

Havelock Belmont Methuen Official Plan and Zoning Update

Submission #4 by Ambrose Moran Dated May 14 2011

Subject-Consultation and Background Report

- Waterfront Development Policies

BACKGROUND

I was able to attend an open house as part of the consultation process and also meet with Michael Keene on Nov 15 2011 to share some of my views on issues which have been raised in the past through submissions to Council

I have review report section related to waterfront development and commend your consultants the quality of the report and submit the following comments and recommendations

COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS

#1--New Shoreline designation(Page #18)

I fully support having a shoreline designation and current OP policy is deficient in having waterfront as a sub section of rural

#2 Minimum Lot Frontage—(reference my previous submission #2) I recommend that the minimum lot frontage be included in the OP with the following wording—“In no case shall” a lot be created on the Shoreline Designation with less thanmeters frontage. In a previous OMB case between Belmont Methuen and Jack Lake Cottager association and myself a professional planner testified for the township that 98 ft met the intent of the in effect OP policy at that time stating in no case shall a lot with less than 150 ft frontage be created—without the strong OP policy stating “ In no case” we may not have been successful in that OMB case—this case may be referenced on www.ApsleyWatch.com →>> Havelock Belmont Methuen→>> Lake Planning ->>>OMB Decision

#3 Marine facilities (Page #11) – dock are different from boathouses and boathouses should not fall within the definition of marine facilities—I agree that docks are necessary in waterfront locations but boathouses are not NECESSARY for storage of boats as stated in this report.

I agree as stated in report , that development along waterfronts can impacts water quality, wildlife habitat and navigation and scenic amenity--- the County OP and HBM OP address these issues including visual impact and allowing boathouses would be in direct conflict with these OP policies. The vast majority of respondent to a survey indicated they did not want to see boat houses

#4 Expansion of Non Conforming and Not Complying uses—this is the most important aspect of the Zoning Bylaw update. Currently far too many planning relief application are required. I would suggest the existing approach by North Kawartha Twp be considered which has been in effect since 1996

allowing for certain development within the water yard setback based on a formula of allowing expansion of existing cottages based on 40% of water frontage to max of 60 ft and minimum set back from lake of 29 ft—this came out of a negotiated settlement with the OMB in 1996 and has worked well except recently an OMB hearing directed attention to a requirement that lot frontage and building frontage be better defined affecting point lots.

#5 Minimum Lot setback—the 30 meter setback requirement has merit for newly created lots but not practical to impose such a development standard on lots created in 50's and 60's and 70's before such a setback was contemplated,- I recommend that the 30m meter setback only apply to lots created after the requirement was imposed by the County of Peterborough OP.

#6 Boathouses (Page 13)For Jack Lake I support the Dysart Township approach of requiring boathouse to comply with the shoreline setback and not allowing in water. This position would be respected by MNR for in water boat houses as MNR is required under section 6(2)of the Planning Act to have regard for established planning policies of the municipality .

#7 Maximum Coverage to control density of development along shorelines I would recommend that the % max coverage for buildings only apply to say the first 200 ft of land back from the waterfront. This approach is applied in some Muskoka townships ie Sequin Twp

#8 Unattached Decks should not be exempt from water setbacks—this is a current defect in the existing zoning bylaw.

Ambrose Moran

As individual and not representing any group