

ADDENDUM TO THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2021 SPECIAL COUNCIL AGENDA

**Additional Comments Received
as of September 30, 2021
at 12:00 p.m.**

- A. Robert and Karin Duda
- B. Charmain Green
- C. Mary Ann Greenwood
- D. Wayne Lennox
- E. Lorimer Lake Association
- F. Dan Mallory
- G. Joshua and Danielle Wensink

A.

From: robert.duda@safetyscience.ca [mailto:robert.duda@safetyscience.ca]
Sent: September-28-21 11:17 AM
To: paula.macri@whitestone.ca
Cc: 'kduda' <kduda@live.ca>; mayor.comrie@whitestone.ca; councillor.gorham-matthews@whitestone.ca; councillor.lamb@whitestone.ca; councillor.mcewen@whitestone.ca; councillor.woods@whitestone.ca; michelle.hendry@whitestone.ca

Subject: Review of comments re: creation new lots on private roads

Hi Paula and Council, hope all is well. We reviewed the comments attached in the Agenda for the Whitestone special meeting and appreciate everyone's input but reiterate our comments that most are opinion without fact. We did find several offensive and self-serving and not based on community planning and fairness. Our land is hard earned and is not a 'backlot' and my 3 girls that hopefully inherit this land we have are just as important as waterfront owners.

Re: road standard... this seems to be the crux of what needs to be addressed. We appreciate the issue of standards for private roads, however, if the numerous current private roads are adequate for current waterfront owners and obtaining taxation from them.... Then they are acceptable for new lot creation on the non-waterfront side. Requiring a higher road standard for the creation of a lot on an existing private road is simply not fair.

Overall we do not think Whitestone should get involved in any standards for Roads and owners that build and develop lands accept the responsibilities for limited service of fire, ambulance etc. to their properties based on their situation. Similar to water access lots. Private roads are private and its up to the owners and any agreements they have to manage access. Let the owners own and assume responsibility.

If the issue of road access is something that is needed we think the solution is that for NEW private roads there needs to be NEW standards but the Existing private roads (inherited by Whitestone) need to be "Grandfathered" ... especially when there are waterfront users already using them with no special standards or requirements for the road. Be glad to discuss and I trust there are creative ways to bring things into a fair position.

Robert and Karin Duda
705.733.5350

B.

From: Charmain Green [mailto:deerns1@outlook.com]
Sent: September 24, 2021 11:38 AM
To: michelle.hendry@whitestone.ca
Subject: Official Plan Amendments (2)

RE: Trailers on Vacant Lots & Building on Vacant Lots that do not front on water front or a year round road.

This letter constitutes our written notice of objection to the proposed changes. Both proposed changes have long term implications that should not be undertaken without serious consideration to the impact on the lakes and surrounding area.

Additional residential use of the private roads will only put additional pressure on the lakes such as the health, water quality etc., and lake access points nearby. The additional influx of people and boats on the back lots who will want to access the lakes and will have an effect on private road upkeep, any new backlot changes will increase stresses on water access, resources and on those trying to maintain them.

We hereby wish to be notified of any communications, discussions and decisions regarding the above noted plan amendments.

Heinz & Charmain Green
078078 11th Line
Meaford, ON N4L 1W5

C.

From: Mary Ann Greenwood <mary.greenwood@live.com>
Date: 2021-09-30 12:11 a.m. (GMT-05:00)
To: mayor.comrie@whitestone.ca, councillor.gorham-matthews@whitestone.ca,
councillor.lamb@whitestone.ca, councillor.mcewen@whitestone.ca,
councillor.woods@whitestone.ca
Subject: Full-time trailers and back lot development

Mayor and Councillors,

I have a few concerns regarding full-time trailers and back lot development. In regards to full-time trailers I would like to know how water, grey water and waste will be addressed. Trailers are meant to be hooked up for water and waste. Will full-time trailers be required to put in a septic system? If not the impact to the environment and lake water quality will be greatly affected with runoff.

Another concern is how many trailers will be allowed on a property? Will they be taxed as a permanent building or as a lot? If they are permanent trailers they should have to pay the same taxes as someone with a permanent building.

In regards to back lot developments my concern is the impact to the environment and safety. What size of lots will be allowed? Overdevelopment will cause animals to travel into residential areas. Cities are having trouble with coyotes and wild animals because they have no place to go. Co-existing with wildlife can only happen if they have space too.

As for safety a lot of back roads are single narrow lanes with blind hills and curves. Putting more traffic on these types of roads increases the chances of collisions. Will there be a standard mandatory width that a road must be before allowing development on that road?

Sent from my iPhone

D.

From: **Wayne Lennox** <wmjlennox@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 27, 2021 at 10:42 AM
Subject: Meeting to consider amendment to Official Plan
To: <paula.macri@whtestone.ca>
Cc: Lynn Brennan <lynnmbrennan@gmail.com>

Good morning Paula

I am submitting my comments--attached--to be considered at said meeting on the 30th.

I will also be attending via zoom.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Cheers

--

Wayne Lennox

Lennox Specialty Projects

705 716-0347

45 Shabbott's Bay Rd (Lake WahWashKesh)

RR 2

Dunchurch, ON

To Mayor Comrie and Council

Cc Lynn Brennan, President, Lake WahWashKesh Conservation Association

Re plan to amend Official Plan to permit development on back lots fronting on private roads.

I am against the adoption of this amendment. Mr Jackson has outlined the issues very thoroughly and on balance, it appears the negatives outweigh any potential gains (an opinion also supported by the late Mr. Russell).

First of all, as changes are coming to the municipality's Official Plan the very consideration of these amendments should only be viewed in the context of the revision of the OP as the ramifications are significant and, obviously, potentially contentious.

Allowing more development on back lots will intensify the demand for upgrades to private roads as more vehicles will be travelling on them. With the trend of more and more retirement to the cottage coupled with working remotely, there is increasing usage as it is by lakefront property owners. Our cottage is on a private road, and though it is in reasonably good shape, it is not suitable for most emergency vehicles. Much of it remains impassable in winter and early spring. Remediation to bring it up to some provincial standard would be incredibly expensive. The notion that those benefitting from such an upgrade would have to bear the cost is incredibly frightening. (Mr Jackson's letter re regulation 9.06.2).

Many lakefront owners chose to build under the assumption that there would be no back lot development as the current OP forbids it. It seems patently unfair and perhaps even punitive to reverse course now.

The impact that intensified development on private roads could have on our landfill sites has not been explored. These are currently under significant pressure. The need for new sites would increase and the search for an additional landfill site(s) can be both challenging and extremely expensive.

If back lot property development is allowed on private roads, it will likely mean intensified lake usage through expanded marina facilities, as back lot owners would not have lake access. How do we measure the impact such increased usage might have on the quality of our lake?

Perhaps private roads should never have been allowed by the province for many of the reasons that Mr. Jackson and the late Mr Russell have outlined. But since we have them, Council has to mitigate the problems and possible negative impacts—financial and otherwise—that often attend them. Allowing for back lot development is not going down the right 'road' but more likely will open the proverbial Pandora's Box.

Wayne Lennox

To: Mayor George Comrie, Michelle Hendry, Members of Council, and the Whitestone Planning Team, Municipality of Whitestone
From: The Lorimer Lake Association
Date: September 24, 2021
Re: Proposed Amendment to Official Plan #2 (2021)- private road policy update

On behalf of the Lorimer Lake Association, we are writing to state our support of the letter dated September 14, from John Wesley the Chair of the Whitestone Conservation Association, opposing the proposed amendment to the official plan regarding the private road policy update.

We do not feel that the Municipality of Whitestone should allow building permits for existing back lots, or any new backlot, which would be adjacent to private roads, but would not have water frontage, or front on a municipally maintained road.

The addition of such backlots would serve to decrease water quality and the wilderness appeal that we all treasure. It would also result in a great lack of privacy for property owners that would be adjacent to such new backlots being proposed.

Severances, that could be permitted in the future, in the Municipality of Whitestone, could ultimately increase the amount of these backlots that do not front on the lake or on a municipal road. These new backlots could, depending on the property owned, include a section that may overlook another cottage property on the lake. The result would be a great reduction in the wilderness appeal that is so paramount to cottage owners. Furthermore, a large amount of run off would result from such development, and this would ultimately disrupt not only the neighbors, but also the quality of the lake. In addition, boat traffic would increase from the new lot owners desire to launch their watercraft at public launches on the lake, which contributes to an increase in shoreline degradation, and a decrease in the lake quality.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this matter.
Respectively,

The Lorimer Lake Association

F.

From: Dan Mallory [mailto:dan@malloryinsurance.com]

Sent: September 25, 2021 1:25 PM

To: michelle.hendry@whitestone.ca

Subject: Official Plan amendment No 2 meeting Sept 30/2021/ bldgs on vacant lots

Hi Michelle:

For the meeting on Sept 30, 2021, please provide this note of support to amend the Official Plan to grant building permits to vacant lots that do not front on waterfront or on a year round road.

There are many buildable lots in the Municipality of Whitestone that do not front on a year round road but are only a short distance to the year round road. Their access road could be much closer than the driveways of many dwellings that do front on a year round road.

If a property owner builds not on the year round road, it should be their decision to accept that they may not have the level of municipal services that others may have. Thank you.

Daniel W Mallory
Whitestone taxpayer

G.

From: Danielle Regeling <d.m.regeling@gmail.com>
Sent: September 29, 2021 9:19 PM
To: michelle.hendry@whitestone.ca
Subject: Meeting for Plan Amendment #2

Hello,

This is in regards to the meeting on September 30 to discuss Plan Amendment #2 on Trailers on vacant land. This is our written submission of our opinion in regards to this proposal:

We, as property owners in Whitestone, believe that it would be a benefit to the community to leave it to the sole discretion of property owners to have an RV, trailer, tiny house, or other alternative form of housing year round, as they see fit on their land, while respecting appropriate distances from lot lines as well as proper waste disposal. We are for reducing regulations on use of trailers on vacant land as we feel that property owners should be able to decide whether or not to have trailers on land that they have purchased, while respecting the items listed above.

Thank you,
Joshua and Danielle Wensink

Sent from my iPhone