

### Attachment A Summary of Public & Agency Comments

Comment #	Source	Comment Received Summary*	Comment Response
Public Cor	mments		
1+	S. Summers	Suggestion that fencing setbacks be addressed in the Zoning By-law. Suggestion for minimum of 2 spaces required for new residential buildings. Suggestion for MCR lots when severed be designated as R2.	<ul> <li>The draft Zoning By-law does not provide provisions to address setbacks for fences. Section 3.27 (Yard and Water Setback Encroachments) would permit a fence as an encroachment into any yard. Often times fencing standards are best addressed in a separate Township By-law.</li> <li>The draft Zoning By-law requires a minimum of 1 parking space per dwelling unit and a minimum of 1.25 spaces per dwelling unit in an apartment dwelling (Section 3.14.1 Parking Requirements). Any new dwellings in the Township will be required to meet this minimum standard.</li> <li>See Schedule C of the draft Zoning By-law, the zone boundaries for the MCR have been revised.</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
2+	C. Marcellus	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
3 <sup>+</sup>	S. Lawrence	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
4+	M. McDowell	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
5 <sup>+</sup>	C. Hunt N. Hunt	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
6+	K. McDonald	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
7+	C. Jones	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
8+	T.	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

9+	E. Moore S. Momy	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
10 <sup>+</sup>	E. Moore S. Momy	Opposed to a By-law change to restrict the right to use a recreational vehicle on private property, restricts freedom of assembly.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
11+	K. Hubbard	Opposed to any proposal to prohibit short term use of recreational vehicles on private property for short term and weekend use.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
12+	K. Graham	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park a recreational vehicle on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
13 <sup>+</sup>	C. Copeland	Request for additional information on By-law changes for rural living.	N/A
14+	A. Hutchinson	Concerns expressed regarding livestock animals near residential uses. Request made that the Fencing By-law be reviewed.	<ul> <li>The Zoning By-law does not provide the means to control where livestock animals roam on a particular property that permits an agricultural use or a hobby farm.</li> <li>Section 3.15, Section 4.4.3, Section 12.1.3.2, and Section 13.1.3.4 of the draft By-law ensure that any new or expanding livestock facilities and new residential dwellings are separated from one another in accordance with the appropriate MDS formula issued by the Ontario Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Rural Affairs.</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
15+	P. Grant	Concerns raised regarding well construction, building permit and consent process.  Minimum of 50-foot (15m) street frontage per well.	<ul> <li>Some of these concerns are not directly related to the draft Zoning By-law review process.</li> <li>The draft Zoning By-law establishes minimum lot area and frontage provisions for a variety of zones. For residential uses, the minimum lot area and frontage standards vary depending on the dwelling type proposed and the services available.</li> <li>Section 3.24 of the draft Zoning By-law outlines the servicing connections required for development within the Village of Spencerville.</li> </ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.
16 <sup>+</sup>	R. Villeneuve	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park and use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted for special circumstances.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
17+	Marcellus	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park and use a recreational vehicle on private property; do not create by-laws that further restrict the use, should be permitted during spring, summer and fall and remove trailer from definition of 'structure'.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
18+	R. Lafontaine	Tuttle Point should be given special consideration in the draft Zoning By-law due to environmental context. Area is experiencing new development and use of trailers.	<ul> <li>Majority of properties fronting onto Tuttle Point are proposed to be zoned RLS. Provisions of the RLS zone are proposed to restrict overdevelopment of lands adjacent to the river and that have limited services (access to a public road).</li> <li>Properties along Tuttle Point are also located adjacent to a Provincial Significant Wetland and susceptible to Flood Plain hazards. Section 3.16 of the draft By-law provides provisions regarding development adjacent to environmental protection and natural heritage resources. Section 5.7.1 also provides provisions regarding development within the flood plain over lay zone.</li> <li>See Residential Limited Services (RLS) response and discussion in report.</li> </ul>
19+	C. Cleary	Concerns expressed regarding proposed Domestic Fowl Coop zone provisions and provided recommended changes; by-law should not limit to specific type/sex of fowl.  Concerns expressed regarding definition of Hobby Farm, permit sale of farm products produced.  Recommended changes to definition of Livestock Units and Hobby Farm zone provisions.	<ul> <li>During the November 2020 Development Committee Meeting these comments were brought forward for the Committee's consideration. The Committee agreed not to change the provisions regarding the proposed Domestic Fowl Coop, Hobby Farm and Livestock Unit definitions.</li> <li>The definition of Hobby Farm in the draft By-law permits farm gate sales of agricultural products provided they are produced on the hobby farm.</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
20+	P. Grant	Concerns expressed regarding development in rural, village and hamlet areas.  Comments provided on vision of Township's Official Plan.	No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

21+	P. Bury	Request for information on public meeting timing.	N/A
22+	R. Perrin	Opposed to by-law that would penalize personal use of recreational vehicles on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
	a public comment re I comment).	ceived on a preliminary draft of the Zoning By-law prepared for Community Developn	nent Committee discussion (prior to the release of Draft 1 – May 2021 issued for public
23	D. Walker	Permit camping on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
24	T. Gilligan	Section 3.12.3 is too restrictive. By-law should be revised to permit occasional use of recreational vehicles to 5 consecutive nights on a residential property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
25	A. Hutchinson	By-law should require a specific distance between livestock and residential dwellings/wells, referring to Brouseville.	<ul> <li>The Zoning By-law does not provide the means to control where livestock animals roam on a particular property that permits an agricultural use or a hobby farm.</li> <li>Section 3.15, Section 4.4.1.3, Section 12.1.3.2, and Section 13.1.3.4 of the draft ensure that any new or expanding livestock facilities and new residential dwellings are separated from one another in accordance with the appropriate MDS formula issued by the Ontario Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Rural Affairs.</li> <li>Properties within the Brouseville settlement area are zoned Hamlet Residential (RH). Section 4.4.2 of the draft Zoning By-law provides provisions to permit a domestic fowl coop on these properties provided the provisions of Section 4.4.2 are met.</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft Zoning By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
26	L. Temple	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park and use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted.  Concerns expressed regarding shipping container provisions, shipping containers support tiny home movement and affordable housing.	<ul> <li>See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.</li> <li>Section 4.8 of the draft By-law includes provisions for Additional Dwelling Units. The intent of these provisions is to implement Official Plan policies and provide affordable and alternative housing forms throughout the Township.</li> <li>Section 4.10 of the draft By-law includes provisions to make it clear where shipping containers are permitted to be used for storage purposes within the Township.</li> </ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			<ul> <li>Section 4.11 of the draft By-law includes provisions to make it clear that tiny homes are permitted as a single dwelling where a residential use is a permitted principal use. Depending on the merits of a building permit that is issued, shipping containers may be included in the construction materials associated to establishing a permitted single dwelling. Shipping Containers and Single Dwellings are defined as two separate uses within the draft Zoning By-law</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided regarding shipping containers, tiny homes and affordable housing.</li> </ul>
27	C. Wilson	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park and use a recreational vehicle/tent on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
28	A. Roth	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, suggestion to 1 per property or limited to a certain number of days per year.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
29	D. & B. Byrd	Request to end phone calls.	N/A
30	C. Barton	Opposed to making it illegal to allow friends to camp on property, suggestion for minimum lot size requirement. Confusion regarding zoning on a property.	<ul> <li>See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.</li> <li>178 Shanly Road is zoned on Schedule B of the Draft 1 – May 2021         Comprehensive Zoning By-law as R1. A revised draft can consider labeling placing of other exceptions zone more appropriately to avoid interpretation confusion.</li> </ul>
31	D. Bessette	Concerns expressed regarding Additional Dwelling Units Section 4.8 provisions; properties with frontage on both a private road and public road permitted? Are existing second dwellings on private road exempt from the new By-law?	<ul> <li>Any existing structures that were lawfully constructed before the passing of the proposed new Zoning By-law would be permitted to continue. Section 3.11 of the draft By-law includes provisions regarding non-conforming and non-complying uses, buildings or structures.</li> <li>Section 4.8.1.1 of the draft by-law requires that a second dwelling unit and/or second dwelling must be located on a lot where access is provided by an improved street. This provision is in place to implement Section 6.2.1.2 of the Official Plan where it states second units are not permitted in relation to residential uses where access is obtained by private roads.</li> </ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			<ul> <li>Reviewing Schedule A of the draft Zoning By-law, properties on Riddell Road are zoned RLS. The zoning on some of these properties may change as a result of a thorough review with staff.</li> <li>Section 6.5.3.2 of the RLS zone provisions does not permit a Second Dwelling Unit or Second Dwelling regardless of how access is provided to a property.</li> <li>See Additional Dwelling Unit response and discussion in report.</li> <li>See Residential Limited Services (RLS) zone response and discussion in report.</li> </ul>
32	L. Wilson	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted.  Council should be concerned with the maintenance of buildings.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
33	F. Mulhulland	Opposed to a By-law that does not permit Tiny Homes or Shipping Containers as homes due to economic and environmental benefits.	<ul> <li>Section 4.10 of the draft Zoning By-law includes provisions to make it clear where shipping containers are permitted to be used for storage purposes within the Township.</li> <li>Section 4.11 of the draft Zoning By-law includes provisions to make it clear that tiny homes are permitted a single dwelling where a residential use is a permitted principal use on the property. Depending on the merits of a building permit that is issued, shipping containers may be included in the construction materials associated to establishing a permitted single dwelling. Shipping Containers and Single Dwellings are defined as two separate uses within the draft Zoning By-law</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
34	K. McAndrew	See Schedule Comments #24 – provided below.	
35	B. Salmon	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property (vacant lots); should be permitted but with specific parameters i.e. number of recreational vehicles, length of stay, number of individuals permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
36	K. McDonald	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

		and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) (incorrectly noted as Section 3.22 in comment) of current By-law.	
37	L. Schenck	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle/tent on private property; should be permitted. Comments provided on dogs/cats running at large.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
38	W. Douglas	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, suggestion for a limited time and no use of AC units.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
39	K. Graham	Camping on property should be permitted, not living in a recreational vehicle.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
40	B. Byrd	Overnight camping should be permitted on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
41	G. Knapp	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law and define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
42	M. Craddock	Concerns and confusion expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle/tent on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
43	C. Egan	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle/tent on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
44	A. Locke	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use and camp on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
45	B. Byrd	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

46	T. Byrd	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, suggestion for permitting system and use of trailers should not be for profit.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
47	A. Gilmer	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; enforcement concerns, suggestions for permit system; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
48	D. Moulton	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle/bunkie on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.  Section 3.12 (Occupancy Restrictions) of the draft Zoning By-law would not permit an accessory structure to be used as a 'Bunkie'.
49	R. Moulton	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle/tent on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
50	D. Starkey	Comments provided on Section 3.22, suggest wording to cease use of recreational vehicle since permitted to park and clarify whether use of Section 3.22 applies to building renovations.  Clarify 'approved onsite sewage disposal system'.  Domestic Fowl Coops are allowed in (RU) (A) and (HR). Does that mean they are not permitted in (R1) (R2) (R3) and (LRS)?	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.  See Domestic Fowl Coops response and discussion in report.
51	S. Zorzella P. Davies	Provided comments and recommendations on the RLS provisions including definition of limited services, water setbacks, yard requirements, lot size, floor space index and lot coverage.	<ul> <li>See Residential Limited Services (RLS) Zone response and discussion in report.</li> <li>Section 6.18.2 of the Official Plan requires that development or site alteration shall generally occur a minimum distance of 30m from the normal high water mark of any waterbody. The Official Plan also includes policies to limit development within the 30m water setback. Section 3.25 (Water Frontage and Water Setbacks) is meant to implement the policy direction for development adjacent to waterbodies. A 30m setback to a watercourse for buildings or structures is a current provision in the Township's current Zoning By-law. The intent of the water setback provision is to prevent the disturbance of the shoreline areas or the removal of the soil mantle and natural vegetation (Section 6.18 of Official Plan).</li> </ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments requesting that the 30m water setback not apply to properties on Tuttle Point.
52	M. Ault	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
53	S. Marcellus	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
54	D. & R. Dulmage	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to park and use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
55	J. Philiban	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
56	R. Corey	Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law, reductions from 3 months to 30 days acceptable.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
57	D. Poaps	Opposed to Section 3.12.3 of the draft By-law.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
58	F. Menard	Reinstate old by-law to apply weekend and week stays in an recreational vehicle, suggestion for 1 month.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
59	T. Rae	Opposed to Section 3.12.3 of the draft By-law. Reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
60	B. Marcellus	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

		and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	
61	K. Bartlett	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
62	L. Schenck	Should be permitted to sleep in a tent or trailer on private property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
63	P. Arruda	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
64	L. Peterson	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property.  Opposed to any By-law changes that further restrict free use of personal property.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
65	B. Peck	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property. Remove Section 3.12.3 of draft by-law.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
66	P. Bury	Property is zoned MCR, does this mean a gas station could be established next door or across the street?	The draft MCR zone only permits an existing Automobile Service Station. If a property is zoned MCR, a new Automobile Service Station would not be permitted.  No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided.
67	P. Davies	List of properties provided with recommended zone changes (RU/RLS) based on lot sizes.	See Residential Limited Services (RLS) response and discussion in report.
68	P. Grant	Comments provided on open storage definition.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

		Comments provided on Section 3.12 and Section 3.13.2 of By-law. Suggestion that recreational vehicles may not be stored or parked on a vacant lot.	
69	M. Hamilton	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, suggestion provided to limit the number of days and stays per year to use a residential vehicle and permit requirements.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
70	G. Thorburn	Rural people will have no voice.	N/A
71	S. Summers	Comments provided on the MCR zone applied to properties between Centre Street and Sloan Street in Spencerville. Concerns expressed that this would allow higher density residential development.	No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided.
72	C. Marcellus	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than a month) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
73	A. Clarke	Comments provided are in relation to the Township's Interim Control By- law. Concerns that Frederick Street is not the best location and concerns over water shed.	No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided.
74	D. Bessette	Seeking clarification regarding Additional Dwelling Units and requirement for access on an improved road for a specific property that has frontage on both a private road and improved street.	<ul> <li>13 Riddell Road is zoned RLS in the draft Zoning By-law. Additional Dwelling Units (Second Dwelling Units and/or Second Dwellings) would not be permitted on this property per Section 6.5.2.1 of the draft Zoning By-law regardless of the road frontage the property may have.</li> <li>13 Riddell Road has frontage on an improved street, the zoning on this property may change in a future draft of the By-law following review with staff.</li> <li>See Residential Limited Services (RLS) zone response and discussion in report.</li> <li>See Additional Dwelling Unit response and discussion in report.</li> </ul>

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			,
75	A. Hutchinson	Concerns expressed regarding zoning for livestock uses and residential areas, referring to Brouseville.	<ul> <li>The Zoning By-law does not provide the means to control where livestock animals roam on a partial property that permits an agricultural use or a hobby farm.</li> <li>Section 3.15, Section 4.4.1.3, Section 12.1.3.2, and Section 13.1.3.4 of the draft Zoning By-law ensures that any new or expanding livestock facilities and new residential dwellings are separated from one another in accordance with the appropriate MDS formula issued by the Ontario Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Rural Affairs.</li> <li>Properties within the Brouseville settlement area are zoned Hamlet Residential (RH). Section 4.4.2 provides provisions to permit a domestic fowl coop on these properties provided the provisions of Section 4.4.2 are met.</li> <li>No recommendations are proposed to the draft By-law with regards to the comments provided.</li> </ul>
76	A. & D. Murphy	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends and short stays (less than three months) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
77	D. Dulmage	Clarity provided on recreational vehicle use on personal property at open house.	N/A
78	G. McDonald	Opposed to RLS zone provision change from 20% to 10% lot coverage as it would impact properties and development opportunities. Propose new limit is for new severances only.	See Residential Limited Services (RLS) Zone response and discussion in report.
79	S. Zorzella P. Davies	Comments provided regarding definitions and use of recreational vehicles, use of recreational vehicles during construction, summary of challenges with RVs during construction, boats. Discussion paper also provided on recreational vehicles.	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.
80	H. Ardley	Concerns expressed regarding being permitted to use a recreational vehicle on private property; should be permitted, permit in any zone for weekends	See Recreational Vehicle response and discussion in report.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

		and short stays (less than three months) for personal use of property owner and family.  Remove Section 3.12.3 of By-law and reinstate Section 4.32(c) of current By-law, define seasonal.			
Agency Comments					
81	MHBC o/b TransCanada PineLines Limited (TCPL)	Comments provided to revise Section 3.17 (Setbacks from Natural Gas Pipelines) to conform to current TCPL standards.	See TransCanada PipeLines response in report.		
82	South Nation Conservation Authority	Recommend new definitions for 'Development', 'Regulated Area', 'Site Alterations' be added to the By-law.  Recommend amendments to the definitions of 'Conservation Use', 'Partial Service', 'Site Alteration' and 'Watercourse'.  Recommend amendments related to setbacks to watercourses, Environmental Protection zones,  Recommendation to include provisions related to fish habitat and steep slopes/erosion hazards setbacks.  Recommendation to clarify wording in Section 3.2 (Existing Undersized Non-Complying Lots) and Section 3.25 (Water Frontage and Water Setbacks).	See Attachment B.		
Schedule	Comments				
30	C. Barton	Concerns expressed regarding zone category on property, referring to Schedule B.	178 Shanly Road is zoned on Schedule B of the Draft 1 – May 2021     Comprehensive Zoning By-law as R1. A revised draft can consider labeling placing of other exceptions zone more appropriately to avoid interpretation confusion.		
34	K. McAndrew	Clarify zone boundary for property with Cardinal KOA, referring to Schedule A.	It is our understanding that 609 Pittston Road has contained the KOA campground use for a number of years and has legal non-conforming rights as the property is currently zoned Agricultural (A).		

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.

			It is recommended that the entire property of 609 Pittston Road be zoned CT for the existing KOA campground use.
51	S. Zorzella P. Davies	Recommended zone boundary changes for RLS and RU zones.	It is recommended that the boundaries of the RLS and RU zone be refined with assistance from Township Staff.
82	South Nation Conservation Authority	Recommended that watercourses be added to the legend. Recommended changes to floodplain overlay of Schedule B and D. Recommend clarifying boundaries of Official Plan reference on schedules.	It is recommended that the Conservation Authorities comments on the Zoning By-law Schedules be implemented, see Attachment B.

<sup>\*</sup>Refer to full comment submission for full details and context of comments provided. A summary is provided for ease of understanding the issues and concerns noted in the comments related to the draft Zoning By-law.