

MLCA LAKE PLAN

2023 SURVEY RESULTS

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.

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

YES (TOTAL: 131/176) – Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.

Yes without comments (124/176)

Yes with comments (7/176)

- Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;I believe that there need to be additional provisions as to shoreline development such as docks & supposed "boat ramps".
- Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;this is due to its narrow water body with alot of shorelinr
- Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;The number of and/size of buildings should be relative to the size of the property, and there should be a maximum building size. Clearly a 50,000 square foot building as in the example above is extreme.
- Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;Why are we adopting lake specific policies rather than seeking amendments to the Gravenhurst plan that apply to all lakes? ;

- Yes, I do believe so but it shouldn't be unfair to those who haven't already renovated their cottages.;Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;
- I believe this example misrepresents the Gravenhurst guidelines. For anyone that has applied for changes to the town know there is more complexity in the considerations and process.;Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;

NO (TOTAL: 34/176) – No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings

No without comments (30/176)

No with comments (4/176)

- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;Let's just let the municipality do it's job. We feel the municipality's regulations are sufficient.
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;I believe in a policy that limits the maximum size of cottages. However, I have concerns about a full "SET of lake-specific policies and provisions", as there are likely several policies that I disagree with.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of dwellings.;Example 2 is misleading. Any cottage built within the 30m zone would be subject to current width restrictions. eg at 20m back the cottage could be 19m wide which would mean to hit a 5000sqm footprint it would have to be 245m long, about 2.5 football fields!;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 3/176)

Other (TOTAL: 8/176)

- Insufficient room here for my comments;
- It is important to protect the visible shoreline.
- Yes, I believe that the Muldrew Lakes require a set of lake-specific policies and provisions to regulate the size of any portion of dwellings within 30m of the shoreline, but not any portion beyond 30m.;
- Yes, with exemptions for replacement of existing old cottage
- Allow existing cottages (within the 20m) to be grandfathered and allowed to expand to maximum size of 3,000 sq ft, as long as doesn't go closer to lake. 2. No new severances. 3. New structure on vacant land to be max. 3,000 sq ft and 20 m from lake.;
- okay with family cottage, not okay with an Inn where rooms are rented out;

- We believe that there should be some limits to size of dwellings however we feel that the current zoning bylaws address these issues as they incorporate many other determining factors limiting the size of dwelling ie width, height, setbacks etc. The above example is very misleading and not representative of reality.
- The town of Gravenhurst has regulations in place.

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.

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%)

Breakdown

232 square metres (2,500 sq ft) Gross Floor Area (TOTAL: 15/176)

278 square metres (3,000 sq ft) Gross Floor Area (TOTAL: 27/176)

325 square metres (3,500 sq ft) Gross Floor Area (TOTAL: 56/176)

370 square metres (4,000 sq ft) Gross Floor Area (TOTAL: 22/176)

418 square metres (4,500 sq ft) Gross Floor Area (TOTAL: 7/176)

No Maximum (TOTAL: 24/176)

Unanswered (blank) (TOTAL: 4/176)

Other (TOTAL: 21/176)

- I would suggest 3,500 sq. ft as a maximum, however, recommending a maximum without regard to varieties of current and future lot sizes and frontage feels presumptive. Are you certain there are not places on the lake where (all things considered) a 3,500 sq. ft cottage wouldn't be acceptable?
- not sure
- No opinion. It is dependent on density and proximity to other properties
- We nNeed more open discussion among owners
- While we think there should be a maximum, we don't feel it should be our opinion about what is big enough or too big.

- the max should depend on factors such as shoreline but there should be a max of 6000 that scales down depending on shoreline and other factors
- Frontage-based formula with max of 1,200 sf for 140 ft. frontage for lots with 140
- Variable, with increasing size permitted the farther back from the shoreline, and limited by coverage if 30m or more from the shoreline
- This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst
- We are assuming that this gross floor area refers to one main building on the property, not the total of all buildings on the property. We choose 2500 sq feet for this main building.
- we believe max gross floor area, as currently defined by the town, should be limited to 3,500 sf ft
- 4,000sq feet so long as this only applies to the "waterfront designation of 60m from the shoreline"
- Max of 4,500 per dwelling but allow for more than this if multiple dwellings
- I do not think maximum's should be set in absolute terms, but like how they are set up now, relative to the size and frontage of the lot. There is no reason to treat a lot that is 0.5 acres the same way as a lot that is 50 acres. The ratios are built in insurance
- In accordance with the Gravenhurst by laws and can be objected against as per normal procedures
- It would depend on the amount of frontage and size of lot, as per current municipal regulations
- Maintain current lot coverage of 13%
- As per the current township by-laws
- Town policy
- the Town of Gravenhurst already has appropriate regulations in place
- Again if the cottage is more than 30m back I don't see the need for a size cap, if it's within 30m it is effectively limited by the current with and coverage by laws

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?

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%)
-

BREAKDOWN

YES (TOTAL: 114/176) - Yes, I think the maximum gross floor area for 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.

Yes without comment (111/176)

Yes with comment (3/176)

- Yes, I think the maximum gross floor area for 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. ;I believe that most of us don't know what a 3000 sq ft home looks like within the shore allowance. It's such a personal choice - the the building fits into the landscape, is aesthetically pleasing, and hidden from view as much as possible. If it's at the edge of the lake it should be regulated.;
- Less than or equal to maximum gross floor area, in consideration of topography, lot depth, or other constraints (e.g. right of way).;Yes, I think the maximum gross floor area for 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. ;
- I believe that this should depend on the individual site. ;Yes, I think the maximum gross floor area for 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. ;

NO (TOTAL: 24/176) - No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located

No without comment (19/176)

No with comment (5/176)

- No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located.;I feel that the width of the building should be limited. You always have the option of going up or back.;
- No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located.;there are some older cottages that would need to be grandfathered on footprint if rebuilt;
- No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located.;problem being " rebuilding on our current footprint would be not be permitted "New builds should be built beyond the set back but existing cottages 50 plus years old should be grandfathered in .;
- No, I do not think the maximum gross floor area for 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. I believe that there should be one permitted maximum size for all new dwellings, no matter where the dwelling is located.;Yes, I think the maximum gross floor area for 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. ;

N/A (TOTAL: 26/176) - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated

N/A without comments (20/176)

N/A with comments (6/176)

- N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;Already regulated. Don't need further changes. Shoreline development impacts can be managed through t other means such as planting and landscaping to control impacts to the water, for example.;
- N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;This is already regulated by the Town of Gravenhurst;
- N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;again, this is already regulated by the Town of Gravenhurst;
- N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;see comments above;

- N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;Your lake plan will merely cause a reduction in value of properties on the lake as people will be limited from renovation and developing as necessary which will result in lower vqlues ;
- Max per town regulations;N/A - This question does not apply to me because I do not believe that dwelling size should be regulated.;

OTHER (TOTAL: 11/176)

- Exemption for rebuild of existing demolished cottage but no intrusion on existing setback;
- I think it should be 20 m - as we discovered on the Litterst property, the 30m wasn't enforced anyhow and many properties would put the cottage on the road or over the hill if it was 30 m.;
- Building on a lot of this description should not be permitted
- If there was a cottage on the property prior, then they should be allowed to build where the old one was. Distance from the water.
- 30 Metre set back for new builds should be enforced.
- if there is an existing structure which is being replaced, there should be the same max gross floor
- No room here for my comments
- We believe that the current zoning bylaw adequately address this issue by taking into account other restrictions such us width, height, distance from lake. The responses offered above don't provide an accurate description of how things are calculated.;
- It should be, as it is no, regulated by the Gravenhurst Municipal by-laws and NOT by a Lake Association;
- The existing 13% lot coverage rule should apply regardless as long as necessary variances are obtained. ;
- As per the current township by-laws;

UNANSWERED (TOTAL: 1/176)

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.

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%)

BREAKDOWN

Fixed cap (TOTAL: 36/176) - There should be a fixed cap (maximum gross floor area) no matter where the dwelling is located within the 30 metre buffer area.

Fixed cap without comments (35/176)

Fixed cap with comments (1/176)

- There should be a fixed cap (maximum gross floor area) no matter where the dwelling is located within the 30 metre buffer area.;New builds should not be permitted 50 ft close to shoreline;

Range (TOTAL: 81/176) - There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake

Range without comments (75/176)

Range with comments (6/176)

- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;I also believe that new buildings or renovations to existing buildings within the 30 meters should be severely limited. Construction should be encouraged at the 30M mark, and grandfathering shorelines should be done only in rare cases.
- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;also with a cap to a max building size;
- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;I believe this should be the case for NEW builds - not changes to existing structures;

- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;As currently in the by law;
- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;And the range should also have allowance for buildings currently in existence (for renovations);
- Would prefer gross floor area further away from the lake, in consideration of topography, lot depth, or other constraints (e.g. right of way)..;There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;

N/A (TOTAL: 9/176) - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area

N/A without comments (7/176)

N/A with comments (2/176)

- If the build has been approved within the 30m setback I feel it's been decided for appropriate (usually less environmental harm) and should fall under the same 13 percent calculation. Otherwise they're stuck sticking to the setback potentially causing more harm environmentally.;N/A - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area.;
- N/A - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area.;Topography is mostly the factor in this situation; a lot may be narrow and long so the dwelling would need to fit into this footprint. ;

N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation. (TOTAL: 21/176)

N/A without comments (17/176)

N/A with comments (4/176)

- N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation.;current bylaw address this issue.;
- N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation.;N/A - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area.;again, the Town of Gravenhurst already has appropriate regulations;
- N/A - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area.;N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation.;
- N/A - I do not think there should be a lesser permitted maximum gross floor area for new builds within the buffer area.;N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation.;The town of Gravenhurst has regulations;

Unanswered (blank) – (TOTAL: 20/176)

Other (TOTAL: 9/176)

- There should be a fixed cap (maximum gross floor area) no matter where the dwelling is located within the 30 metre buffer area.;There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;
- There should be a range of permitted maximum gross floor areas based on proximity to the lake.;There should be a fixed cap (maximum gross floor area) no matter where the dwelling is located within the 30 metre buffer area.;
- Cottages within the 30 metre buffer should be allowed a fixed cap amount but only to be built on the non-lake side of the cottage so it's not visible from the lake. ;
- There should be a fixed cap (maximum gross floor area) no matter where the dwelling is located within the 30 metre buffer area.;N/A - I do not think building sizes on the lakes require any further regulation.;
- this lake should of had a square foot max. a long time ago there should only be cottages on the lake note homes . " hence a the lake issues ";
- 30 metre setbacks should be enforced.;
- Neither of these options are ideal. These unfairly penalize legacy cottages close to the water. There are a lot of these cottages. All well and fine for those that have already developed or over-developed their properties. Greatly affects resale value potential. Will property owners be able to apply for a variance and have their individual situations considered for approval.;
- As per before. By the way, your answer choices are very skewed and do not fairly project an unbiased option;
- Again, no room here for my comments;

QUESTION 11

Do you support refining the policy that imposes criteria for relief 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%)**
-

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 122/176)

Yes without comment (116/176)

Yes with comments (6/176)

- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; Define soil conditions;
- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; This applies to grandfathered sites, I'm guessing;
- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; The less the setback, the smaller the build permitted.;
- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; I think it should be 20 m - as we discovered on the Litterst property, the 30m wasn't enforced anyhow and many properties would put the cottage on the road or over the hill if it was 30 m;
- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; I believe this change is relaxing the 30m set back constraints? I have read it many times...if so, yes i agree. ;
- Yes, I support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement; i'm not sure there should be any material dwelling type buildings within the 30 min setback, a deck or corner of a building is fine but a whole dwelling should no be permitted;

No (TOTAL: 47/176)

No without comments (37/176)

No with comments (10/176)

- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;The verbiage is subjective again and I have observed the Town Planners being very thorough in their evaluations when this has come up and they have taken into account the considerations which the bold detail seems to be trying to capture. The reports when approvals are very detailed and discuss each point being addressed.;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;as worded this is very punitive for owners with existing properties within 30 meter regardless of depth of property;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;The existing municipal requirements already address this scenario;
- I'm not sure who the bold wording serves, and why the Official Plan criteria is insufficient. The criteria for terrain or site allowing request for relief exists. The proposed wording appears to extend the cases where development in the 30-metre setback would be allowed, specifically in the situation where blasting or extensive removal of mature trees (whether or not in the 30-metre setback) is required. ;No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;We have been on the lake since 1932, OUR association has no right to treet the lake like we are all part of a condo association and give itself condo like powers to tell everyone how to live their lives . this lake plan is attempting just that and many of us ask you to put an end to your higher than thou behavior.;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;Regulations are already in place.;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;the current regulations & the Town of Gravenhurst have addressed this sufficiently.;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;The lake-specific policy seems to indicate that it is for redevelopment whereas the current OP seems to refer only to new construction on an existing lot?;
- No, I do not support the proposed lake-specific policy regarding criteria for relief from the 30 metre setback requirement;The wording of the OP should remain as to pertaining to new builds, not redevelopment.;

Unanswered (Blank) (TOTAL: 1/176)

Other (TOTAL: 6/176)

- There should be additional exemptions. ;
- Relief only due to major physical conditions - need for blasting or removal of trees should not be cause for relief.;

- I might support the principle but the wording is confusing. Who determines 'more suitable'. It should not be the developer. Better to have a graduated size limit that is firm, and say that you can vary setback or size, but not both., but should ;
- Not enough room here for my comments;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- The phrase "existing lots of record" seems key here. No new lots which cannot comply with the 30m setback should be permitted. However we would prefer to see suitable buildings a little closer to the lake over the removal of trees or the blasting of rock. ;

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?

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 98/176) - Yes, I believe the Muldrew Lakes require additional and lake-specific provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.

Yes without comment (96/176)

Yes with comment (2/176)

- Yes, I believe the Muldrew Lakes require additional and lake-specific provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;Your interpretation of the application of the width formula is a distortion of the original intent of the standard. It was meant to apply to everything less than 30m from the lake and, if it had been applied in that way, there would be no need to discuss the size limit.;
- Yes, I believe the Muldrew Lakes require additional and lake-specific provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;I feel strongly that no limits should be placed on adding a second story to existing legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 m buffer.;

No (TOTAL: 71/176) - No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced

No without comment (60/176)

No with comment (11/176)

- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;we believe that the existing bylaws are sufficient. we believe that it would improve lake character by cleaning up some of the old dilapidated cottages and we believe upgraded septic systems would improve lake quality. Gentrification would have a positive visual impact;

- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;Because most of the dwelling within the buffer are less than 900 square feet and should be allowed to enlarge the dwelling side and back just not forward to the lake .;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;There should be absolutely no additional provisions. In fact the current provisions are restrictive and are an over step by the city and the committee. This is private property after all.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;yes I am one of them. Your proposals will kill the value of my cottage , even if I have no plans to renovate.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;Current regulations already exist that address this.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;current regulations already address this;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;I believe that the existing zoning requirements are adequate and are already sufficient to preserving water quality and overall lake health. Once again, your preamble is very leading and biased. ;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;The current by-law, while not perfect seems to address current situations as they pertain to lot size and proximity to the water which is much more fair than limiting redevelopment to a percentage of an existing structure. I would prefer to see building width calculated as a percentage of water frontage and distance from water as well.;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;Should be case by case;
- No, I do not believe that the Muldrew Lakes require any additional provisions to regulate the extent to which legal non-complying dwellings within the buffer area can be enlarged or replaced.;13% lot coverage seems too restrictive and I'm open to allowing a second story to be built without enlarging existing footprint;

Other (TOTAL: 7/176)

- Due to some lot configurations, ie islands specifically, it can be difficult to meet all the setback requirements;

- We believe regulations should take into consideration lot size. As an example, our property is over 25 acres and at least 1300 waterfront feet. Under the proposed regulations, our modest buildings could not be enlarged, nor could we add another building, even if it were more than 30m from the shoreline. Given the vast available space, it does not seem at all inappropriate to be able to add another building such as a second bunkie on a property such as ours. ;
- ME: (b) and (c) is fine but not (a). And the restrictions should be within 20 m not 30 m. Existing buildings within 20 m of lake should be allowed additions but not any that go closer to the lake. They should not be forced to add up but to stay on the same level and be allowed to expand to the sides.;
- I am in support of developing a lake-specific plan to protect the lake but we should be flexible enough to allow legal, non-compliant dwellings to 'upgrade' without causing significant harm. I don't agree with not allowing addition to height as this could be a way of allowing additional square footage without causing significant environmental harm.;
- Not Sure;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- Not enough room for legitimate comments;

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 only) or B) regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size). Please choose your preferred option below.

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 - 47/176 (26.7%)
 - Other - 6/176 (3.4%)
-

BREAKDOWN

Option A (TOTAL: 48/176)- I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the ground floor area (footprint only).

Option A without comments (45/176)

Option A with comments (3/176)

- Option A - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the ground floor area (footprint only).;this seems the most environmentally considerate option;
- Option A - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the ground floor area (footprint only).;Option B - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size).;
- Option A - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the ground floor area (footprint only).;Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;I like A but I do feel like allowing only 400 square feet on 1000 sq ft. is a bit low. Perhaps this square footage could be allowed on a sliding scale where smaller cottages can add a bit more than someone who has a larger footprint. Someone with 2000 sq ft adding 800 sq ft is a bit excessive.;

Option B (TOTAL: 48/176) - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size).

Option B without comments (45/176)

Option B with comments (3/176)

- we support B but the ability to add a second story should be limited depending on the actual setback. ie no second storey for a property that is 10 m from the water even if they stay within the max gross floor area limit; Option B - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size).;
- Option B - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size).; Within the 30 metre buffer, expansion should only be permitted on the non-lake side of the building so it's not visible from the lake. If that is not to be incorporated, I support option B. ;
- Option B - I support permitting a percentage increase to building size by regulating the increase to the gross floor area (total building size).; given the current lake condition - i'm not sure we should be allowing any increase in size to buildings within the 30 meters;

Option C (TOTAL: 27/176) - I would support Option A or Option B

Option C without comments (25/176)

Option C with comments (2/176)

- Option C - I would support Option A or Option B.; As per previous restriction for building new cottage with less than 30 meters setback from shoreline, propose a sliding scale to increase square footage for cottage addition or replacement with a larger setback. Isn't this what is proposed in #14 below?;
- Option C - I would support Option A or Option B.; Encouraging vertical growth is preferred to sprawling out. Also, a percentage cap limits a building that is small today compared to a large existing building therefore a combination of percentage max and absolute size max, whichever is less, might be better ;

Option D (TOTAL: 47/176) - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.

Option D without comments (36/176)

Option D with comments (11/176)

- Building area increase should be allowed to the limit of the maximum building size allowed in question 10; Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.; we believe current zoning bylaw addresses this issue. Regulation should not be based on size of existing dwelling. The above options A&B penalize cottage owners with existing small cabins. For example a 500 sf cabin on a 200' lot would be limited to 700 sf, while someone with an existing cottage of 2000 sf could increase to 2800 sf. How is this fair? ;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.; This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;

- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;Both examples penalize those with currently smaller cottages, regardless of setback.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;I think we should leave well enough alone and let the township deal with individual requests for exceptions. Stop playing condo corp games. This lake is not a condo, This association has wasted enough of our dues on this exercise.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;Regulations are currently in place and are appropriate and fair;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;current regulations are appropriate;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;I think that the fairest way would be as a percentage of lot area.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;To be clear: Only as a percentage of lot area as per existing by-law.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;Negatively affects small cottage - needs to be case by case. Suggest our cabin is smallest on the lake 18x24. If there is a cottage that is 10m from the shore that is 1200 sq ft then everyone should be allowed to. Precedent already set on the lake. If they have built it why cant we?;
- Your questions are drafted in a biased manner intended to support the plan that is being proposed;Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within the 30 metre buffer.;

Other (TOTAL: 6/176)

- I do not support a percentage increase approach because it allows multiple incremental increases in building size, and it allows bigger, more impactful buildings to increase more than smaller, less-impactful building. Stick with a graduated building size, or better, a graduated ground floor area.;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- No room for comments;
- Whatever Town rules are;
- The increase should be up to the maximum everyone has on the lake, so 3000 sq ft for example, but don't allow them to go any closer to the lake, so the increase has to be above, beside or behind.;

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?

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%)
-

BREAKDOWN

Option A (TOTAL: 65/176) - I believe that the percentage amount should be based on the proximity of the existing dwelling to the shoreline

Option A without comments (64/176)

Option A with comments (1/176)

- Option A - I believe that the percentage amount should be based on the proximity of the existing dwelling to the shoreline.;Again, within the 30 metre buffer, expansion should only be allowed on the non-lake side of the cottage. If we do allow expansion on the lake side, the expansion should be no closer to the lake than the existing building. ;

Option B (TOTAL: 25/176) - I believe that the permitted expansion should be based on the size of the existing dwelling.

Option B without comments (24/176)

Option B with comments (1/176)

- Option B - I believe that the permitted expansion should be based on the size of the existing dwelling.;Option B is more fair, but per my notes above, there should be a size limit, not a percentage increase.;

Option C (TOTAL: 25/176) - I would be in support of either Option A or Option B.

Option C without comments (25/176)

Option D (TOTAL: 49/176) - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline

Option D without comment (40/176)

Option D with comment (9/176)

- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;Building area increase should be allowed to the limit of the maximum building size allowed in question 10;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;see response to question 13. We do not believe that regulation should be based on size of existing dwelling and that the existing zoning bylaw provisions are sufficient;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;Both examples cited penalize current smaller cottage owners.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;the Town of Gravenhurst already addresses these issues on individual basis.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;Option A is more fair, however it should not be based on the existing ground floor area, it should be based on the lot size and frontage.;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;as above;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;disadvantages small cabins;
- Option D - I do not support the adoption of any additional provisions to regulate expansions of legal non-complying dwellings within 30 metres of the shoreline.;each cottage and cottage has its own unique needs that can be addressed without the need for the lake plan ;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 2/176) (blank)

Other (TOTAL: 10/176)

- Town regulations;
- The town of Gravenhurst is constantly addressing these issues with the individual cottage owner;
- I believe that an increase in gross floor area achieved by adding a second story to an existing legal non-conforming footprint should be allowed. I also believe there should be a maximum gross floor area of 3500 (including the second story). ;
- Me: The increase should be up to the maximum everyone has on the lake, so 3000 sq ft for example, but don't allow them to go any closer to the lake, so the increase has to be above, beside or behind.;

- if the structure already exists - guidelines should be the same no matter the distance from the water.;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- No room for legitimate comments;
- A combination of ideas in Option A and Option B. Both are important.;
- Option B - I believe that the permitted expansion should be based on the size of the existing dwelling.;;Option C - I would be in support of either Option A or Option B.;

QUESTION 15

Would you support replacing the width formula with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage?

TOTAL

- Yes – 88/176 (50%)
 - No – 74/176 (42%)
 - Unanswered - 4/176 (2.3%)
 - Other - 10/176 (5.7%)
-

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 88/176) - Yes, I would support replacing the width formula (Illustration 6) with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage.

Yes without comments (85/176)

Yes with comments (3/176)

- we are not clear as to what % increase is being proposed ;Yes, I would support replacing the width formula (Illustration 6) with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage.;
- Yes, I would support replacing the width formula (Illustration 6) with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage.;i would also take percentage of land coverage into account;
- Yes, I would support replacing the width formula (Illustration 6) with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage.;i would prefer a formula that doesn't allow any expansion in width - only up up or back;

No (TOTAL: 74/176) - No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.

No without comment (64/176)

No with comments (10/176)

- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;if we looked at the cottages on the lake, I feel the old ones (many very similar in size to mine) are already at the max or even already wider than the max width based on distance. If I'm 15m from OSWL I'm already at max and I don't even think I'm 15m. My place is very much the same cookie cutter size and distance from OSWL as so many cottages on the lake.;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;we believe the current bylaws are fair. Once again you are penalizing cottage owners with small existing cabins;

- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;any cottage existing and under 20' wide should be allowed 50%
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;Absolutely not. This needs to be applied in the manner in which it was intended, not the current approach. If anything, this should be so fundamental that a variance to it would be rarely permitted.;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;Emphatic NO! Penalizes existing cottage owners who may want to reasonably expand. ;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;I would support replacing the width formula with a provision regulating expansions in width by a percentage OF THE LOT FRONTAGE.;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;If you are trying to encourage undisturbed natural shoreline the width of an existing dwelling should be irrelevant. Even more relevant would be a similar table as above but the max width would be a sliding percentage based on length of shoreline. More equitable in maintaining a percentage of natural shoreline on all lots. If however you wish to give a break to those with cottages that are already wider or larger than allowed you could add a not withstanding provision to allow for an addition of up to 25% or whatever of the existing structure. ;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;Disadvantages small cabins - prefer case by case or precedents already set;
- No, I would not support replacing the existing width formula (Illustration 6) with a percentage based provision.;Keep the existing limits to maintain more development free shoreline.;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 4/176)

Other (TOTAL: 10/176)

- Expansion should only be allowed on the non-lake side of the building for non-complying structures. ;
- Keep it simple. Width should be based on 2 factors: Up to a max of 50' but also based on width of lot (not the width of the existing building) on a sliding scale.;
- Percentages adversely affect expansion of smaller cottages, but the existing width formula is not nearly restrictive enough.;
- Depends on topograhly;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- not sure;
- KEEP IT AS IT IS;

- Town regulations;
- Let the individual deal with their own request with the township. so leave it as is;

QUESTION 16

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

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 93/176) - Yes, I would be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.

Yes without comments (90/176)

Yes with comments (3/176)

- Yes, I would be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;Provisions could be included to allow such relocation provided the previous footprint is completely rehabilitated to a natural state.;
- Yes, I would be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;I'm more in the "yes" camp than in the "no" camp, however, I would prefer to remove the word "majority" (since, again, this implies growth caps) and instead strictly require that the existing building footprint be part of whatever maximums (max width, etc.) are allowed per the official plan within the setback area.;
- Yes, I would be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;is there a way to create to set this regulation that incentivizes any increase in set back - eg. of they are 10 m to day, but move to 20 then you can get more size increase;

No (TOTAL: 69/176) - No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.

No without comments (58/176)

No with comments (11/176)

- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;The replacement building is not closer to the water.;

- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;If for some reason my cottage was destroyed and physically could not be rebuilt on the same footprint for some reason I would want it to still be within the 30m as close to existing footprint as possible (say a massive explosion like middle lake had not long ago). Much of north lake south facing would have hydro lines in their front view if we hit the 30m set back.;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;if you are proposing to improve your situation of non-compliance better ie by moving further away for the shoreline you should be permitted to do so;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;If space is available to move further back from sensitive buffer and builder wishes to setback further, why would we restrict that. Or am i reading this wrong?;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;Allow them to go to sides or behind, not closer to lake.;
- if someone wants to move from 10 m from shoreline to 20 m from shoreline they should be permitted to do so;No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;I believe that the creation of a similar footprint further back from the existing footprint (where 30 metres is NOT possible) is better than restricting to the existing footprint. I think movement further back from the shoreline should be prioritized in whatever way is possible.;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;the Town of Gravenhurst has appropriate regulations existing;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;Under the proposed provision, if a property owner of a cottage within 10m of the shoreline wishes to relocate it 10m further back from the shore, using the same size footprint but not in the majority of the same footprint, the proposed restrictions would not allow it. By all accounts this would be an improvement, but it would be prohibited by the provisions. This seems unreasonable. I also think this question should present such a scenario in order for the survey respondents to fully understand the implications. Without a fair and complete explanation of these implications, Question 16 cannot yield reliable data. ;
- No, I would not be in support of a provision on the Muldrew Lakes to restrict the location of a replacement dwelling to the majority of the existing building footprint.;disadvantages small cabins ;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 4/176)

Other (TOTAL: 10/176)

- so you can build a new 3500sq foot building but if you want or have to renovate an existing 800sq foot building you will be discriminated against??a;
- Any increase in set back allowed whether or not it occupies part of same footprint, and complies with other provisions.;
- If the owner wishes to move the replacement of a non-complying cottage to beyond the 30 metre buffer, that should be allowed. You have not explained why this would not be beneficial to the lake. ;
- Mildly supportive, but we should not prevent a location that reduces the degree of non-compliance and is still subject to graduated size limits. If this is a hard limit, it could backfire. If you want a bigger expansion, move farther back. If we don't allow this approach we will end up with a size fight more often.;
- Any renovations/rebuilds of existing cottages that are non-compliant with the 30M setback should not be allowed. Grandfathering existing structures is one thing, but renovations/rebuilds are an opportunity to ensure everyone meets compliance rules.;
- n/a;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- Too confusing;
- Town regulations;
- your questions are interesting to say the least. this lake plan should stay out of the building code business. stop telling them how to look after what is their responsibility.;

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?

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 88/176) Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.

Yes without comments (83/176)

Yes with comments (5/176)

- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;we are only commenting on section f;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;If the owner wishes to rebuild beyond the 30 metre buffer, this should be allowed. ;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;Limit 1,000 sf ground floor, 800 sf second floor for 140 ft frontage and increasing for larger frontage;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;Yes, but need more categories in (a) and (b).;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;is there consideration for septic field / tank placement to get it setback more from the lake as it expands;

No (TOTAL: 73/176) - No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes

No without comment (61/176)

No with comments (11/176)

- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;structures that are non-compliant should move towards compliance with any renovations or rebuilds.;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;The current regulations in the Town of Gravenhurst are acceptable. ;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;No second story if setback only 10m, maybe at 20m;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;While the combination of these subsections (ignoring subsection f)) make it clearer how existing cottage expansion would be better (and more equitably) controlled, it still doesn't create an even playing field. ;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;I would say they got away with submitting their point of view before the rest of the population realized what they were up to. I'm as much to blame not making the time to ask questions. To be fair, I never thought we would have these kind of people in our association with these sort of values.;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;A 1201 sqft dwelling could increase to 1500max. Whereas 1199sqft could increase to 1799sqft. Logic?? Better to base it on lot arear??;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;Who is the genius that devised this one? That means that a 1199sq ft cottage could become 300sq ft bigger than a 1201sq ft cottage?! Everything should be based on lot frontage and area within 60m of the lake. It's simple and equitable and in the best interest of your stated goals of protecting the lake.;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;Soetimes topography allows for a second storey better than expansion othewise.;
- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;disadvantages small cabins;

- No, I would not be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Municipality of Trent Lakes.;I support allowing people to add an additional storey to a bungalow (so not beyond a two storey dwelling);

Unanswered (TOTAL: 4/176)

Others (TOTAL: 11/176)

- Confused as this seems to have already been addressed in #14 & 15 above?;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- Mildly support. (f) is essential. But this formula is inconsistent and thus vulnerable to variances - if you have 1,200 sf, you can go up to 1,500sf; if you have 1,198sf, you can go up to 1,792sf. And, what is so different about 9m vs 10m that warrants another storey. Consider allowing more height in all cases to reduce footprint and width, I would prefer that.;
- Yes, except for provision (f), which seems harsh to a new buyer.;
- agree in concept but would want a cap on max size;
- I agree in part with this plan; however, i believe that the addition of a second story should be allowed, even within the setback (as there is less environmental impact from adding a second story than by adding to the ground floor footprint). ;
- I would support the current regulations;
- The town of Gravenhurst already has regulations in place. Cottage owners either build on the footprint or build 30 meters back.;
- Town regulations;
- assuming proper septic provisions are made, we are not sure what the problem would be to have a 2 storey building within the 10m setback. We think a smaller footprint and less vegetation removal close to the shoreline is preferable
- Size and reconstruction should be the same as for all buildings, just not any closer to lake.;

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?

TOTAL

- Yes - 86/176 (48.9%)
 - No - 71/176 (40.3%)
 - Unanswered (blank) - 3/176 (1.7%)
 - Other - 16/176 (9.1%)
-

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 86/176) - Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.

Yes without comments (81/176)

Yes with comments (5/176)

- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;though I'm not sure these are restrictive enough depending on the size of the existing dwelling, proximity to neighbours, sight lines ;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Agree but again seems to be covered by #14 & #15 above. What is the purpose of this survey question?;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;to a cap on max building size;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;I think non-complying dwellings (ie less than 10meters from the lake), should not be able to expand.;
- Yes, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;i would prefer this regulation but without any permitted increase in width. Would this also apply to building were the setback is increase, eg. if the building was less than 10, but increased to 25 in the rebuild the the 20-30 rules would apply;

No (TOTAL: 71/176) - No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.

No without comments (59/176)

No without comments (10/176)

- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Muldrew Lakes are not Georgian Bay. Our three lakes are small and narrow.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;I assume choice No above should read No, I would NOT meaning structures that are non-compliant should move towards compliance with any renovations or rebuilds.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Width should already be covered by the existing max levels and I support going back and up without added size restriction.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Large cottages that are already in the buffer would be allowed to expand by up to 70% with this method. There needs to be a more controlled expansion limit that is based on set maximums rather than percentages. ;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;this is all great when you use a 1000'sq but our cottage is only 600'sq which would only allow 750 . there need to something in this whole survey to at least allow up to 1200'sq for existing non conforming under 1000'sq> ;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;I am opposed to percentage increases. Just set the size and width limits.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;It should be based on percentage of frontage and lot area regardless of the size of the existing cottage.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Objections as stated above repeatedly.;
- No, I would be in support of implementing a set of lake-specific provisions regulating expansions/reconstruction of legal non-complying dwellings similar to those in the Township of Georgian Bay.;Disadvantages small cabin owners;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 3/176)

Other (TOTAL: 16/176)

- n/a;
- I don;t really know what I would prefer. ;
- Yes or No, Both answers are identical;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- Either a yes or no answer is in support of this question.;
- Questions are too cut and dried;
- nd there still needs to be a maximum gross floor area to avoid HUGE buildings;
- I believe that for existing legal non-conforming dwellings within 10 metres of the high water line, it is reasonable to limit the increase in width if a second story is permitted to allow for a reasonable maximum gross floor area.
- In general I support these restrictions, but there should be much further consideration for small cottages (ours is 600 sq ft, 20 ft wide) on an over 400 ft wide lot. Can this also be incorporated?;
- I like the idea in theory but 25% on 1000 sq ft is a bit small. I do believe that allowing additional square footage in many cases could result in less environmental impact still then clearing a new site for a completely new dwelling. This is dependent on a site specific discussion.;
- No, I would NOT be in support. Above option is misleading;
- Do not support the above ;
- Size should be restricted to same as rest of lake and water frontage width. Don't force an owner of a small cottage to restrictions based on the size of their existing cottage, same rules for everyone. Do a width of building up to a max. (e.g. 50') and factor in the width of the lot so doesn't overwhelm the lot.;
- Town regulations;
- I support the current regulations.;
- either way I answer this question means "I would be in support" which I'm not. Again, the Town of Gravenhurst already has regulations in place;
- Not in support;

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)?

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 124/176)

Yes without comment (112/176)

Yes with comments (12/176)

- Yes; Sleeping cabins should be assigned based on proportion of coverage. Cottages that have 0.5 acres should not be treated the same as cottages that are 50 acres. Number of sleeping cabins is less important than the total floor coverage. I see no reason to limit sleeping cabins. Larger area cottages could and should have any number of sleeping cabins, provided they do not burden septic or any other environmental considerations. A one bathroom 500 sq. ft. unit or a one bathroom 800 square foot unit will have no different impact on the environment. So it should not be based on area, but on # of bathrooms or any other specific concerning impacting lakeshore sustainability;
- Yes; If sleeping cabins have more than a 30 meter setback or are not substantially visible from the shore and the lot is big enough to still stay within the total square footage requirement, I think there should not be a size restriction for the sleeping cabins and two sleeping cabins should be permitted..;
- Yes; As long as the cabin(s) is 30 m from shore;
- Yes; blurb says 46.5 change says 45.6;
- Yes; New cabins should not be allowed in the buffer zone. ;
- Yes; We would like to see a provision allowing larger properties to have 2 larger bunkies, let's say total floor space of 800 sq ft;
- Yes; Sleeping "cabins" should also be allowed on top of garages (even if not on the "first" floor);
- Yes; This is of strong concern because sleeping cabins can easily be converted into freehold full cottages. I want this expansion provision to be further limited because Muldrew Lake is deeply endangered by excessive development. ;

- Yes;Should be dependent on land coverage;
- Yes;providing the purpose is non rental. this allows larger growing families to be up at the cottage together. To add a 2nd cabin to a cottage that it's owner is renting out is changing the cottage to a camp and that should concern the lake association.;
- Yes;We would support sleeping cabins up to 800 sq ft. ;
- Yes;would also suggest that a 2 story 250 sq ft option is better as it results in less lot coverage for the same increase in sleeping space;

No (TOTAL: 39/176)

No without comment (30/176)

No with comments (9/176)

- No;there should be no restrictions as long as 30 metres from the lake;
- No;Prefer that we do not increase the number of building per lot.;
- No;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No;Prefer one sleeping cabin;
- No;It is not in keeping with the way properties have historically been developed on Muldrew Lake. And 500 sqft can easily serve as a two bedroom cottage and NOT just a sleeping cabin! Dividing this into two smaller dwellings can have similar impact. If you are trying to restrict overdevelopment, why would you be encouraging people to multiple habitable structures on their property that could easily house another family(s) with kitchen etc!?? ;
- No;I don't think that it's at all historically typical to say that properties had multiple sleeping cabins although some had this setup. I don't understand how having 2 additional self contained small cottages on one property would lessen density and preserve the natural quality of the lake. Having the potential for multiple families on one property would only increase recreational and environmental stress!;
- No;We believe that there is a system in place already by applying to the committee of adjustments.;
- No;One sleeping cabin is enough to limit growth on Muldrew. The lake is already stressed. We need to protect it.;
- No;one is enough;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 2/176)

Other (TOTAL: 11/176)

- Not strongly against this, but more buildings even with smaller footprints could cause more environmental impact depending on site and potential to look even worse than one. The new 500sq ft cabin near Kerr Island is visually appealing. Would prefer that over seeing two half the size plus a cottage eventually.;
- I support the official plan.;

- two sleeping cabins at 500 sq ft. If this is allowed, I would imagine increases to main dwellings may not need to be as large;
- No comment;
- No room for comments;
- Yes I support so long as this only governs sleeping cabins with the 60m waterfront area. ;
- 2- Only if the setbacks for each are substantially more than 30 metres (i.e. behind the cottage; invisible to the lake;
- Depending on the property I feel that the number of sleeping cabins should not be limited to 2. ;
- Whatever the current by law permits;
- This should be decided by the town of Gravenhurst when applying for a building permit;
- Let the Town of Gravenhurst decide at the time of application decide if 2 sleeping cabins is more appropriate;

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?

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 156/176)

Yes without comments (144/176)

Yes with comments (12/176)

- Yes;Also zoning should be looked at to prevent commercialization of the lake.;
- Yes;The examples listed I would want more than just Boating Impact Study. Development of Crown land or Kerr island with a condominium development would be something much more impactful and hopefully addressed ;
- Yes;Recreational Carrying Capacity (RCC) should be applied to any vacant lot.;
- Yes;I'm much more concerned with allowing larger and many more high speed boats and the impact on our shoreline, wildlife and peace/quiet than I am about cottages too close to the shoreline. b ;
- Yes;What about the surfing wake boats, about 2 out of every 3 cottages has one, wakes are huge, every one comes to south lake for the large bay. Huge wakes all day are killing the shoreline and docks. Got rid of our boat for even with mooring whips it would hit the dock.;
- Yes;I don't understand this question. You have already indicated that Muldrew's 400 dwellings is significantly over capacity (should be 160 max). Why would building additional lots / condos even be allowed?;
- Yes;Is there already something in place that would require any Impact Study (boating, roads, schools?) to be done for development of this nature?;
- Yes;These studies would probably be required by the town for projects of this magnitude.;
- Yes;We should be making it as difficult as possible to have any property developed into multi unit occupancies.;
- Yes;I think this is absolutely necessary to stop any more over crowding on the lake. We already cannot kayak on weekends;
- Yes;vacant lots should be re-purchased by the crown and remain vacant or become public use;

- Yes;I don't see any advantage to allowing increased development through the use of crown land for this purpose. I also don't like the idea of allowing an increase to the inn. Our lake has become too crowded.;

No (TOTAL: 14/176)

No without comment (14/176)

Other (TOTAL: 6/176)

- Water craft regulation is a Federal responsibility under Transport Canada. There are no regulations now limiting the number or type of water craft that can be owned by property owners. A Boating Impact Study would be unenforceable at the municipal level. I understand the concern for future potential multi unit residential development on the lake, but suspect that it would have to be dealt with through zoning regulations. ;
- how about no 6000lb wake boats and only one per cottage and one 9.9 or under ?????;
- I would not be in support of any further multiple residential development;
- I would not be in support of multiple residential development. ;
- No room for comments;
- We would need further information to understand what the results could actually accomplish.;

QUESTION 21

Are you in support of applying the Muldrew-specific provisions listed above 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%)
-

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 127/176)

Yes without comments (122/176)

Yes with comments (5/176)

- Yes;excluding dormers seems pointless, Extra natural light is an asset;
- Yes;Again due to narrowness of lake. What about existing boathouses?;
- Yes;Be sure to include seasonal boat ports - framed structures with removable roofs;
- Yes;90 metres is pretty small - don't want boathouses cheek by jowl - incredibly visible;
- Yes;both the plan and the by-law should include boat ports;

No (TOTAL: 36/176)

No without comments (29/176)

No with comments (7/176)

- No;I think boathouses are part of the atmosphere and esthetic of the Muskokas, I;m not keen on over restrictive policies on them. It's anal and annoying.r;
- No;This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- No;Boatports and Boathouses are very different in the current bylaw and need to continue that way;
- Current bylaws are too restrictive - I don't think narrow channels (which Muldrew is mostly) should not be prohibited from having boathouses, just limit them to no living accommodations or rooftop patios and square footage.;No;
- No;We need a better definition of boatport. Are canopies included as boatports? Definitions vary from any covered boat area, to built structure, to permanent structure with foundation.;

- No;I would need a more specific definition of what constitutes a Boat Port. Are canopies Boat Ports for example?;
- No;Is the image shown actually considered storage or a building? I would interpret the original language to be something with walls and actual storage on the inside like a traditional boathouse. There's multiple new open structures similar to image in the past year with patriots on the top, is this what we're trying to limit? And if so, is there a reason? I have answered no due to the uncertainty on this.;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 4/176) (blank)

Other (TOTAL: 9/176)

- Island properties require boat access so I believe they should have more leniency in boating, docking and boat coverage options;
- We would need further clarification to what a boatport is NOT. Is a boat awing a boatport? We do not think a boat awing should require the same provisions as a boathouse.;
- unsure what is being proposed;
- No room for comments;
- I am against this type of development as it ruins the views;
- the Town of Gravenhurst should be including boat ports in their zoning bylaws;
- Yes if the definition of boatport means covered permanent structure and does not include boat slips, covered lifts, etc...;
- we have a few that have been added to our lake in the past 10 years. most of us just figured they knew someone at the town and got away with it. sadly \$ talks ;
- I support the current regulations.;

QUESTION 22

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

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%)**
-

BREAKDOWN

Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake (TOTAL: 115/176)

10 metres without comment (105/176)

10 metres with comments (10/176)

- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;Needs an additional provision for areas of shallow shoreline water
- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;Don't limit narrow channels, let them have the same restrictions as others but then keep the lake projection measurement low.;
- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;!d prefer even smaller projection limits;
- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;This is an issue I do agree the association should address to the town of Gravenhurst as it is building in the water.;
- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;We would support a smaller limit. 5m ;
- Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;should we allowing any more new boathouses or boatports that project into the lake - that might be a better question ;
- Would prefer that there be no new boathouses. Shoreline integrity is ruined by these buildings;Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;
- I don't want to see boathouses or boatports. ; Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;

- We would support no boat houses on the lake; Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;
- no new boathouses or boatports; Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 10 metres (32.8 ft) into the lake;
-

Boathouses and boatports should be limited to project a maximum of 12 metres (39.4 ft) into the lake (TOTAL: 22/176)

12 metres without comment (22/176)

I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports (TOTAL: 31/176)

Do not support without comment (26/176)

Do not support with comments (5/176)

- I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports; This topic should follow the existing and future recommendations from the professionals at the Town of Gravenhurst.;
- I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports; I think there are properties that would need to project a boathouse/port 15m to have the depth necessary. I don't see the need to fight about 10 or 15 ft. By the way, the zoning bylaw doesn't seem to prevent boathouses in narrow parts of the lake.;
- I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports; I believe you are mistaken? There is already a specific provision to limit the projection of boathouses in the Town of Gravenhurst 5.2.4.4 (ii) ;
- I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports; Please check your facts, the current by-law already limits boat houses and ports to 15m.;
- I do not support a lake-specific provision for the projection of boathouses and boatports; The current provision is only a few metres greater.;

Unanswered (TOTAL: 2/176)

Other (TOTAL: 6/176)

- As in similar comments made previously, limits should be less arbitrary and more relational. projection of a boathouse should have more to do with the ration of the boathouse to the waterbody than a standalone number;
- 32ft is a lot of depth for a boat house, I'd like to see it smaller, possibly 8m or 26.2 ft, thats a good size boat for Muldrew;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- not sure;
- No room for comments

- another example of "you have no right to add another level of government to the lake.;

QUESTION 23

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

TOTAL

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

BREAKDOWN

Yes (TOTAL: 100/176)

Yes without comment (94/176)

Yes with comment (6/176)

- Yes;SER should not be required for permitted additions or sleeping cabins;
- Yes;There needs to be clarity on what size constitutes a "large sleeping cabin";
- Yes;Concern re integrity of those doing S E R, not being on the payroll of developer;
- Yes;It will be necessary to define a clear line on what is minor. Ideally it is defined as the incremental area to be impacted in the zone within 30m of the lake so that it is not required if people keep to the setback. This becomes more important without Site Plan Approval option.;
- Yes;So long as the site evaluation is unbiased and works with the owners to find the best possible solution;
- It is not clear who receives the site evaluation report. If it is the Town then my yes choice stands. If it is to the Board who would then have to consider its impact and appeal to the Board or to the owner I would vote No. The Board of the day should not have to negotiate or legislate the findings.;Yes;

No (TOTAL: 62/176)

No without comment (50/176)

No with comment (12/176)

- No;At the lake yes but not when the set back is met.;
- No;There should be and already are guidelines to follow. Crowding minor construction projects with red tape is not helping the environment. If criteria exist for safe and respectful development there is no need to reinvent the wheel each time.;
- No;I would want "major" to have a full detailed list of what this includes. My cottage burns down and I want to rebuild, does this count? I support for new builds, but would need definition of major including what a sleeping cabin vs large sleeping cabin is.;

- No;should only apply to multiple residents, expansion of campground or building of condos;
- No;a responsible builder and owner should know what they are doing;
- No;I think this would be considered overreach and unreasonable next, you'll be telling us what colour tent we can put up there has to be limits;
- No;In the wrong hands such a report could be used to halt or make onerous the development of all sorts of things. I don't trust who does it and how it is handled by the city. ;
- No;A new cottage is not a major project as long as we limit its size, e.g. 3000 sq ft;
- No;A site evaluation is already required from the Town if you cannot meet the current requirements. Why do we need more?;
- No;a site evaluation report is already required if you can't meet the current requirements. Why should MLCA require a site evaluation report regardless?;
- No;This should definitely not be a requirement. If a property owner wishes to enhance their reasons for locating a structure in a certain area and feels that this might help them, then they are free to have this Site Evaluation Report done if they choose.;
- No;Just another level of unneeded bureaucracy and financial and time burden. I'm sure your consultant would love to sneak this one in. An SER might be a good tool for someone to have the option to commission for a minor variance hearing, but let's leave it at that.;

Other (TOTAL: 14/176)

- I support the idea in theory but I think the cost of the site evaluation seems to be very high. I would support this idea if it was for new builds only (not re-building of an existing structure on the same footprint).;
- Define 'minor renovations'. Does that include additions? Up to how many sq feet?;
- Yes if total size of development including expansions to exceed 3500 SF;
- Only "net new" ie. Not a rebuild on/near same footprint;
- Earlier drafts left the decision of 'minor' to Town officials. It should be defined clearly in the Zoning;
- Need better definition of what would be a MAJOR development vs a MINOR development;
- This issue, because of its complexity, requires more public discussion than has taken place to date.;
- No room for comments;
- not sure;
- Not sure what is required for this kind of report, ie: skillsets, costs, etc;
- Yes so long as this is constrained to development within the 60m waterfront area of the property. ;
- Whatever the current by-law allows;
- Requirement already exists;
- that is how the town treats minor development. stop your micro management behaviours;

QUESTION 24

Other comments or suggestions regarding the draft lake plan proposed.

- While it is important to provide rules which support the "lake specific" topography such as narrow channels, I would prefer not to have significant restrictions on currently legally allowed changes which may impact property values.
- What a waste of money this rabbit hole has been.
- This is a critical moment in the development of Muldrew Lakes and hopefully this plan will give some teeth to preventing building that is out of character with the lake.
- A lake plan revision should be sensitive to rebuilding existing cottages on legacy properties, many of which reflect early or historic development. Such properties and generational families are part of the Muldrew Lake community, and draconian restrictions harm the long term social fabric. We agree that new cottages on vacant land should be restricted, but onerous restrictions on long term cottages that need a rebuild should be recognized with a "not withstanding clause"
- Nature needs to be front and centre vs development. It is a small, narrow lake. We need to maintain shore line, views, nature.
- Restricting wakeboard boating going forward.
- I believe all cottagers want what is best for the sustainability and common enjoyment of the lake. The town already has bylaws and criteria in place, so I am not sure why the lake needs to impose additional by laws. We should be trusting the people in charge of assessing and drafting these laws to be doing their jobs, or hold them accountable if they are not. The cottagers association should not be in the law drafting business. If there is any abuse of current laws, or laws that no longer seem relevant, the MLCA should be working in conjunction with the township to review and change these laws, as they pertain to the greater and broader community. I think doubling up the efforts of the township is not in keeping with the mandate. We should all find ways to be respectful of one another within the boundaries of the regulations, and review these regulations with the appropriate channels.
- 'Lake capacity' is greatly affected by the lake shape. The simplistic current method is not useful. Long and irregular lakes have much longer shorelines than round lakes and can permit more capacity without crowding.
- I do not think a Lake Association should get involved with organizing and submitting rules over and above what already exists through the Municipalities. This is NOT the role of a Lake Association as this will directly affect the value of our collective properties whether negative or positive.
- we believe that cottage owners who do not currently comply with the proposed lake specific policies should not have the right to vote on the plan. We believe that this proposed plan is in many ways punitive to the cottage owners who have not redeveloped and favourable to those who already have. We believe that the current zoning bylaw adequately address the concerns raised by the MLCA.
- Yes. When we speak to other lake owners it is becoming evident that many people are not aware of this plan or how it will affect them. Some of these proposals will significantly impact people's cottage investments. The number of people to date that have voted on these proposals (based on attendance numbers) do not even amount to a quarter of the lake residents, The

validity of this representation is not acceptable in our eyes and should not be accepted as a majority by the Town of Gravenhurst. Additionally, it has been suggested that there are a number of people pushing for these new regulations that actually have cottage properties that do not conform to the above-mentioned proposals. It is our opinion that these individuals should abstain from voting and /or promoting these changes. We feel that there are already sufficient measures in place to deal with development on the lake through the Town of Gravenhurst. The proposals represent a very black and white approach to deal with a great many gray areas.

- Thank you for all the work you're doing on this... it's VERY much appreciated!
- I'll take this opportunity again to commend those who worked so long and hard on the lake plan. While I hope the changes made in this survey address the concerns sufficiently of the cottagers who objected to the first plan, there will always be blowback. Hoping their numbers are reduced now.
- I believe the Lake Association should focus its efforts on maintaining lake access at the two landings with docks that are in good repair to ensure everyone has safe access to the lake, and to also focus its efforts on building and maintaining community and safety on the lake. I am concerned that the time, energy and money devoted to the ongoing issue of the Lake Plan over the last number of years has been a major distraction for the Lake Association, and has led to divisiveness within the lake community.
- Thanks for allowing me to complete this survey and I think the MLCA board is doing a great job.
- questions presume all lots are the same size, I prefer that % of lot sq footage be the criteria for size of dwelling, and enhancements. When it comes to non-conforming enhancements, ie within 30m, I agree with a gradual dwelling size increases as you go further back from the water however, the width increase limits proposed could be based on setback minimums instead of fixed percentages.
- Thanks for your hard work on this project.
- I would like a septic inspection done for each cottage measured By water quality at the cottage location. We also need a blue algae plan
- Very well done!
- The Gravenhurst Official Plan 2009 Section D17.3.1 restricts development on Muldrew Lakes to that which is modest and reasonable in keeping with the character of the lake. Most respondents to the MLCA 2020 Survey defined modest and reasonable as 2500 to 3500 square feet. Yet the proposed Lake Plan last summer used as small as 1,000 square feet. ?????
- Our cottage is less than 15 meters from the shoreline. It is only 1000 sq ft. I am vehemently opposed to being capped at 1000 sq ft or on;y adding 25% lateral expansion. As a cottage owner since 1999, you are penalizing any opportunity of expanding my cottage in any manner to support my growing family by adding more bedrooms and living space. Building 30 meters back is cost prohibitive and adding a 500 sq ft bunkie is not the answer.
- Common sense and preservation is really what we should keep in mind when it comes to the future of Muldrew
- Thanks for putting this together.
- Keep up the good work.

- Recreational Carrying Capacity (RCC) should be applied to any vacant lot. With a current 160%, using RCC, of 240 cottages over the limit when the RCC is 160 the lake is way too developed and any more development is going to definitely have a detrimental impact. We are already seeing this with blue green algae outbreak this year. Enough is enough, we should not allow any development on vacant lots - full stop. In addition, any executive on the MLCA Lake Plan who owns an existing lot should NOT be allowed to vote on this issue - it is a clear conflict of interest.
- No. Thank you
- Great job with the survey!
- You might explain that the Board has decided to hold a vote on the Lake Plan proposal this year and that only MLCA members will be allowed to vote so we get a maximum membership in 2023.
- This should continue to be the responsibility of the town of Gravenhurst. The MLCA although well intended does not have the expertise, knowledge and understanding of the well-educated and licensed professionals who are responsible for planning.
- Preparing this survey clearly took a lot of work and I thank the Lake Plan Committee for all its efforts.
- I do not support a Muldrew specific plan
- We would like to see the wording modified to include more scenarios such as our own. We would suggest that allowed gross floor space for the total of all buildings should be calculated as a percentage of the lot size. The proposed plan does not appear to take into consideration larger lots which could very easily accommodate additional buildings, specifically a bunkie, with the required setback.
- Blue Green Algae bloom last fall is indisputable indication of poor management and over-development of lake (2022). All property values fall and recreational suitability is reduced. Serious limitations of building/expanding must be enacted
- 1. You are making it too complicated. 2. Treat those with existing cottages within buffer to have same limits as new cottages. 3. Don't restrict boathouses as much. 4. Change buffer to 20 m not 30 m (which is what Town is doing anyhow - e.g. Litterst application).
- Thank you for your work in compiling this important survey.
- Thank you for all the work done on this. I am a big supporter of taking steps to preserve the ecology of the lake. I am generally in favour of the plan so long as the limits are intended to be for the 60m waterfront areas of a property. I have 13+ acres of land of which 1/4 is more than 60m away from the shoreline. I don't have any plans to develop the land and I currently maintain it as a managed forest. However I believe it is over reaching and beyond the scope of protecting the ecology and aesthetics of the lake to apply these restrictions to those parts of my property.
- Instead of wasting time and money on Lake Plan should focus on
 1. Attending town meetings requiring building variances
 2. Saving lake shoreline from wake boats
 3. As a board of directors of MCLA you do not have a mandate from the majority of cottage owners on the lake for a lake specific building code i.e. Lake Plan.

- A key question for me that I think should be an explicit planning factor is what is visible from the lake. Boathouses are inherently visible; if sleeping cabins are at the back of the lot, they are not visible at all.

After all, why come to a lake that looks like an etobicoke suburb?

- Those that build and do not follow the permit requirements such as size or set backs should not be able to pay their way out thru a fine, tear the building down. The rich should not be allowed to do what they want, paying a fine to get what they feel they deserve.
- Of the 400 or so properties on the lake, only a very small percentage was represented at the open house meetings during the summer of 2022. The second open house was held so close to the end of the cottage season that there was not sufficient opportunity to organize additional discussion inclusive of the many who had not yet participated in the open house discussions to date. The open house meeting that was held virtually in November was very biased in its presentation and structure in favour of the committee's proposals, allowed for very little open discussion at the end, had at least one technical communication issue as an important viewpoint was being expressed, was scheduled very late, and did not attract a significant amount of participation among property owners on the lake. The survey that participants were told would be conducted in the January to April period was to be a "simple survey", with a very limited number of questions. By contrast, the questions in this survey are many, very complicated, can be interpreted in different ways, and deserve more public discussion and a greater rate of participation. Moving this process forward over the non-cottage season makes it very difficult to promote increased participation and discussion. This was made all the more challenging by the refusal of the MLCA Board to either share addresses of members for the purpose of communication by interested parties or to distribute communications on their behalf. In late August, 2022, when I visited many property owners by boat, I found that most were unaware of the impact that the Board's proposals might have and that they did not have much understanding of the issues. This survey should not be relied upon as having been completed by a well-informed majority of property owners, who had the opportunity for full and frank discussion.
- A very clear survey with good explanations for most questions. Well done
- Posted Boat speed limits in the narrows and sensitive loon nesting areas.
- Thanks for all your work on this
- Lots .
- I support the general approach of stipulating quite stringent limits on further development on Muldrew Lake. The lake is seriously threatened, as is demonstrated by the appearance of blue-green algae blooms this year. Measures that would limit and regulate the pressure on the lake included within this survey appear modest and should be strengthened. Similarly regulation of motorized boat numbers and size is an example of legislation that should be strengthened. Rights of individual property owners for development and expansion of their properties should be balanced with collective rights of all Muldrew Lake property owners for a sustainable, healthy future of this very sensitive and arguably already-overdeveloped lake. Strong public legislation is essential in order to preserve the future of the lake.
- I am concerned that so much of the survey looks at percentage increases of size, width etc. when this approach is a) unfair to the small existing places and b) creates non-linear and arbitrary steps

in permitted development. As I have said before, a lot of thought went into the width limits as a simple tool that would have controlled size if it had been reinforced with OP policies to that effect and a consistent application.

- I think that water quality is a major concern and the lake plan should have specifics about septic systems and the elimination of outhouses and grey water systems.
- I am very concerned about the degradation of Muldrew Lake. I'll support all efforts to reduce the human impact. I'd strongly recommend an audit of non-complying septic systems.
- I think that all of the proposed changes are short sighted, restrictive and unfair to the cottage owners on the lake. Every home owner should have autonomy over their own personal property.
- Given the overbuilding on Muldrew lakes I would encourage further development be limited to existing dwellings. Water quality and green algae are indicators of stress on our waterbody. I am more concerned about the environmental impact than the design of the dwellings
- We may need to limited the types of watercraft allowed on the lake. Every year the lake becomes more and more unsafe. There is a clear lack of respect on the water, even when individuals are swimming or paddle boarding. I have spoken to lake patrol a few times and it's clear that the ministry does not want to put up signs or regulate our lake because it's too small. It is very disheartening to know that nothing will be done unless someone is actually killed (which has been happening on the Muskoka lakes). What can be done to prevent this type of occurrence? I'm all for having fun on the lake. I just want people to be safe as they "play."

On a side note, I'm interested to know what the percentage allowance of Air B&B's/rental properties is on Muldrew. It seems evident that there a quite a few rental properties. Does the lake have a cap on the amount of properties that can be registered as rental properties? I ask because limiting this number may help with the negative environmental impacts. I gather this is a bold statement, but we know people treat properties and land differently when they do not own them.

I understand the need and value for this survey, but what I do not understand is the fact that it is clear that Muldrew is already significantly overpopulated and that the environment is being negatively impacted. Why would the township even consider allowing additional dwellings to be built of crown land? How would this help preserve Muldrew Lake and it's surrounding environment? This seems highly contradictory and quite frankly absurd. Now I maybe shouldn't say this as its somewhat political, but if people are looking to live in the city with condos and large dwellings, then let them live in the city. We should not allow the township to be influenced by individuals with deep pockets. Lets stand our ground and set a good example for all lake associations.

- I do not want a lake plan submitted. This plan is stepping over the lines on several points. The plan is setting up rules and regulations that remind me of a condo corporation document that trys to address everyone's wishes and if you don't like the rules you will be asked to leave the building. I have been on the lake since 1960. our family built here in 1932. I don't want to sell because we have this small sample of our lake inhabitants that want to over control "our Lake" and take over the local bylaw department's job because things are not perfect in their opinion. There are 400 cottages on this lake and only about 200 members of the association of which maybe 1/4 -1/2 want this plan to go forward.

- Not to mention a lake plan such as this, if put in place with the town will kill the resale value just as a condo sale is a hard sell unless you are just buying to rent it out and then the ridiculous rules don't effect you personally. I have no plans to ever sell and I don't rent it out so let's stop the building code attacks. My family has always been a member of the association and happy with the efforts and events over the years. This year the only reason to join is so I can have my vote of NO when the time comes. I think the association will see many members and non members join this year just for the NO vote opportunity.
- As stated in question 7, I definitely believe in a policy that limits the maximum size of cottages. However, I have concerns about a full "SET of lake-specific policies and provisions", as there are likely several policies that I disagree with. Only the policies that receive significant majority support by all property owners (not just MLCA members) should be considered.
- I very strongly support regulating development of lakeside properties, but feel that special consideration should be given to very small existing cottages which would be adversely affected by exclusive use of percentage limits.
- Thank you for all the hard work in updating the lake plan. I think that some boaters on the lake need to be more careful with their wake when close to shore and near smaller boats. I don't know if this is within the scope of the lake plan.
- I feel the Association should have no input on the cottage owners building requirements. This lake plan has been difficult for cottage owners to realize the full effects it would have on their properties. The meetings have been not known to all cottage owners, have been cancelled last minute or held virtually in off cottage season. The virtual meeting left very little time for open discussion and was limited more as the association would not share all opinions. This also was brought forward when on the facebook page discussion was not permitted.
- I strongly feel the Town of Gravenhurst has been diligent in keeping up to date with their standards for building permits. They have regulations already in place for all areas this survey covers.

The Association should be focused on current septic systems on the lake. Encouraging the Town of Gravenhurst to enforce their mandate of pumping septic systems every 5 years. Inspecting septic systems and enforcing cottage owners to replace them if necessary. Educate cottage owners on septic friendly products.

I strongly feel that Muldrew Lake does not need a Lake Plan.

- I'm very concerned that the timing of this survey (the winter & very early spring) while many property owners are not at their properties, it doesn't provide cottagers the opportunity to discuss the pros & cons amongst themselves. With the MLCA cancelling the August in person meeting & by spending the vast majority of the November meeting reading the revised plan which the attendees had already read limited the opportunity to ask questions & when questions were asked, they deferred the majority of the questions to be answered individually off line. Which again, limited the communication to others.

I know from experience, the Town of Gravenhurst already has regulations in place & are very diligent in any deviation from those regulations. The Town of Gravenhurst continues to revise their regulations for the good of the Muskoka Lakes & I strongly believe the MLCA does not need to impose their own regulations.

- We are strong proponents of maintaining the health of our lake and its surroundings. We do not feel that a Lake Plan is a necessary component to maintain this. We feel that there are many bylaws already in place that will keep our lake in its present state. Cottages built 100 years ago should not be considered the pattern of development of the lake. The majority of the cottages and development of the lake was done around the 60's and 70's. Many many of these cottages are built within the 30m zone. Does this mean that this should be the "visual" lake character? Should we be considering that this is the visual impact that we want for our lake? Who is to decide that? Everyone has their own opinions.

We should not be capping the size of a cottage. Times change. The first cottages that were built were considered to be adequate to those who built them. The next generation of cottages became a bit bigger etc etc. When should we stop or do we even have the right to ask that? How would our present selves feel if the cap had been put on cottage size in the 1930's according to what they felt at the time was a modest and reasonable size? Impacting the shoreline is indeed a concern. We should be addressing this issue as it relates to a percentage of the amount of shoreline that each property currently possesses - not as a percentage of the size of the existing dwelling on it. We currently have zoning in place that restricts a new build in terms of distance from the water, setbacks, heights etc. as it relates to their lots.

It appears that the main concerns for preparing the Lake Plan are water quality and visual impact. Currently we are allowed to build many structures at the shoreline including dock, deck, sauna, pumphouse, gazebo and a shoreline storage building. Would this not affect the visual impact of the shoreline much more than a cottage built back from the water? Would these structures at the shoreline have more impact on water quality than a cottage built back from the water? We should not be focusing on the cottage as much as we are! The immediate shoreline is much more important for visual as well as ecological impact!

As well, as we previously mentioned in one of our answers, a sleeping cabin being 500sqft can be much more than just a sleeping cabin. That is the size of many of the first cottages built on the lake. An average bedroom is 140sqft. It would be my assumption that a sleeping cabin of 500sqft could easily be accommodation for another family, which would seem to contradict the whole Recreational Carrying Capacity concerns for our lake.

It was our understanding that the 2020 survey could have been answered by multiple people from one property? Could this skew the results one way or another?

When undertaking to complete this present survey, it was no where near the 20 minutes or 50 minutes that was suggested it should take. After consulting with other cottage owners to discuss the questions, reviewing the current Gravenhurst zoning bylaw to see how it relates, revisiting the past surveys and researching various parts of questions to ensure our comprehension was correct, we ended up putting in a several hours of our time. Being well versed in this industry and very familiar with zoning bylaws, the OBC, as well as having been through the Committee of Adjustments process professionally on several occasions, we are very concerned that many of these questions in this survey are extremely leading questions and that the average cottager would be inclined to think that answering "Yes" would be in their best interests without understanding the true impact of their answers.

Although we understand and appreciate the efforts that are being made to protect our lake with this Lake Plan, we are not entirely convinced that it is a necessary undertaking to maintain the quality of life on Muldrew Lake.

- I must say that I appreciate the efforts and good intentions of the Lake Plan committee and I consider many of them friends, so I truly hope that I don't offend anyone with my comments but:

1) You have not achieved anywhere close to a consensus of 51% of the cottages and properties on the lake so I would really question the validity of this exercise. It can be argued that everyone has had the opportunity to respond but a lack of response can't be considered support for the Plan. In fact I think the opposite is true.

2) The lack of responses could be partially due to the fact that to truly understand and respond to the survey in more than just a superficial way, it takes a lot longer than the 20 to 50 minutes suggested. I have a degree in architecture and have run a design/ build company for over 35 years, and have represented clients at various CofAs over 30 times and it took me hours to research the existing by-laws and how they pertained to the survey questions.

3) In many cases the survey questions were leading or at the very least biased. I would be very surprised if you don't get the responses that you are looking for.

4) As with the last time a Lake Plan was produced it turned out to be very divisive (I already feel bad about writing this) and not very effective. As I recall when the final plan was put together it was less restrictive than the then current zoning by-laws. Also very costly, and seemed to result in a lot of cottagers dropping out of the MLCA.

5) My understanding, and I could be wrong, is that this latest attempt at a Lake Plan is not being funded by the MLCA but instead by fund raising by a private group of cottagers. If this is true then to me it supports my assertion that it really isn't supported by a majority of the lake.

6) To be clear, as per my answers to the survey, I am not opposed to logical restrictions to what can and can't be built on Muldrew. However I believe they should be logical and equitable, therefore should be based on lot size and frontage. Trying to restrict things based solely on what currently exists is just nimbyism, and not necessarily helpful for the lake.

Having been a Muldrew Lake cottager for 55 years, my wife and I have both served on the MLCA board running regattas, benthic testing, the fireworks and ski clinics. Our kids spent their summers on Muldrew. Needless to say we are invested in the quality of environmental, social and the aesthetics that makes our lake so special, it's just that not everyone agrees on what that means...

- This survey covers a very complex and detailed account of building requirements that I suspect many would not have taken the time to digest nor do I feel I fully appreciate. Overall I believe the building requirements should be done on a case by case basis with the town. If precedents have been set on the lake I'm not sure how the people that are benefiting from those precedents are able to then limit others from the same. General rules around ensuring large buildings are not visible from the lake and the care of the shoreline are critical...but other details feel unfair.
- I find the whole process that the association has implemented regarding the proposed lake plan to be flawed and biased. I have attended the annual meetings for many years and note that the same small group of activist cottagers are pushing for a plan that significantly limits the development of cottages on the lake. The association has used the Covid years when there was

a lack of cottagers at their cottagers to push through its agenda at full speed to the detriment of cottage owners. At the last annual meeting there were many cottagers who did not support the proposed plan and based on discussions and surveys i have been involved with from other cottagers on the lake, it appears that the association does not have the support of the majority of its members let alone the majority of cottagers on the lake. When issues were raised at the annual meeting and recent zoom meeting about the actions of the association reducing the value of cottagers - a very simple answer was provided that the association spoke with an agent regarding a lake that imposed a similar plan and it didn't suffer any loss. Before any plan is put in place: (i) a very detailed study must be imposed to determine the economic impact on the cottagers (and not a simple call to a real estate agent), (ii) the plan should be approved by 66.6% of the cottagers on the lake - not merely approved by the board of the association (which is bad governance), (iii) the association members (board members who support the plan), should be required to advise the cottagers/association to the extent that their respective properties have grand-fathered boat houses, cabins and any variances that they have applied for in the past to renovate or develop their footprint and (iv) if their cottages have outhouses on them which may cause impact green algae, etc. The association advised that protecting the lake from an environmental perspective was its goal, all new builds have better septic systems and energy saving/green technology which benefit the lake and the environment then older cottages. Implementing a plan that limits development will cause more environmental damage that moving forward without a plan. If the association wants to take action for positive environmental impact: (i) have them implement a plan requiring cottages with outhouses on their properties to have them inspected to ensure that they are not negatively impacting the lake and if they are, take action to remedy the impact and (ii) have all cottages on the lake (or at least association members) agree to have their septic systems up to a set code and have their septic tanks pumped on a regular basis.

Your lake plan does also not address unique properties (like mine) that have significant shorelines and acreage that would currently allow for the construction of a much larger cottage than what your current plan allows for, which was contemplated when the property was purchased. Your proposed lake plan punishes those cottagers who purchased their property at significant cost and with the long term intention of building a new cottage that would provide for the owners children and grandchildren to enjoy the cottage for future generations. All cottagers on the lake love Muldrew and want to see it loved, taken care of and available for all future generations. The associations actions do not take into account the unique nature of each cottage and cottager and are trying to implement a plan that will significantly limit the development potential of most of the existing cottages on the lake. The proposed plan will merely result in cottagers selling their properties and moving to lakes that do not have activist lake plans vs. developing or renovating them and staying on Muldrew or leaving their properties as is and not implementing better technologies (septic, energy saving, green, etc.) which new cottages or which renovated cottages would benefit from.

- The space provided for "other:" comments is restricted to only a very few words. There are a zillion descriptions of possibilities with basically only space for a yes or no. My message is that there should be a much greater opportunity for open discussion among all cottagers which is now impossible.
- Water quality is of most importance. Septic system inspections (real ones) regularly to ensure there is no seepage into the lake or harm the environment. Any other ways to keep our water safe should be addressed. Discouragement of any large dwellings with multiple bedrooms and

bathrooms and docking which will be used as an Inn or Airbnb should be restricted (other than the existing Indian Landing).

- Thanks for all the hard work put into this survey. My family has been enjoying Muldrew since 1898. The sixth generation is now coming. I hope its unique character can be maintained for generations to come.
- Secondary dwellings should be permitted on lots bigger than an acre. (With limits to combined size)

We would support enforced speed limits on the lake with the goal of reducing speeds of boats, wake of boats, and noise of boats.

- The overarching question of the survey as stated on the first page is to see if respondents would like to see shoreline development regulated through the Gravenhurst Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws. With all due respect to the individuals who put an undeniably large amount of time and effort into the Lake Plan draft proposals, we respectfully disagree with the overall intent of the lake-specific policies being proposed. It is our firm belief that regulations already exist within the Gravenhurst Official Plan and Zoning Bylaws. We are not in favour of the Lake Plan Committee submitting any further restrictions to what currently exists on our behalf as property owners and members of the Lake Community.

There appears to be two guiding intentions with the Lake Plan surveys (2023, 2020)

i) preserving the health of the lake and ii) preserving the visual character of the lake.

With regards to preserving the health of the lake, we feel the current zoning bylaws for construction/reconstruction are sufficient at this time. We also perceive an issue in the survey's proposals for dwelling size expansion, as lot frontage was never a consideration in establishing new restrictive provisions. Any wording that limits expansion to a percentage of the existing dwelling is not acceptable in our opinion as this in theory puts a smaller cottage that could potentially be on a larger frontage lot at a disadvantage in comparison to a larger existing dwelling that could be on a much smaller frontage lot.

As property owners who want to protect and grow their investment, it is our belief that adding restrictions on dwelling sizes in the manner in which is outlined in several questions could potentially have financial consequences. We don't support a group advocating for the kinds of changes that could impact people's property as an investment and/or any future development.

We also believe that the health of the lake revolves around so many factors. In fact, a "large" new-build cottage/septic would have less of a negative environmental impact on the health of our lake than a smaller, older cottage with an ageing, ill-maintained septic system or leaching pit. Bigger does not always mean bad.

With redevelopment bylaws already in place to protect the shoreline buffer area, any attempt to restrict cottage size further seems more of an attempt to control Lake Character.

Lake Character was a section all its own in the 2020 survey and it was a bit concerning as to the intent of those questions. We are not multi-generational owners on Muldrew but having enjoyed the lake for over 40 years we are not new to the lake either. We have seen the lake grow and evolve like all things do with time. The beauty in life lies in embracing the diversity in life. If we

were to offer an opinion or a description as to what the Lake Character is, it would be one of immense diversity and if there's a lake character to be preserved it should be a reflection of this diversity. A boat ride from Indian Landing to South Lake will illustrate this. From the charming history of the Red Door to the exquisite architecture of the Hurst's cottage. There are cottages that are tucked away behind the foliage while others show off their beauty from the lakeside, all offering their own unique level of grandeur or charm. From log cabin style cottages to A frames, from cottages with beaches to those perched high up on the rocks. There are stretches of shoreline that offer the beauty of nature and there are stretches of shoreline that bustle with lake activity and remind us what cottage life is all about. Muldrew has a diverse character that should be embraced and not controlled.

- Evidence of algae blooms show be a warning sign for all of us. an unusable lane will have far worse effects on our property values than any bylaw limiting cottage size! It is time to put the brakes on and look after our lake!
- I don't think there is a need for a lake plan and don't need to modify something we don't need
- 1) there were no comments in here about septic system or other activities that could introduce foreign substances into the lake, in addition to the setback for buildings should there be stricter rules about this?

2) there was nothing in here about about boating activities - where is that considered - both for safety and environmental concerns
- I wanted to say that I appreciate that the committee is being responsive to concerns. I know that there will be recognition that people's responses might be influenced by their own situations- those who have large and/or nicely renovated cottages already may be able to say they don't support additional changes to other lots because they are happy with their own property. Those who were hoping to do a renovation in the next ten years will be very adamant that they should be allowed to continue with these plans. We all, likely, want to preserve the natural beauty of the lake and ensure it can support a healthy ecosystem and that together, we can make sure that we all enjoy the lake for years to come. However, we also don't want to place those with aging/small buildings at a huge disadvantage when we recognize there are ways to allow them to make the desired changes with minimal impact on the environment.