

MLCA Lake Plan

Summary of 2023 Survey Results

Below is a summary of the results from the survey that the MLCA Lake Plan Committee conducted in January – April 2023 to get some direction and clarity from property owners (regardless of whether they are members of the MLCA) regarding the amendments the MLCA is proposing to the Gravenhurst Official Plan and the Zoning By-law.

Many respondents who selected a specific response (e.g. ‘yes’ or ‘no’) included comments that qualified and elaborated on their answers. In addition, some respondents did not select any of the answers provided and only provided comments. All of these comments are available for review at MLCA’s website, and have been reviewed and taken into consideration by the Lake Plan Committee.

Questions 1 to 6 of the survey were questions that gathered basic information about the respondents (e.g. their name, email address, cottage address, whether they are a property owner or family member of a property owner, whether they are a member of the MLCA and, if not, whether they would like further information about MLCA).

QUESTION 7

Do you believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings? This question relates to both new dwellings on vacant lots as well as additions to or the replacement of older cottages.

SUMMARY: The majority of respondents – 131/176 (74.4%) – want the size of new dwellings on vacant lots and the size of older dwellings that are being renovated or replaced to be regulated. Only 34/176 (19.3%) stated that they did not believe Muldrew Lakes required a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of new dwellings and older dwellings that are being renovated or replaced.

TOTAL

- Yes – 131/176 (74.4%)
- No – 34/176 (19.3%)
- Unanswered – 3/176 (1.7%)
- Other – 8/176 (4.6%)

QUESTION 8

If you are in support of regulating the size of dwellings on the Muldrew Lakes, please select your preferred maximum gross floor from the options below.

SUMMARY: In total, 98/176 respondents (55.68%) stated that the maximum gross floor area of dwellings on the lake (including new builds and old dwellings that are being expanded or rebuilt) should be 3500 or less. In contrast, 24/176 respondents indicated that they preferred that no limit be placed on the size of cottages (13.6%).

Of the 131 respondents who indicated that they wanted the size of cottages to be regulated, 56 (42.8%) indicated that they preferred that the maximum gross floor area of dwellings on the Muldrew Lakes be limited to 3500 sq ft. As well, 27 of the 131 respondents who wanted the size of cottages to be regulated stated that they wanted to limit the gross floor area of cottages to 3000 sq ft (20.6%) and 22 stated that they wanted to limit the gross floor area of cottages to 4,000 sq ft (16.8%).

TOTAL

- 2,500 sq ft - 15/176 (8.5%)
- 3,000 sq ft - 27/176 (15.3%)
- 3,500 sq ft - 56/176 (31.8%)
- 4,000 sq ft - 22/176 (12.5%)
- 4,500 sq ft - 7/176 (4%)
- No Max - 24/176 (13.6%)
- Unanswered - 4/176 (2.3%)
- Other - 21/176 (12%)

QUESTION 9

If you believe that dwelling sizes should be regulated on the lake, do you believe that the maximum gross floor area for new builds that cannot meet the 30 metre setback requirement should be less than the maximum gross floor area you indicated in Question 8?

SUMMARY: The majority of respondents 114/176 (64.8%) indicated that they wanted the size of new builds that cannot meet the 30 metre setback to be less than the maximum gross floor area they indicated in Question 8.

Of the 176 respondents, 24 (13.6%) indicated that they did not think the maximum gross floor area of new builds within the 30 metre buffer area should be less than the maximum gross floor area for new builds at or beyond the 30 metre setback. Further, 26 respondents (14.8%) indicated that this question did not apply to them because they did not believe that new provisions should be introduced to regulate the size of dwellings on Muldrew Lakes. A common theme in the comments of these respondents was that there should be one maximum size wherever the cottage is located and that the Town of Gravenhurst has adequate bylaws to deal with this issue.

TOTAL

- Yes - 114/176 (64.8%)
- No - 24/176 (13.6%)
- N/A - 26/176 (14.8%)
- Unanswered - 1/176 (.6%)
- Other - 11/176 (6.2%)

QUESTION 10

If you selected “yes” above in Question 9 and you believe that the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings being built within the 30 metre buffer area should be less than the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings built at or beyond the 30 metre setback, please select your preference from the options below.

SUMMARY: In total, 81/176 respondents (46%) indicated that the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings being built within the 30 metre buffer should vary depending on the proximity of the dwelling to the lake (e.g. the size of the new dwellings should decrease the closer it is to the lake). This represents about 70% of the respondents who responded that they believed the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings being built within the 30 metre buffer area should be less than the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings built at or beyond the 30 metre setback.

In addition, 36/176 respondents (20.5%) felt there should be a fixed maximum gross floor area for new dwellings being built within the 30 metre buffer area that is less than the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings built at or beyond the 30 metre setback. This represents about 30% of the individuals who responded that they believed the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings being built within the 30 metre buffer area should be less than the maximum gross floor area of new dwellings built at or beyond the 30 metre setback.

Of the 176 respondents, 9 (5.1%) indicated that the sizes of dwellings within the 30 metre setback should be the same as the size of new builds beyond the 30 metre setback.

Finally, 21/176 respondents (11.9%) stated that there should not be additional regulations for new builds within the 30 metre setback area.

TOTAL

- Fixed cap - 36/176 (20.5%)
- Range - 81/176 (46%)
- N/A - no lesser permitted max within the 30 m setback - 9/176 (5.1%)
- N/A - should not be regulated - 21/176 (11.9%)
- Unanswered (blank)- 20/176 (11.4%)
- Other - 9/176 (5.1%)

QUESTION 11

Do you support refining the policy that imposes criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement for new dwellings?

SUMMARY: A majority of respondents - 122/176 (69.3%) - indicated that they are in favour of imposing more specific criteria that must be met for relief to be granted from the 30 metre setback requirement.

About a quarter of respondents (47/176 (26.7%)) indicated that they were not in favour of imposing more specific criteria for relief to be granted from the 30 metre setback requirement.

TOTAL

- Yes - 122/176 (69.3%)
- No - 47/176 (26.7%)
- Unanswered - 1/176 (.6%)
- Other - 6/176 (3.4%)

QUESTION 12

Do you believe that the Muldrew Lakes require additional lake-specific provisions to regulate the extent to which existing legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer area can be enlarged or replaced?

SUMMARY: The survey results indicate that the majority of respondents - 98/176 (55.7%) - believe the Muldrew Lakes require additional lake-specific provisions to regulate the extent to

which existing legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer area can be enlarged or replaced. Of the 176 respondents, 71 (40.3%) did not believe that Muldrew Lakes requires additional lake-specific provisions.

TOTAL

- Yes – 98/176 (55.7%)
- No – 71/176 (40.3%)
- Other - 7/176 (4%)

QUESTION 13

There are two general approaches to permitting a percentage increase to building size: A) regulating the increase to the ground floor area (footprint) or B) regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size). Please choose your preferred option below.

SUMMARY

Of the 176 respondents, 48 (27.3%) indicated that they were in favour of regulating increases to the size of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre setback by regulating increases to the ground floor area (footprint) and 48 (27.3%) indicated that they were in favour of regulating increases to gross floor area (total building size) of these dwellings. In addition, 27/176 respondents (15.3%) indicated that they would be content with either regulating the ground floor area or gross floor area.

In total, 47/176 respondents (26.7%) stated that they do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer. Many of these individuals indicated in their comments that they did not want any additional provisions put in place to regulate the development of existing dwellings on the lake and there was concern that either option would be inequitable to individuals with small dwellings.

TOTAL

- Option A - ground floor regulation - 48/176 (27.3%)
- Option B - gross floor regulation - 48/176 (27.3%)
- Option C - either A or B - 27/176 (15.3%)
- Option D – do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 m buffer - 47/176 (26.7%)

- Other - 6/176 (3.4%)

QUESTION 14

Do you prefer percentage increases to the size of legal non-complying dwellings be based on the proximity of the existing dwelling to the lake or the size of the existing dwelling?

SUMMARY: In total, 65/176 respondents (37%) said that they prefer percentage increases to the size of legal non-complying dwellings be based on the proximity of the existing dwelling to the lake and 25/176 (14.2%) said that they prefer the increase to be based on the size of the existing dwelling. In addition, 25/176 (14.2%) indicated that they would support either option.

Of the 176 respondents, 49 (27.8%) indicated that they do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.

TOTAL

- Option A - proximity to shoreline - 65/176 (37%)
- Option B - based on size of existing dwelling - 25/176 (14.2%)
- Option C - either A or B - 25/176 (14.2%)
- Option D - 49/176 (27.8%)
- Unanswered - 2/176 (1.1%)
- Other - 10/176 (5.7%)

QUESTION 15

Would you support replacing the width formula with a provision regulating expansions to the width of dwellings by a percentage?

SUMMARY

Half of the respondents - 88/176 (50%) - answered that they would support replacing the width formula with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage and 74 (42%) would not support such a provision.

TOTAL

- Yes – 88/176 (50%)

- No – 74/176 (42%)
- Unanswered - 4/176 (2.3%)
- Other - 10/176 (5.7%)

QUESTION 16

Would you support a provision to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint?

SUMMARY: Just over half of the respondents - 93/176 (53%) – indicated that they would support a provision to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.

Of the 176 respondents, 69 (39%) indicated that they would not support such a provision. Many of the comments provided suggested that rather than requiring use of the majority of the existing footprint, the most important factor in rebuilding or enlarging legally non-complying buildings should be that the situation of non-compliance is improved (e.g. the building is further from the lake than the original building).

TOTAL

- Yes – 93/176 (53%)
- No – 69/176 (39%)
- Unanswered (blank) - 4/176 (2.3%)
- Other - 10/176 (5.7%)

QUESTION 17

Would you be in support of introducing provisions for regulating the expansion/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to the provisions implemented in the Municipality of Trent Lakes?

SUMMARY: This was the first of two questions where models used by other lake communities to regulate the expansion/reconstruction of legally non-complying dwellings was provided to get a sense of the kind of provision that would be supported by the Muldrew Lakes community.

When provided with the example of the provisions implemented in the Municipality of Trent that regulate the expansion/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings, slightly more respondents were in favour (88/176, 50%) than opposed (73/176, 41.4%) to introducing this type of provision for Muldrew Lakes.

TOTAL

- Yes – 88/176 (50%)
- No – 73/176 (41.4%)
- Unanswered - 4/176 (2.3%)
- Other - 11/176 (6.3%)

QUESTION 18

Would you be in support of introducing provisions for regulating the expansion/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to the provisions implemented in the Township of Georgian Bay?

SUMMARY: This was the second of two questions where models used by other lake communities to regulate the expansion/reconstruction of legally non-complying dwellings was provided to get a sense of the kind of provision that would be supported by the Muldrew Lakes community.

When provided with the example of the provisions implemented in the Township of Georgian Bay that regulate the expansion/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings, slightly more respondents were in favour (86/176, 49%) than opposed (71/176, 40.3%) to introducing this type of provision for Muldrew Lakes.

TOTAL

- Yes - 86/176 (49%)
- No - 71/176 (40.3%)
- Unanswered (blank) - 3/176 (1.7%)
- Other - 16/176 (9%)

QUESTION 19

Do you support a lake-specific provision that would allow property owners to build either one sleeping cabin up to 45.6 square metres (500 square feet) in size or two smaller sleeping cabins with a total floor space of up to 46.5 square metres (for example, 2 x 250 sq ft cabins)?

SUMMARY: The majority of respondents - 124/176 (70.5%) - are in favour of allowing property owners to build either one sleeping cabin up to 500 sq ft. or two smaller sleeping cabins with a total floor space of up to 500 sq ft.

TOTAL

- Yes - 124/176 (70.5%)
- No - 39/176 (22.2%)
- Unanswered - 2/176 (1.1%)
- Other 11/176 (6.2%)

QUESTION 20

Do you agree with the proposal that a Boating Impact Study should be required as part of any application for multiple residential development on Muldrew Lakes?

Summary: The majority of respondents - 156/176 (88.6%) – are in favour of a provision that would require a Boating Impact Study to be conducted as part of any application for multiple residential development on Muldrew Lakes.

TOTAL

- Yes - 156/176 (88.6%)
- No - 14/176 (8%)
- Other 6/176 (3.4%)

QUESTION 21

Are you in support of applying the Muldrew-specific provisions that currently exist in the Muldrew Lakes-specific zoning bylaws to both boathouses and boatports?

Summary: The majority of respondents - 127/176 (72.2%) – are in favour of applying the provision that already exists in the Muldrew Lakes-specific zoning bylaw to both boathouses and boatports.

TOTAL

- Yes - 127/176 (72.2%)
- No - 36/176 (20.5%)
- Unanswered - 4/176 (2.3%)
- Other - 9/176 (5%)

QUESTION 22

Please select your preferences for developing a Muldrew-specific provision related to the projection of boathouses and boatports.

SUMMARY: The majority of respondents - 115/176 (65.4%) – are in favour of a lake-specific provision that would limit the projection of boathouses and boatports to 10 metres.

TOTAL

- 10 metre limit - 115/176 (65.4%)
- 12 metre limit - 22/176 (12.5%)
- Do not support limiting projection - 31/176 (17.6%)
- Unanswered - 2/176 (1.1%)
- Other - 6/176 (3.4%)

QUESTION 23

Do you agree with requiring a Site Evaluation Report for any major development on the lake?

SUMMARY: The majority of respondents - 100/176 (56.8%) – are in favour of a provision requiring a Site Evaluation Report for any major development on Muldrew Lakes and 62/176 respondents (35.2%) are not in favour of such a provision.

TOTAL

- Yes - 100/176 (56.8%)
- No - 62/176 (35.2%)
- Other 14/176 (8%)