands within Hamlets that are currently zoned Agricultural. The intent is to identify these ear-mark these lands for future development opportunities and limit the intensity/types of uses that can occur with the understanding that they will likely eventually be developed. Uses permitted are intended to be small-scale and not intense. Agricultural uses without livestock facilities have been permitted in these zones. The list of OFDU and Ag-Related uses have been informed by the PPS, Publication 851 and the City's Official Plan. The list of permitted uses is intended to specific and requests for uses not listed would generally be reviewed and evaluated through an Official Plan Amendment and/or Zoning By-law Amendment. Uses were selected and permitted based on best practice research and input from Staff. It should be noted that preliminary recommendations for Official Plan Policy updates were identified in the December 2020 Issues and Options Report: "That the City of Kawartha Lakes undertake policy framework updates to implement Provincial Policy and Guidelines. This may include detailed criteria for on-farm diversified uses, including specific uses or criteria to limit the scale of the use. Policy guidance regarding agriculture-related uses could also clarify the role of this use in supporting the agricultural community and ensure they are directed away from prime agricultural area."

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
	New comment: without context AR zoning looks to include some uses that maybe should be ag e.g. warehouse, yard, workshop, service, market, value added, feed mill. Depending on size much of this can be part of a farm. Some AR uses are allowed if considered diversified use which is confusing e.g. greenhouse. These concerns are increased now with the increases to development fees. Consultation with Ag: It is difficult to comment on this zoning as we are not planners nor do we fully understand the reasons behind some policies etc. If future feedback is desired our board would be open to receiving a presentation of the bylaws and changes that have occurred specific to the ag industry. This would allow us to ask questions and provide more quality feedback.		
09-Apr-24	see attachment titled 790 Elm Tree Road	Raj Kehar	Correction made.
04-Apr-24	See attachment titled Brian Bartley Response	Brian Bartley	See Brian Bartley_Reponse
	See attachment titled Darlene Callan	Darlene Callan	Requirement to allocate the area of operation to a portion of the site has been included. Requiring a relationship with a farm use is generally not included in a zoning by-law and has not been incorporated.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
01-Apr-24	This is further to my letter of objection and supporting documents, dated June 23, 2023. I objected to draft Schedule A-B26, dated March 2023, insofar as it applied to my client's land, described as 57R-1243, Parts 2 and 4, Sunset View Road. I've not received a reply from either WSP of the CKL concerning this matter. The owner obtained the required Minor Variance, and he has advised me the city has issued a Building Permit for a detached dwelling on his land. The initial construction work has been inspected and complies with the Building Code and the Permit. I've reviewed draft Schedule A-B26, dated March 2024 and note the AG zone symbol applies to Part 2. Again, and considering the above information, I recommend the appropriate zone symbol for Part 4 is RR3A-1098, which is consistent with other existing residential lots along the private roads in this neighbourhood. As the RZB project public meeting is scheduled for April 10th, please prior to that date, confirm that Schedule A-B26 will be revised by expanding the RR3A-1098 zone boundary to encompass all of Parts 2 and 4, 57R-1243. If you've any questions, please contact me as soon as possible.	Doug Carroll, RPP,MCIP DC Planning Services Inc.	RR3A-1098 applied to be consistent with adjacent lands.
26-Mar-24	See attachment titled Stub Road	Kevin Duguay	As identified in previous correspondence, the Holding Symbol label was placed incorrectly. This has been rectified in our mapping.
15-Apr-24	Summary: inquiry about recycling operations for lands with an Aggregate Extraction use (IX Zone)	Dennis WolfSimmons	Phone call. Explained the definition of Aggregate and Mineral Operation contains recycling.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
15-Apr-24	Hi Jonathon I am looking for the written submissions for the CKL rural zoning, including provincial agencies such as OMAH. I keep looking on the site but can't find them. Any help would be appreciated. Thanks Barry Snider	Barry Snider	The recent report to the Planning Advisory Committee included comment-response matrices detailing comments received on the Rural Zoning By-law. I have attached these for your reference. We are not in receipt of written submissions from OMAFRA or the Province
12-Apr-24	Jon, Thank you for following up regarding my questions pertaining to the current King's Bay zoning, as included in the proposed Rural Zoning By-law. Following your email I asked our planner, Keven Duguay for an opinion. I submitted a copy of Kevin's Memorandum to the City for consideration by the PAC. I have attached a copy of our submission to the City, including Kevin's Memo. When you have had a chance to review the zoning proposed for King's Bay, please get back to me with any proposed adjustments. For your information, although we didn't request an opportunity to speak at the PAC meeting on April 10th, we did attend (Mike and Rene Wilson 124 Southcrest, Chris and Nancy Dares 146 Southcrest) and were given permission to sit in the Chambers. There were certainly several spirited presentations. Based on what was presented it seems that there might still be some work to do.	Mike Wilson	As identified in previous correspondence, the Holding Symbol label was placed incorrectly. This has been rectified in our mapping.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
16-Apr-24	Hi Jonathan, At Wednesday's planning meeting it was made clear that you are not to deal with new applications. However part of my objection letter relates to Exception 990 (Manvers) wherein you show that the minimum lot size in this zone shall be 4500.0 sq. m. All of the Woodland Hills property is currently zoned with a minimum lot size of 4000. sq. m. Please make the above change for exception 990(Manvers).	Donald Kerr	This has been revised as requested.
25-Apr-24	Want to be sure this property zoning is correct to allow for dwelling. Owner seems to believe it is zoned incorrectly as community facility. We recently demolished the City building next door . Craig , Sharon is wondering about her 10' laneway?	Councillor Yeo	1025 Portage Road is currently zoned as Community Facility under the Eldon Zoning By-law. Understanding that this is incorrect, Hamlet Residential Zone has been applied.
24-Apr-24	Hi Jon I really would like to see protection of wetlands included in rural zoning bylaw. Evidently municipalities can add this to our zoning bylaws. I believe this would speak to our present OP Thanks Pat	Councillor Warren	The City's Official Plan permits agriculture, excluding existing buildings or structures, in the Environmental Protection Designation. The Environmental Protection Designation has been implemented through the Environmental Protection Zone with agriculture permitted as aforementioned. A zoning by-law cannot contradict the Official Plan.
08-Apr-24	see attachment titled Correspondence to RZBL - J Trider R and L Roddy.pdf	Jillian Trider, Charlie McDonald, Rick Roddy, Lorraine Roddy	Zone boundares are not being revised as part of the Rural Zoning By-law Project. The delineation of Agricultural Zoning and Hazard Land Zoning (Environmental Protection (EP) Zone, in the RZBL) is being carried forward from the in-effect Zone Schedules. Additionally, site specific requests to rezone properties are not being considered through this Project. There may be additional technical studies that would be required to sufficiently evaluate the described rezoning. It is recommended that a separate Zoning By-law Amendment Application be pursued.

Date Received	Comment	Author	Response
20-Mar-24	Request to be notified of the Recommendation passed on April 10, 2024 (PAC)	Johanna Powell	Response provided.
07-Apr-24	Hello Jonathon, As you suggested I am requesting that the property @ 10 Cityvierw heights be considered for continued operation as a contracting yard as I have been operating my business from that location for many years and do not want to be hindered when this bylaw Amalgamation goes through. I have struggled to get the property description as they recently renamed the road from HWY 7 (7798). It will be AG with new limitations. I need that exception to the new Bylaw.	Jeff Armitage	Site-specific rezonings are generally not being considered through the Rural Zoning By-law Project. The project team undertands that there are MLEO matters related to this site and are not prepared to consider rezoning.

Comment and responses, Brian Bartley 260 Sugar Bush Road, Norland, ON K0M 2L0

Comment:
My comments concern the application of this by-law to farm properties.
My first concern is that this by-law is in conflict with the CKL Official Plan -2012. Specifically the Official Plan calls for a more restrictive set of uses for Prime Agricultural Land (Section 15) defined as having Class 1, 2 or 3 soils and a more broad set of permitted uses for Rural Designation land comprising Class 4, 5, 6 and 7 soils. Specifically the Official Plan permits Rural Designation lands to be used for:

- Limited low density single detached dwellings
- Active and passive recreational uses and facilities
- Agricultural-related commercial and industrial uses
- Dog kennels
- Farm implement dealers
- Golf courses
- Ski resorts
- Farm markets
- Public and private infrastructure
- Public parks
- Utilities
- Ecotourism
- Agri-tourism

- Livestock and auction barns
- Nurseries
- Greenhouses
- Abattoirs
- Forestry management
- Sawmills
- Hunt camps
- In addition to any permitted uses on Prime Agricultural Land.

The Rural designation outlined in the Official Plan would also permit the severance of a lot for a retiring farmer.
The Final Draft Consolidated Rural Zoning By-Law ignores the Official Plan designations of Prime Agricultural and Rural and lumps all agricultural soil class lands 1 through 7 into one AG classification and for the most part applies the more restrictive use requirements of the Official Plan Prime Agricultural designation to it all. Further the Consolidated Rural Zoning By-Law generally imposes a much more restrictive set of uses on agricultural land in the northern geographic townships than is presently the case under the existing zoning by-laws in these townships which are largely consistent with the Official Plan -2012 Rural designation. There is a significant difference in the way farm operations work on Class 1,2 and 3 soils versus the more marginal soil classes, which is not reflected by the present draft of the zoning by-law.

Response:
The definition of the Prime Agricultural Area, as per the City of Kawartha Lakes Official Plan, is as follows: "means areas where prime agricultural lands predominate. This includes: areas of prime agricultural lands and associated Canada Land Inventory Class 4-7 soils; and additional areas where there is a local concentration of farms which exhibit characteristics of ongoing agriculture. Prime agricultural areas may be identified by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs using evaluation procedures established by the Province as amended from time to time, or may also be identified through an alternative agricultural land evaluation system approved by the Province." Effectively, through this definition, the Official Plan couples the Prime Ag (Class 1-3 lands) with Rural (Class 4-7 lands). This Prime Agricultural Area has been implemented through the Rural Zoning By-law's Agricultural Zones. At a high-level, a more conservative approach to the Agricultural Zones has been taken with the understanding that the municipality wishes to exercise some discretion when it comes to what types of On-farm Diversified/Agriculture-related uses are permitted as of right. There may be some instances where a proposed use requires technical evaluation and analysis to confirm that it is suitable for a subject location. Such analysis is generally undertaken through an amendment to either (or both) the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law. To maintain consistency with Provincial policy, it is our recommendation to maintain one Agricultural Zone.
Overall, there is a significant lack of consistency in terms of the permitted uses in the rural area zoning by-laws and there are conflicts between the zoning by-laws and the Official Plan. Further, the Official Plan is not up-to-date with Provincial policy. These issues are expected given the age of the rural area zoning by-laws, and the great degree to which Provincial Policy has evolved in the rural areas with respect to permitted uses over the past few decades.

Comment:
It is difficult to pre-zone for all agriculture-related uses as defined by the Provincial Policy Statement. The Official Plan contains limited criteria, and the existing policies are difficult to 'zone' as-of-right (e.g., the need to consolidate agriculture-related

commercial/industrial uses in the rural area cannot be easily regulated by zoning which is highly site-specific). Further, as it is the City's intent to update the policy to consider these uses, any pre-zoning would be premature at this time in the absence of policy guidance and there is an opportunity to update the zoning in parallel with any policy updates. Depending on the direction the City takes with respect to the policy updates, it may be desirable to establish a separate zone category for agriculture-related uses (rural-industrial/commercial) which can be applied through future site-specific rezoning applications similar to the Agricultural Support Zone in the Ops Zoning By-law. This zone can also be used to recognize existing uses. To complement this approach, consideration may be given to permitting certain agriculture-related uses in the hamlets to create opportunities for these uses, subject to criteria and compatibility with the principally residential character of many hamlets. The Official Plan permits a range of uses in the Hamlets including processing and assembly uses, service and repair uses, storage and warehousing as well as commercial uses servicing surrounding rural areas, so it is interpreted that a range of agriculture-related uses in the Hamlets can be contemplated.
Another more specific contradiction of the Official plan is that the Official Plan specifically permits dog kennels on both Prime Agricultural and Rural land designations, yet the draft By-law would permit only existing kennels on AG lands.

Response:
Dog Kennels have been permitted in all Ag zones.

Comment:
In my April 1, 2022 e-mail submission and separately others commented on restrictions on sawmills in the initial draft of the By-law. There was a response to these concerns in that it was stated that sawmills would be classified as Agricultural Products Processing Facilities, but table 7-2 only permits existing Agricultural Product Processing Facilities in AG and AC zones. Sawmills may be moved, from one location to another as timber availability changes. Existing sawmills would already be permitted as an existing non-conforming use. The present draft permitting only existing sawmills in the AG zone is needlessly restrictive and again in conflict with the Official Plan at least when applied to Class 4-7 agricultural land.

Response:
Sawmills have been permitted in all Ag Zones.

Comment:
More generally I question the Advisory Committees priorities in permitting only existing Agricultural Products Processing facilities on AG and AC zone lands, which in addition to sawmills would include a flour mill, egg grading station, fruit and vegetable storage or a grain elevator, while at the same time permitting Cannabis processing facilities in all Agricultural Zones.
The AR (Agricultural Related) zone does not address these contradictions of the Official Plan. AR zoning is not mentioned in the Official Plan. AR zoning does not differentiate between Soil Classes 1-3 and 4-7. Consequently it neither offers the protections outlined in the Official Plan for Prime Agricultural Land nor does it provide for the more flexible use profile outlined in the Official Plan for Rural zoned land.

Response:
As described above, the Agriculture Related (AR) Zone is newly created and intended to be similar to in-effect zones like the Agricultural Support Zone.

Comment:

I brought up the issue of Home Occupation and Home Industry in my comments of April 1, 2022. The response printed in the comment matrix states no changes are proposed at this time. While these are permitted uses on AG land in the Final Draft Consolidated Rural Zoning By-law they are effectively made moot for most farms by the a Section 4 restriction, specifically that:
A home industry (or occupation) shall not be permitted on a lot abutting a waterbody.
And a Waterbody is defined:
Waterbody means a body of water or the natural channel for a permanent or intermittent stream of water, including a river, spring, stream or lake and which may be navigable.
I believe you would be hard pressed to find a farm lot in Kawartha Lakes that does not have one of these features. This appears to be an unnecessary and discriminatory restriction on the farm community and I suggest it should be removed or modified. If the goal is protection of water bodies then this makes no sense as someone living on a lake without having purchased the shoreline right of way could operate a home industry or occupation, while some one living on a farm lot with an intermittent stream touching the lot located 500 meters away from the home occupation or industry location could not. If it is simply a "Not In My Back Yard" restriction then again a specified distance from a Navigable Waterbody to the home industry or occupation would make more sense. I believe the restrictions regarding abutting a water body should simply be removed.

Response: Thank you for the insight and detailed comments The provision that prohibits Home Industry from lots adjacent to waterbodies has been deleted.

Comment:
I also raised the issue about the lack of communication on the Rural Zoning By-Law to property owners in my e-mail comments of April 1, 2022. None of the neighbours I spoke to were aware of this project. The response I received to my comment regarding communication in the Comment Matrix from the First Draft was that the project was published in local newspapers, on social media and on the project website. My response to this is that the only paper delivered or available in my area is from Haliburton, I do not have time to waste on social media and I was never sent a link to the Project Website, despite having submitted comments in the spring of 2022. I received no communication from Project Team other than a message saying staff would get back to me shortly after submitting my 2022 comments. Hearing nothing I assumed this project had been put on hold, possibly due to Covid, until I came across information in September of last year regarding a Final Draft. I sent several requests for an update on the status with no response. (Possibly because it now appears that Mr. Derworiz email address appears to have changed without notice since April of 2022.) It was not until Wednesday March 27th of this year, two weeks ago, that after contacting the Clerk's Office I was provided the Comment Matrix from the First Draft of the Rural Zoning By-Law which included responses to my 2022 comments. I still do not see that these comments have been posted on the Project Website for public review. The City has no problem delivering tax bills twice a year by Canada Post. It would seem that similar efforts could have been made regarding the Rural Zoning By-Law Consolidation project.

Response: Thank you for your comments and feedback on the communications of this Project. It has been challenging with the loss of local print publications and we have tried to push notice and awareness of this Project regularly.

Agricultural Development Advisory Committee Comment Response Matrix

Page	Section	Issue/Concern	Recommendation	Action
USER GUIDE				
v	Step 4	The word 'or' is not appropriate, since a severance in the absence of consolidation would not require prohibition of residential uses on the retained lot. This is only required where there is consolidation and severance, during that specific noted process for surplus farmhouse dwellings.	Change 'or' to 'and'	Change incorporated
vi	Step 6	Omits noting that some provisions in Section 4 contain provisions that apply to all uses. It only references the certain permitted uses.	In the second sentence add "that apply to …'all uses and other provisions that only apply to' … certain permitted uses.	Change incorporated
Vi & 110	Future Development Zone	Unfairly, the effect of the new creation of a Future Development Zone, to apply to lands within the Hamlet Area, but outside the current built area, at a point when KLOP mapping of the Hamlet area borders cannot also be updated, imposes restrictions on 1658 acres of Agriculture Zoned lands. Current outlines of the Hamlet area in certain examples seem to be random circular areas outside the current built form, and cut randomly across lots, and in some	Either the KLOP mapping should be remedied to align with existing lot line borders or alternatively, create the new FD Zone, but abandon the severe use restrictions being added to that zone in the current draft and add them at a future update (MCR) when the Designation mapping can also be updated and the restrictions imposed on a more realistic land base for areas where development may and could occur.	The purpose of the Future Development Zone is to act as interim development zone for lands within Hamlets that are currently zoned Agricultural. The intent is to identify these ear-mark these lands for future development opportunities and limit the intensity/types of uses that can occur with the understanding that they will likely eventually be developed. Uses permitted are intended

		cases providing no realistic space for development in the form of a Development Plan Area, or even single new lot creation. Additionally, it is questioned that there is a real need for such significant expansion of Hamlets given the extensive expansions being undertaken around the larger urban centres. The PPS suggests that development should be directed to Urban areas. In a rural community, Hamlets should be avoided for expansion, and development directed to the large urban centres where infrastructure and services are more readily available.		to be small-scale and not intense.
DEFINITIONS				
10	Agri-Tourism	Although detailed lists are not ideal, a few key examples that are missed here should be added to reflect modern uses.	Add culinary experiences, retail of farm products and value-added farm products as well as ready-to-eat products.	Change incorporated
10	Agricultural Event Venue	Expand definition to allow for food preparation facilities.	Add 'and may have food and beverage preparation and serving facilities'	Change incorporated
10	Agricultural Products Processing Establishment	This is still showing a mix of value-retaining farm uses and value-added farm uses, and also overlooks the term Feed Mill, and still needs a definition for Grain Elevator (elsewhere herein mixed up	Sort out the Value-Retaining Uses that are listed, as those should not be confused with processing. Remove exclusion of abattoir, as it is most certainly a processing facility. Change 'may include' to 'including, but not limited to,'.	Change incorporated

		with Feed Mill). A fruit and vegetable storage facility is a value-retaining use, as is a grain elevator. Why does abattoir need to be separated, or excluded from this APPE definition as there is not a difference in where they can be permitted? A specified list is not ideal (as identified in the Discussion Paper, and should have the words "including, but not limited to", to allow for a more contemporary set of examples.	Change word 'consumption' to use so as to be inclusive of all types of uses by humans, including ethanol, bio-products, building products, etc.	Change incorporated
11	Agriculture Products Warehouse	Note that this is an agricultural activity, and should be permitted in all zones where agriculture is permitted. This definition fits for facilities a farmer would have on farm (storage), and also would fit for independent storage facilities established on smaller non-farm lots as Agriculture Related.	In Section 7 update that Agriculture Products Warehouse be a permitted use in the Agriculture Zone since a farmer will also have storage of agriculture produce.	The intent is for this to be a principal use serviing a broader area. It is agreed such a use, when accessory to a farm, should be permitted. This is covered in the definition of Agriculture which permits value-retaining farm uses.
11	Agriculture	The placement of the term 'farm greenhouse' is inserted in the area of the definitions which describes the types of agriculture production, however it is a building type that fits more appropriately in the latter part of the definition which deals with the inclusion of facility types.	Move "farm greenhouse" to just following 'livestock facilities'.	Change incorporated

11	Air Filtration Control	Typo – "size" should be "sized"	Change to "sized".	Change incorporated
16	Development	A planning act definition for Development should be added so as to differentiate between it and the definition of Development included within section 4.6.1 Conservation Authority Regulated Area.	Add a Planning definition for "Development"	Development' is not typically defined in Zoning By-laws. Where used in this By-law, clarification has been provided so that a specific Act or legislation is referred to.
18	Farm Café and Shop	Should include the sale of products produced on the farm. Also needs the addition of "may include limited seating and a small-scale commercial kitchen", to allow for the activities that would be included in a café.	Add "and may include limited seating and a small-scale commercial kitchen". Edit "… the sale of value-added products …" to read "… the sale of products and value-added products …"	Change incorporated
19	Farmers' Market	Needs to refer to language used in Health Unit Description of "Farmers' Market" - "majority of vendors are farmer producers". Note that it would not count producers of non-farm artisan products as primary producers. This is a key distinction between a Farmers' Market and an Artisan Market. Details can be found in "Operational Approaches for Food Safety Guidelines, 2019, produced by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.	Change "primary producers" to "farmer producers as defined by the Food Premises O. Reg. 493\17 as amended from time to time." (or appropriate reference to the O. Reg.)	Change incorporated
19	Feed Mill	The wrong term is described within this definition. It describes a	A Feed Mill is a mill or factory in which food for animals is manufactured and includes storage	Definition for Feed Mill has been revised as described. Definition for

		grain elevator, not a feed mill. This should be corrected so that definitions are shown for both Feed Mill and Grain Elevator.	for ingredients and completed feeds as well as accessory office space. A Grain Elevator means premises where farm commodities such as grain, corn, and oil seeds are brought, stored, dried, processed, and sold, and also includes the drying, processing, and elevation for storage of farm commodities.	Grain Elevator has been included. Grain Elevators have been permitted in AG zones.
20	Film Production	Update of terms is needed.	Change video taping to 'video recording' and add audio as "… form of visual and audio recording …"	Change incorporated
20	Garage, Private	Should Private Garage be listed as a permitted use in Residential Zones chart? And why only temporary, and what does that mean in length of time?	Remove "Temporary", as there doesn't seem to be a definition of temporary. Also, what is the rationale for parking of a motor vehicle to be temporary when it is accessory to a dwelling unit. Should that not be a regular use? If there is an intent to differentiate between motor vehicles and commercial/recreational vehicles, should they be defined separately?	The term 'temporary' has been removed.
20	Garden and Nursery Supplies	Growing is an agricultural activity and as such, this should be permitted on agricultural land, with the accessory activities and related product/equipment rental permitted as an OFDU.	Split into 2 definitions. in Section 7: create "Garden and Nursery" as a permitted use in the Agriculture Zone, retaining the first half of the existing definition ending with "sold to the public". Amend this definition to "Garden and Nursery Supplies, and the "sale or rental of such goods, products or equipment normally associated with gardening or landscaping" be added in the ODFU permissions.	Separate definitions created and Garden and Nursery included as permittd use in the Agriculture Zone. Changes incorporated.

20	Greenhouse, Commercial; and Greenhouse, Farm;	Three definitions are not needed as they area essentially all the same, and all should be permitted on agricultural lands. The differentiation here is not needed, and is not recognising that both activities are agriculture uses with the growing activities and the inclusion of the greenhouse building also included in the Agriculture definition. Any references to transplanting to out doors are irrelevant, and follow no current logic or practices that would need to be differentiated in this definition. Regardless of indoor or outdoor growing or transplanting and whether sold as retail or wholesale, both are agriculture uses. One references a 'premises' and the other a 'building'. The piece of differentiation is the "may include the sale of incidental, or seasonal merchandise" which should be defined more generally, and be included within the Farm Produce Outlet definition as an On Farm Diversified Use.	A greenhouse on a farm can look just the same as an urban greenhouse, and they are both agricultural activities, and should be added to the Section 7 permissions for all Agriculture Zones. The piece of differentiation is the "may include the sale of incidental, or seasonal merchandise" which should be defined more generally, and be included within the Farm Produce Outlet definition as an On Farm Diversified Use. This would deal with the question of permitting the sale of related, incidental merchandise within a farm shop that may be complementary to the products produced on the farm.	Farm Greenhouse and Commercial Greenhouse have been permitted in all Ag Zones.

		Transplanting outdoors is not always done for farm greenhouses. Many plants and vegetables are grown entirely within the greenhouse. This is an agriculture use. Is this meant as a definition for a building permitted within the 'Agriculture' definition? If so, remove the reference to transplanting. Also, there should be no requirement for transplants to be grown on the same lot as they are transplanted to. Some farm operations have multiple lots.	Remove references to transplanting from both definitions, as there is no standardization for either, and is not part of the distinction.	Reference to transplanting has been removed.
22	Home-Based Food Processing	This definition does not cover the scope of what a home-based food processing business entails. It may involve a separately constructed kitchen facility, in order to comply with Health Unit Regulations, and also should not be restricted to processing food which is not time or temperature controlled. It commonly includes refrigerated, and perishable product. It is a small-scale food processing business which operated according to the provisions for a Home Occupation or a Home Industry. See additional notations provided on Draft 3-Final.	Change to "means a business established within a dwelling unit or in an accessory building and permitted according to Ministry of Health Food Premises Regulations where a kitchen is permitted to be used to process food, and package it to be offered for sale."	Change incorporated

		From KLOP 11.1 & 11.2 General Provisions for Home Based Business - both Home Occupation & Home Industry: f) if the use is food related, the proposed use should comply with the Health Unit's requirements with respect to the potability of the water and the protection of food from contamination with respect to the handling and storage.		
22	Home Occupation	Since a Home Occupation is permitted in an accessory building by this definition, then Section 4 needs to be updated to align. Also, relative to comment above, the accessory building provision is the reason to remove references in H-B Food Processing definition to a 'residential' kitchen. Also, the residential kitchen may not be the facility used within the home, as there may be a separate kitchen constructed for this activity within the home in order that it can be fully permitted under the Food Premise Regulation for sales outside of a farmers' market. Sales of low risk food products prepared in the domicile kitchen are only permitted within an	Update Section 4 to reflect the inclusion of accessory buildings in this definition.	The OP requires that a Home Occupation be wholly contained with a dwelling. Definition of Home Occupation revised to align with OP
			Consider issues around swimming instruction or outdoor yoga or exercise classes surrounding the definition's restriction to indoor activities.	See above.

		exempted farmers' market. Separate facilities within a home are required if Health Unit approvals are sought for sales to occur at any other location other than an exempted farmers' market.		
22	Hunt Camp	Omits the allowance for sanitary facilities	Add Sanitary Facilities to the noted facilities permitted.	Change incorporated
24	Livestock Facility	The term "material storages" is not part of the MDS definition, and should be removed so as not to be confusing. Storage is already noted separately within the Agriculture definition and does not need to be noted here if it occurs within a livestock barn.	Remove the words "or material" so that the definition includes "… manure storages and anaerobic digesters" to align with MDS Publication 853.	Change incorporated
29	Micro-Brewery	Why is this restricted to situations with a restaurant? A micro-brewery often does not have a full restaurant, but often solely a tasting room with minimal food offering to qualify for AGCO regulations (such as bagged chips, and other foods not prepped on-site). Also, a micro-brewery in an industrial setting may have no on-site consumption at all, so, should address retail provisions.	Revise definition to fit both in Commercial and Industrial zones where there may or may not be a restaurant or tasting room, and may only involve retail sales. Ensure retail sales are permitted in both zone types.	Definition revised to Micro-Brewery means premises used for the small-scale production and sale of beer, wine, cider, or spirits produced for consumption off-premises, or on-site consumption. A Micro-Brewery may be located in combination with a permitted restaurant or tasting room.
41	Value-Added Farm Use	This definition has terms which are confused with Value- Retaining Farm Use. Move terms some terms to	Move terms such as bagging, packaging, drying, and bundling to the Value Retaining definition. Add	Change incorporated

		the Value Retaining definition. Also need to consider if this is the best place to add in the OP Permitted use in Prime Ag of "Secondary Uses" - definition includes "uses that provide value added agricultural products from the farm operation such as farm markets, farm produce stands, farm vacation establishments, farmhouse dining rooms, farm wineries or cideries and bed and breakfast establishments". Or if they should be listed independently within the permitted uses chart. Due to the wording "such as", it may be appropriate to use the first part of the definition, and use language "including, but not limited to".	the "including, but not limited to" terminology.	
41	Value-Retaining Farm Use	Adjust to align the correct terms with the correct use, as noted above. Also add egg grading, washing, cutting, refrigeration, and freezing, and utilize the "including, but not limited to" terminology.	Add the terms egg grading, and those identified above to be moved from Value-Added to Value-Retaining. Also add to the explanation example: washing, cutting, refrigeration, and freezing. Add the "including, but not limited to" terminology.	Change incorporated
PROVISIONS				

51	4.4.10.4.b	Shipping container restrictions in the front and exterior side of principal building is not necessarily relevant where the buildings are so far set back and may be in the centre of a 100 acre property. Consider providing an exception for situations where the container placement would be greater than 100m from the street line.	Consider providing an exception for situations where the container placement would be greater than 100m from the street line.	The zoning by-law establishes requirements which should work most of the time, and minor variances can be sought for exceptions.
54	4.6.1	Conservation Authority (CA) Regulated Area (RA) - Duplication is unnecessary and cumbersome/costly and inefficient to include Regulated Area Mapping within a Zoning By-law. This mapping is often updated when it is determined that the mapping does not reflect the actual conditions on the ground. If mapping is embedded in Zoning, it will be very difficult and costly to update. Will a ZBA be required to update mapping?	Clarification is needed regarding process/timeliness for updates to Schedule A mapping as amendment are made. Will it be as RA updates are made by the CA, or at future comprehensive updates?	Section 4.7.1.b states that a ZBLA is not required.

		Need a definition added to the Section 3 definitions for Development. However, it should be noted that the Conservation Authority Act definition for Development is different from the Planning Act definition of Development, and it could be confusing herein as to which is being referenced. This is another reason that this section should not be included in the zoning by-law, but only a possible reference to the need to check with the conservation authority regarding possible regulation of the lot through the Conservation Authorities Act. if the word development here refers to the CA definition, then it should not be bold.	Add a Planning Act Definition of Development in Definitions. Clarify which term for Development is referenced within the bolding in section 4.6.4.1.a and remove bolding if it references the CA Act definition.	Term has been un-bolded. Reference made to Conservation Authorities Act.
		Which 'text of the regulation' is being referenced in 4.6.4.1.b? Should there be a reference in that statement to the Section numbers included in this reference? And should it be "this regulation"?	Which text of the regulation is being discussed in 4.6.4.1.b – should the section number reference be added?	Text of the regulation refers to the Conservation Authority Regulation.
		What is this process for 4.6.4.2? How is it accomplished, and who makes the decisions? Staff, Council, Board of Directors?	Clarify process for 4.6.4.2 who makes the decision and by what process?	This is a Conservation Authority process and outside the Zoning By-law
60	4.13.1.i	Height Exceptions - Need to add exemptions for agriculture related use and	Add exemptions for agriculture related use and also add a note (#3)	Change incorporated

		also note this exemption in Table 7-3	regarding this exemption in Table 7-3.	
60	4.14	Does not reflect modern language or gender neutral examples. Add including but not limited to.	The addition of examples is needed, and also the Including but not limited to terminology.	Instruction classes and daycare centres are not home industries and will not be included. "including but not limited to" language has been inserted.
			Custom Workshop, Instruction classes, daycare centre.	
		For 4.14.1.4 – there should be just a minimum setback rather than an outright prohibition, as there is no justification for this discrimination simply because the property abuts a water body. It may be very far away, and if enclosed within a building, its hard to understand what the impact would be to cause a prohibition.	For 4.14.1.4 – there should be just a minimum setback rather than an outright prohibition.	Change incorporated
61	4.15	Remove prohibition for use of accessory buildings or structures, as definition permits it.	Remove prohibition of use of accessory buildings other than attached garages.	The Official Plan does not permit home occupations within detached accessory structures.
			Clarify the confusion for swimming instruction which may be outside for an outdoor pool. And also other outdoor yoga or other instruction.	The Official Plan states that a home occupation must be wholly contained with a dwelling.
64	4.2	MDS – in addition to above:	Add the term Designation: "… within an Agriculture zone or any zone or designation in which agriculture …"	Designation' is OP terminology which is generally not used in a Zoning By-law. A Zoning By-law refers to Zones.

		Not sure the term "erected" fully covers the indications in MDS Publication 853 which indicates "new land uses, including the creation of lots", not just new buildings.	Review "Options for Municipalities" in Publication 853 with Planning, EcDev-Ag staff and ADAC and place them into the Zoning By-law as required.	Reference to broader provincial regulations has been inserted. No further action taken as the municipality currently implements MDS when applicable.
		Should add the proper reference to the document "Minimum Distance Separation Document Publication 853, as amended".	Add reference to OMAFRA Publication 853 Minimum Distance Separation Document, and expand the language referencing the formulas to encompass "the other applicable Guidelines".	Language pertaining to additional regulations has been included.
		Note that there are options that municipalities are required to consider and also must note in their Zoning By-laws, as found in the implementation section of the Publication. These should be considered in conjunction with Planning Staff, EDO-Agriculture and the Agricultural Development Advisory Committee.		
		Should add the proper reference to the document "Minimum Distance Separation Document Publication 853, as amended". Also, not only referencing the formulas found in that publication, but also the other applicable Guidelines.		

66	4.24.1.2.a	Maximum Gross Floor Area – should not be restricted less than the limit of the permitted area of operation for an OFDU. The Guideline uses the word "may" when referring to the option of a municipality to impose a cap on gross floor area. Edit this to have a maximum gross floor area … of 20% of the lot area. Remembering that a farm operation often has multiple lots and an OFDU for some circumstances would have a larger proportional building footprint, and or may contain multiple OFDUs on a property, all with the majority of uses happening within a building footprint.	Edit to have a "maximum gross floor area … of 20% of the lot area."	The municipality has discretion to be more restrictive. At this time, pending completion of a future Official Plan review which would be the opportuntity to establish City policy, we understand staff would prefer to limit floor area to 20% of the area of operation. If the farm consists of multiple lots, a variance process would be desirable to assess appropriateness of a larger OFDU.
69	4.25.2.1 and 4.26.4 and 4.26.5	Discrepancy or discrimination in treatment of parking space use by Seasonal Outdoor Display Area use of parking spaces versus Seasonal Outdoor Patio use of parking spaces – Seasonal Outdoor Display Areas are allowed to use up to 10% of the required parking, whereas Seasonal Outdoor Patios are not allowed to use any of the required parking spaces. Given what has been seen during and since pandemic times, equal treatment for	Change 4.26.5 to permit up to 10% of the required parking spaces to be used for Seasonal Outdoor Patios.	Change incorporated

		seasonal patios seems to be called for.		
		There also is a discrepancy in what is considered seasonal, with one permitted 4 months and the other permitted 8 months.	Align the seasonal timeframe to eight months for both.	Change incorporated
68	4.27.1	Outside storage should be permitted on a vacant lot as an Accessory to and Agriculture Use. Storage of farm equipment, farm produce, etc. should be permitted on vacant agricultural lots as it is a normal farm practice to do so.	Add an exception for Accessory Uses to and Agriculture Use.	It is common practice to not allow storage on a vacant lot. The lot is not necessarily vacant if it is being farmed, so this provision would not apply. No change proposed.
71	4.31	Seasonal Farm Help Dwellings should not be restricted in size – 150 square metres or 1,600 square feet is not an overly large home, and if used for accommodations for farm help, it is not appropriate to limit the size of the home to a smaller size. Farms will likely use what is available, and if a larger home is available, that is what they will use. There is no relevance here to the number of employee per square foot, so no difference between space	Remove restriction on floor area of seasonal farm help dwellings.	No change has been made. A minor variance can be applied for should an increase floor area be desired.

		for 2 or 20 workers. There should be no limit therefore on maximum floor area for seasonal farm help dwellings. There are farms in Kawartha Lakes using seasonal farm help dwellings who have more than 30 seasonal workers accommodated on the farm. This must not be restricted since that would unduly restrict farms in the need to provide accommodations for their seasonal workers. Nor should they be required to split them up across multiple properties, then requiring multiple residential services to be maintained. (Note, Mariposa & Ops allow for 250 square metres, and that was back in a time when very few farms used seasonal farm workers. Others have not been checked, but these represent large number of farm operations.)		
		Also, with respect to .3, what is the driveway to be shared with, and why is this an issue? There is no requirement for seasonal farm help dwellings to be co-located with any other structure on the farm, so why would a shared	Remove requirement for Shared Driveway - .3.	The shared driveway refers to the dwelling and the seasonal farm help dwelling and is intended to reduce the number of accesses.

		driveway be required? Sharing of a driveway with farm equipment or with farm family home would not necessarily be desired, and depending upon the location of the accommodation, may not be reasonable.		
72	4.34.1	Definition of Development needed.	Add a definition for Development, and clarify which definition is to be used in this situation – Planning Act, Clean Water Act, Source Protection Plans, RZBL?	subsection has been revised: "All development where an application was made under the Planning Act, Condominium Act, or Building Code Act, as amended, will comply with the Clean Water Act through the applicable Source Protection Plans, as amended from time to time"
87	5.6.1	Bicycle Parking – Employment Use is bolded, suggesting there is a definition, but there is not. This term doesn't align with terms used in this by-law. Either define or amend Employment Use to an appropriate term.	Either define or amend Employment Use to an appropriate term.	Employment Use has been removed and specific uses have been listed.: Assembly Hall, Banquet Hall, Club, Community Facility, Micro-Brewery, Office, Parking Lot, Personal Service, Place of Entertainment, Restaurant, Restaurant, Take-Out, or Retail

		Rates of spaces for agri-tourism and farm micro-brewery uses seem random at 4 spaces required. It seems that the Employment Use rate may be a lower rate than the 4 required for a Farm Micro-Brewery, and possibly less than for some Community or Commercial spaces. Why 4 for Agri-Tourism and Farm Micro-Breweries? Most use will be by car due to great distances. Due to the typically large lots within the Agriculture Zone, it seems unnecessary to designate bicycle parking spaces. They would be out of character for agricultural settings.	Remove requirement for bicycle parking spaces on Agriculture Zones entirely, since it would be an unnecessary cost burden when there will naturally be significant space available for bicycle parking, and it is not only out of character for the setting, but also highly unlikely to be used given distances and possibly unsafe highways for bicycles leading to such locations.	The City is completing an Active Transportation Master Plan and has completed an updated Trails Master Plan. Bicycle parking facilities support their implementation.
95	7.2	This draft By-law is more restrictive than the provisions found within the KLOP. Although there was an indication at the outset of this project that the provincial ag policies would be inserted in the KLOP under a separate project to coincide with the conclusion of this project, it is now understood that the updates may not be undertaken until the MCR which will be several years in the future. In the meantime, KL agricultural business' will be restricted	Unless a 'Rural Agriculture' zone is added, these permissions which are restricted to Existing only should be updated to be permissive, and more reflective of current provincial policies than to revert to less permissive by restricting them from the AG zone.	To ensure consistency with Provincial policy, our recommendation is to maintain one Agricultural Zone. Significant effort has been undertaken to define OFDUs and establish a framework and permissions. With respect to the permitted uses within the Rural designation, Section 16.2 and 16.3 of the OP allow the municipality to act with discretion on what types of OFDUs/Ag-related uses can be

		more that the previous provisions in the former township by-laws; be at a competitive disadvantage to other municipalities; face requirements for ZBA's that are costly and lengthy processes; all of which may result in businesses going elsewhere, putting our well-known 'Centre of Agri-Business' at significant risk.		permitted as of right. To ensure adherence to the OP policies and Provincial required, we understand the City would prefer ZBAs.
95	Table 7-2 Permitted	The permitted uses chart is still not consistent with OP permitted uses, and does not reflect differences between Prime Ag and Rural, in that additional uses are permitted in Rural than are permitted in Prime Ag, and ZBA is not noted in OP as required for agri-business uses in Rural designation. A second agricultural zone is required to identify those lands which are designated Rural, and where agri-business (KLOP version of ag-related uses) is permitted. Also ensure that KLOP permitted "Secondary Uses" are reflected as permitted on Prime Ag Lands, with no indication that a ZBA is required.	A zone should be created to be applied within the Rural Designation on agricultural lands where the more permissive activities should be permitted, as outline in the KLOP. In this Rural zone, there should be as-of-right permissions, aligning with the more permissive policies and specifically noted permitted uses in the KLOP. Rezoning requirements are only noted within the Prime Agriculture zone. Provincial policies and guideline suggestion municipalities should be more permissive.	To ensure consistency with Provincial policy, our recommendation is to maintain one Agricultural Zone. We would not want to preclude updated policies for these uses, such as locational criteria, that the City may want to establish. We can permit sawmills.

95	Table 7-2 Permitted	Agricultural Products Warehouse should be permitted in both AG and AC zones as it is an agriculture use.	Change the E to a checkmark.	The intent of this definition is to consider it as an Agriculture-related use as it would serve the broader area. The definition for Agriculture contemplates warehouses as accessories. No change incorporated.
95	Table 7-2 Permitted	Commercial Greenhouse: See notes in Definitions for suggestions to split out the accessory retail from the greenhouse definitions, since all the agriculture zones should permit the growing portion of greenhouses.	Add checkmarks for AG and AC zones.	Change incorporated
95	Table 7-2 OFDU	Move Value-Retaining Farm Use (note corrected term name to match Definition) up to Permitted Uses in the Agriculture Zones, since this is an Agriculture Use, and also add checkmarks in AG, AR and AC.	Move Value-Retaining Farm Use (note corrected term name to match Definition) up to Permitted Uses in the Agriculture Zones, since this is an Agriculture Use, and also add checkmarks in AG, AR and AC.	Change incorporated
95	Table 7-2 OFDU	On Farm Diversified Uses can be done in AR zone since Agriculture is a permitted use, and the OFDU's would be permitted based on that Agriculture use.	Add checkmarks to AR for Farm Café and Shop, Farm Micro-Brewery, Outdoor Patio, and Value-Added Farm Use.	Change incorporated
95	Table 7-2 OFDU	Commercial Greenhouse growing activities are permitted by the definition of Agriculture, only the Ancillary Retail aspect would be an OFDU. This	Add Ancillary Retail as a permitted OFDU.	Change incorporated

		would apply to all OFDU's where there is an Ancillary Retail aspect.		
95	Table 7-2	The list of Specified Accessory Uses does not yet align with all of the KLOP defined "Secondary Uses" which are permitted in Prime Ag. This includes Farm Markets, farm vacation establishments, farmhouse dining rooms.	Add Farm Vacation Establishments and Farmhouse Dining rooms to the list of secondary uses. This would be appropriate to go in ODFU's.	Farm vacation establishments are referred to as Agri-Tourism uses with the overnight accommodations addressed in Bed and Breakfast provisions. Farmhouse Dining Room has been added to the definition for Agri-Tourism use .
95	Table 7-2 Accessory	Add a checkmark for Home Industry in AC, since it is permitted by the definition as accessory to the Agriculture Use, not a dwelling, in this case.	Add a checkmark for Home Industry in AC	Change incorporated
96	Table 7-3	Building Height – exemptions for barns and other tall agriculture and agriculture related buildings noted in Section 4.13.1.g and 4.13.1.i should have a (3) note added here for awareness.	Add a note #3 in AG, AR and AC referencing the exemptions provided for certain agricultural buildings as per Section 4.13.1	Change incorporated
102	Table 9-2	Agriculture should be permitted in Industrial zones as some properties may be large enough for agricultural uses outdoors, but also may include the more modern vertical farming activities which are wholly enclosed within a building, and can benefit	Add checkmarks to Agriculture in IG and IR.	Change incorporated

		from infrastructure and services found in industrial areas.		
103	Table 9-2	Feed Mill and Forestry should be added as permitted as they are appropriate within the broader scope the IG settings. Also add Forestry to IR and ID, as it is a passive growth use with a very short-term harvesting activity after many years, and is a good off-set for carbon issues directly on the industrial property. It would also be permitted by the addition of agriculture use but is good to specifically note as a low potential for conflict and a good way to use excess lands within extra large industrial lots.	Add checkmarks to Feed Mill in IG and Forestry in IG, IR and ID.	Change incorporated
103	Table 9-2	Add Sawmill to the list in IG, and IA as a specifically noted processing facility in the KLOP, industrial locations are also suitable for this activity.	Add Sawmill to the list in IG, and IA.	Change incorporated
106	Table 10-2	Add Farmers' Market as permitted in OS and OSR. If a Fairground and a Public Park can be permitted in an OS Zone, then so should a Farmers' Market.	Add Farmers' Market as permitted in OS and OSR	Change incorporated

110	Table 12-2	The Future Development Zone imposes unfair restrictions on lands at a time when OP mapping updates/corrections cannot be undertaken. Suggest abandoning restrictions until MCR processes determine FD needs, and also can have mapping updates.	Abandon restrictions until MCR processes determine FD needs, and also can have mapping updates.	No change incorporated. The City wants to ensure these lands are developed.
110	Table 12-2	Change (E) restricted uses to permitted uses for Conservation and Single Detached Dwelling. Conservation use should be permitted. Why would you not want a feature of the natural environment to be preserved, protected or improved?	Change (E) restricted uses to (checkmark) permitted uses for Conservation and Single Detached Dwelling.	Conservation Use permitted
	Permitted	If a vacant lot is already created, why would a single detached dwelling not be permitted? In particular, permit a single house a smaller lot where only one single detached dwelling would be appropriate.		Single detached dwelling permitted.
110	Table 12-2 Accessory	Bed and Breakfast and Home Industry should be permitted as accessory to single detached dwellings.	Change (E) restricted accessory uses to (checkmark) permitted Accessory uses for Bed and Breakfast and Home Industry as permitted as accessory to single detached dwellings.	Change incorporated