

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: STA+CRU+BNB Zoning By-law Amendment

Public Meeting Date: May 3, 2021

Item	Author	Submission / Comment	Response
1	Lynda Ivardi	1. Owns a larger lot along Tyrolean Lane (52m x 69m) and would like consideration for two units on the lot similar to adjacent lots in the area.	1. It would appear that there is merit to consider multiple development options on this larger lot such as creating a new lot for a second STA unit, maintaining the current lot size and construct a triplex dwelling, or alternatives. Planning Staff suggest that a more comprehensive approach be used to determine the best use of the lands through a separate zoning by-law amendment process.
2	Terry Kellar (Chair of BMRA STA Committee)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the change that STA's are only to be permitted in areas where they are presently allowed 2. Support the use of the RR Zone 3. Object to permitting STA's on future development lands. 4. Object to the simplification of the lots located on Arlberg Crescent that were subject to the 2015 Ontario Municipal Board Ruling. In particular, occupant load, parking, setbacks and buffering rules should be maintained. 5. Parking standards for new STA's has been addressed. However parking requirements related to 'grandfathered' units needs to be addressed. Do not agree with the interpretation that a grandfathered STA should only provide the parking required for a single detached dwelling. 6. Suggests wording clarification to Section 4.32 7. Suggests additional requirements to the RR Zone to also include the maximum 8 people occupancy and 120 metre separation distance, as well as other established restrictions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment received. 2. Comment received. 3. Through this amendment, STA's will not permitted as of right on any future development lands outside of the Exception Areas (See Schedule 'A1' to Draft By-law). New STA's could be requested by a developer as per the Official Plan STA policies. Any request for new STA(s) in a future development project shall be subject to Town Staff Review, Public Notification and Consultation and ultimately Council Decision. 4. The intent of the Draft Zoning By-law Amendment was to streamline the rules for developing new STAs within the Exception Area. It is recognized that these new STAs are directly adjacent to residential dwellings located along Settlers way and require enhanced protections. Some additional requirements to these lands can be incorporated in the final draft of the Zoning By-law. 5. Legal non-conforming (grandfathered) STAs are protected under the Planning Act. Requirements for additional parking do not appear available. The Town will continue to enforce Parking By-laws and respond to Parking concerns. 6. Agreed. Clarifications provided in final draft. 7. General Provisions (Section 4.32) includes all additional requirements for STAs including occupancy and separation distance. Note can be added to 'RR' Zone category to refer readers to all other STA General Provisions.

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: STA+CRU+BNB Zoning By-law Amendment

Public Meeting Date: May 3, 2021

3	Blue Mountain Ratepayers Association	<p>In addition to the comments provided by Mr. Kellar, BMRA wishes to add the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong support of prohibition of STA's in all residential zones. This measure reflects the fact that STAs are a commercial use and takes an essential step towards reducing the negative impact of STAs on our limited housing stock. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment received.
4	Patricia Yeager	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Long time resident that has witnessed the sprawl of STAs and BNBs from primarily in the Tyrolean Village Area to more and more into surrounding neighbourhoods 2. Some subdivision covenants state that short term rentals are not permitted. These covenants should take precedent over zoning by-law rules 3. STA's should be taxed as commercial uses and be located outside of residential areas. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment received. 2. Subdivision Covenants are private agreements to many subdivisions that the Town are not party to. It is noted that the Town will enforce the Zoning By-law and not private subdivision covenants. 3. Taxation rates are set by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC). MPAC has been advised of the Zoning By-law Amendment and the land use permissions associated with properties that permit Short Term Accommodation uses.
5	Blue Mountains Short Term Accommodation Owners Association (BMSTA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BMSTA represents approximately 70% of the licensed STA units in the Town. 2. Supports the Town in bringing forward a new aligned and harmonized Zoning By-law 3. Concerned with the revised parking requirement and impact on creating new non-conforming uses particularly where STA's have private parking and a common parking area 4. Suggests clarification to the wording to Section 4.32(4)(a) 5. Requests further review of the tandem parking permissions and associated definitions 6. Suggests that the proposed 6.0 metre exterior side yard setback may be excessive in comparison to other lots in the area and new requirement for landscape planting strips. 3 metres appears more appropriate 7. Supports the proposed definition for Rental or Lease Management Program 8. No comment to the proposed Bed and Breakfast regulations proposed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment received. 2. Comment received. 3. Adequate parking should be provided for STA uses. Where private parking and shared parking exists, it could be demonstrated that the updated parking requirements could be met. 4. Agreed. Clarifications provided in final draft. 5. Comment received. 6. 6.0 metre exterior setback was set as per the 'RR' Zone created by By-law 2009-03. In comparison, By-law 2018-65 requires exterior side yard setbacks ranging from 5.0 metres (single detached), 3.0 metres (semi detached), 4.0 metres (triplex), 7.5 metres (4+ unit buildings), and a range of 2.0 to 6.0 metres (commercial uses). It would appear appropriate to consider a reduced exterior setback of 4.5 metres. It is also noted that the Draft By-law requires a 3.0 metre planting strip along exterior yards. 7. Comment received. 8. Comment updated from 'no objections' to 'no comment'.

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: STA+CRU+BNB Zoning By-law Amendment

Public Meeting Date: May 3, 2021

6	Cachet Crossing (Grey Condominium Corporation # 24)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about maintaining current status of being able to rent units as Short Term Accommodation Units and Commercial Resort Units. 2. Concerned about how multiple Rental and Lease Management Companies and individual STA owners can operate within the same complex. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current Zone permits Village Commercial Resort Units as per the Village Core Zoning By-law Amendments in 1999 and 2000. Zoning should reflect the use of the lands as similar to Chateaux Ridge and other similar 'legacy condos'. 2. Cachet Crossing is being used for Commercial Resort Units and Short Term Accommodation units. Management of the complex
7	Weir Foulds (on behalf of Grey Condominium Corporation # 24)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned that the Zoning By-law Amendment as prepared will lead to a number of legal non-conforming uses at GCC # 24 2. Requests that the Town 'pause' on considering amendments on the GCC #24 property. Further modifications to the amendment may be required and these further considerations should be discussed prior to considering an amendment -or- Requests that the property be removed from the Zoning By-law Amendment and left 'status quo' as an area of non-decision in By-law 2018-65 and be considered as part of the remaining Blue Mountain Village Resort Core Area under Section 1.5(f) to the By-law. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment received. 2. Planning Staff suggest that GCC #24 be removed from the Zoning By-law Amendment and that the lands be considered as part of the future Zoning By-law changes required to bring the Blue Mountain Village Core area into the new Zoning By-law.
8	County of Grey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typo in Section 4.32(c) to the By-law. Reference to 'metres' should be added. 2. Section 4.8(j) related to Bed and Breakfast limit of 3 guest rooms should be reviewed to ensure 3 rooms can remain economically viable for operators 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typo corrected. 2. Bed and Breakfasts are consistently limited to a maximum of 3 bedrooms. Should additional rooms be requested, it may form part of a future Zoning By-law Amendment with adequate justification provided in support.
9	Steve and Jayne Mosey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Requests protections to the existing 'non-commercial' character of their residential neighbourhood. 2. Concerns related to the Licensing By-law related to Bed and Breakfast uses 3. Concerns related to enforcement particularly late nights and weekends. 4. Revisions to the licensing By-law have been offered. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed By-law Amendment includes additional residential neighbourhood character protections. 2. Comments related to the Licensing By-law have been sent to Legal Services for consideration through the Licensing By-law process. 3. Referred to Legal Services 4. Referred to Legal Services
10	Stephanie Fillingham	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns with the Licensing By-law as it relates to Bed and Breakfasts within their neighbourhood. 2. Requests protection of the residential / non-commercial character of their neighbourhood 3. Concerns related to the wording and clauses of the Licensing By-law have been listed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments related to the Licensing By-law have been sent to Legal Services for consideration through the Licensing By-law process. 2. The proposed By-law Amendment includes additional residential neighbourhood character protections. 3. Referred to Legal Services

Public Meeting Comments Response Matrix

Project Name: STA+CRU+BNB Zoning By-law Amendment

Public Meeting Date: May 3, 2021

		<div>4. Concerns with the minimum 120 metres separation distance and based on the neighbourhood lot size, every 7th house could be available for a Bed and Breakfast</div> <div>5. Requests that surprise inspections occur on licensed Bed and Breakfast properties.</div> <div>6. Requests the ability to receive notice and speak to applications for Bed and Breakfast licenses including the ability to object to Council as to why a license should not be granted</div> <div>7. Follow up comments and questions were also provided requesting additional information</div>	<div>4. 120 metre Bed and Breakfast distance matches the minimum separation distance (and reciprocal distance) for Short Term Accommodation uses.</div> <div>5. Referred to Legal Services</div> <div>6. Referred to Legal Services</div> <div>7. Referred to Legal Services</div>
END			