

SCHEDULE "A"

PUBLIC/AGENCY COMMENTS

Comment No.	Sender	Comment	Recommended Action
1	Crystal Crabtree	<p>"I am writing to you this evening to raise some concerns I have with the proposed changes affecting livestock/Zoning. It came to my attention that there has been proposed changes that will now impose a maximum livestock unit that impacts the required size of the property. I am very afflicted by this as should this by-law pass, this would have a serious impact on me and my family.</p> <p>When my family moved to Montague in 2015, we specifically chose this location based on the by-laws surrounding livestock. We moved here with the full intent to have a hobby farm and have since established a business breeding KuneKune pigs www.crabtreefamilyfarm.com.</p> <p>As you know, up until this proposed change, there was no restriction set for a maximum number of livestock on a property. The only requirement was that the property was over 2 hectares.</p> <p>Section 3 – General Provisions <i>3.2.2 Notwithstanding Subsection 3.2.1 above, an agricultural use that includes the keeping of livestock shall not be permitted on a lot of less than 2 ha in lot area.</i></p> <p>It is also mentioned in: Section 11 – Rural Zones <i>11.1.2 Zone Provisions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Lot Area (minimum)</i>	<p>The comments raised by Crystal Crabtree resulted in a further evaluation of the amendments proposed and Staff are agreeable with the "Option #1" recommendations made.</p> <p>Those changes are noted as Proposed Revisions to Sections 4.3 and 12.1.2 in the draft Zoning By-law document.</p>

- *Agricultural use that includes the keeping of livestock - 2 ha*

Should the proposed bylaw pass, I would no longer be complying as I would have more than the allowable number of livestock for the size of my property based on the metric used for livestock units. And I am sure that this would also have a negative impact for other residents with hobby farms within the township on Montague. I therefore propose the following amendments to the proposed changes/additions.

Option #1

I suggest that the proposed additional verbiage under 4.3 be amended to reflect a smaller number than the current 10 acres proposed for (A) and (RU) zones. The way it is currently written means that all those with properties under 10 acres will be impacted by the new livestock unit regulation and this will impact hobby farms that are over 5 acres and were previously compliant. For example, our property is 7.25 acres. Our animals are very well cared for and we uphold a high standard in livestock husbandry and bio security. I am a member with PigTrace and we follow the National Farm Animal Care Council (NFACC) Code of Practice for the Care and Handling of Pigs. With that said, I am able to efficiently care for the pigs on my property and the size of my property is more than adequate for me to do so in accordance with NFACC. I would propose that the property size for zones (A) and (RU) would be reduced to reflect the following, allowing those who were compliant under the current by-laws to remain as such.

4.3 Agricultural Use Restrictions (Hobby Farm)

On lots within the Agricultural (A) or Rural (RU) zone that are under ~~2 hectares~~ ~~4 hectares~~ (5 acres ~~10 acres~~) in size, the maximum number of livestock units permitted shall be limited to 1 livestock unit per 0.8 hectares (2 acres) of land.

This would allow for residents with properties under 2 ha to own livestock, (which I believe was the intent, i.e. allowing for chickens) but would still limit the number of livestock as per the unit metric without impacting existing (A) and (RU) zoned properties.

Option #2

This would be a less desirable option as it could be more difficult to track/manage. But in lieu of option #1, a grandfather clause could be added to 4.3 speaking for residents that are already established and currently compliant as to keep them compliant moving forward.

Lastly, I have a question regarding the new wording for Hobby Farm and Agricultural Use. I am a small business run as a sole proprietor and not a commercial operation. I breed a few litters of KuneKune Pigs a year and they are registered with the American KuneKune Pig Association (AKKPS). Our breeding program is focused on breed conservation and not for productions (meat). We are passionate about the conservation of this breed and the importance of maintaining traditional New Zealand conformation as the only true grazing pig. I am seeking some clarification on whether or not we would still fall under the (Hobby Farm) umbrella.”

2	Enbridge Gas	<p>“Thank you for your circulation.</p> <p>Enbridge Gas does not object to the proposed application(s) however, we reserve the right to amend or remove development conditions. This response does not signify an approval for the site/development.</p> <p>Please always call before you dig, see web link for additional details: https://www.enbridgegas.com/safety/diggingsafety-for-contractors</p> <p>Please continue to forward all municipal circulations and clearance letter requests electronically to MunicipalPlanning@Enbridge.com.”</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the document were not received from Enbridge Gas.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Zoning By-law will be provided to them, once passed by Council.</p>
3	Brett Rickard	<p>“I have been told that the township is putting on a bylaw against derelict vehicles. I totally support the council in this matter and new bylaw.”</p>	<p>The Discussion Draft previously presented to Council included a definition of Derelict Vehicle that was incomplete and did not mirror that definition as already noted in the Township’s Property Standards By-law.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the definition in the Zoning By-law to match that of the Property Standards By-law and those changes are noted as a Proposed Revision in the draft Zoning By-law document.</p>
4	Bell Canada	<p>“Thank you for circulating Bell Canada on the Township of Montague’s upcoming Public Meeting as it relates to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law update. Bell appreciates the opportunity to engage in infrastructure and policy initiatives across Ontario.</p> <p>While we do not have any specific comments or concerns pertaining to this initiative at this time, we</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the document were not received from Bell Canada.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Zoning By-law will be provided to them, once passed by Council.</p>

		<p>would ask that Bell continue to be circulated on any future materials and/or decisions related to this matter.</p> <p>Please forward all future documents to circulations@wsp.com and should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.”</p>	
5	Jack Cole	<p>“As per the recent notice on this subject, I would appreciate receiving notification of the decision taken by council on this subject.”</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the document were not received from Jack Cole.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Zoning By-law will be provided to Jack Cole, once passed by Council.</p>
6	Sonya Kovacic	<p>“Please notify me of any planning changes.”</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the document were not received from Sonya Kovacic.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Zoning By-law will be provided to Sonya Kovacic, once passed by Council.</p>
7	RVCA	<p>“I’m working through the proposed changes, and have a few comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>4.26 Shoreline Area Occupancy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Changes to the Conservation Authorities Act exempts approvals from the CA for freestanding unenclosed decks 15m2 or less, this may create an outlier for odd permitting requirements between 15-20m2 vs smaller decks. - <i>16.1.3.2 Floodplain Zones</i> – the RVCA is currently undertaking a review of our minor addition, replacement, reconstruction policies (in concert with the recent act changes), it is possible that CA standards will be subject to change (this summer). 	<p>Section 4.26 proposed to remain as drafted.</p> <p>16.1.3.2 proposed to remain as drafted. If the CA makes changes to their policies in future, there will be a requirement for compliance with those amendments for all future development.</p> <p>Dwelling unit maximum is proposed to be removed from Section 16.1.2.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why is there a dwelling unit maximum when it's not permitted in the flood zone? - The RVCA supports the ARU policies. - Sleeping cabins should be restricted from the floodplain, I think they are, but wasn't clear. <p>Overall, some good changes, maybe worth a chat, let me know."</p>	
8	Jack Cole	<p>"My comments would be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Be careful with this 'new' process. We should be careful to take into account the environmental and living aspects of this change. There is a danger that things like potable water availability, increased air/water/land pollution, decreased public safety, public health implications, and the whole sense of living in this community and other matters could be a major concern if this process is not implemented carefully. 2. I would think this might be an opportunity to promote more renewable energy use and development and certain energy conservation measures. 3. I am guessing that there will be a lot of outside/commercial interest shown in the financial opportunity. There will be a need not to undermine the positive community feeling that currently exists in Montague. 4. I would be happy to serve on a public advisory committee to ensure a safe and equitable implementation of this 'new deal'. I have my own 100 property which will be affected by this new zoning process. I want it to be a positive impact for me and the community, not a negative one." 	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the wording of the document were not received from Jack Cole.</p> <p>The concerns raised would be addressed by the Township's recently updated Official Plan as it is the policy document that guides development within the Township.</p>

9	Amanda Fisher	<p>"I wanted to submit a written statement prior to the meeting as I won't be able to attend the afternoon gathering.</p> <p>That being said, please see my comments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before proposing new zoning by-laws, I think the imperative thing would be to get our roads in check. Pinery road has not been maintained at all this year. While I understand there are certain constraints when it comes to grading the road, there have been times where the weather has been optimal and nothing has been done. I for one don't want to see the road paved but things can still be done to better it. - The township COMPLETELY destroyed the integrity and beauty of Pinery road. It seems ridiculous to put by-laws in place when the road looks atrocious when you're driving down it. The ditches are full of jagged stumps and sticks and there's pushed up heaps against personal property lines. The township should have mulched everywhere they cleared. Then it would have looked nice. <p>I appreciate the opportunity to submit my thoughts."</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the wording of the document were not received from Amanda Fisher.</p> <p>The concerns raised relate to road conditions and will be considered during the Road Needs Study that is currently underway.</p>
10	Caroline Lefebvre	<p>"I would like to be informed of the Decision of Council of the Township of Montague regarding the next zoning by-law update happening on April 9th, 2024."</p>	<p>Recommendations for amendment to the document were not received from Caroline Lefebvre.</p> <p>A copy of the approved Zoning By-law will be provided to Carolyn Lefebvre, once passed by Council.</p>