



The Corporation of the Township of Perry

MINUTES
PUBLIC MEETING
Zoning By-law Amendment

Lot 21 and Part of Lot 22, Concession 5, in the Township of Perry
878 Hwy 592

Wednesday October 1st, 2025
Municipal Office and Electronic Attendance
(1695 Emsdale Road, Emsdale, ON)

Any and all Minutes are to be considered Draft until approved by Council at a
Regular Meeting of Council

In Attendance:

Council Chambers:

Councillors: Joe Lumley, Margaret Ann
MacPhail, and Paul Sowrey
Beth Morton, Clerk-Administrator
Kim Seguin, Treasurer-Tax Collector
Randy McLaren, Working Roads Supervisor
Douglas Holland, Fire Chief/CEMC
Jordan Fraser, Planning and Development
Coordinator Intern
Leah Perron, CEO Perry Township Public
Library

Absent:

Mayor Norm Hofstetter

Electronic Attendance:

Councillor Jim Cushman

Members of the Public:

Sharon Laing
Marilyn Rider
Donna Gallant
Ken Core
Melissa Markham
Seaton Crawford
Carl Grin
Adam Grin
Dan Laing
Dave Laing
Dawn Mashinter
Wayne Mashinter
Brian Isard
Grace Isard
Tanya Christie
Wayne Simpson, Tulloch Engineering

Declaration of Pecuniary Interest

Nil

Resolution No. 2025-331

Moved by: Joe Lumley

Seconded by: Paul Sowrey

Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry does now adjourn from this Regular Meeting at 7:04 p.m. to commence a 'Public Meeting' for a proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for lands legally described as Lot 21 and Part of Lot 22, Concession 5, in the Township of Perry located at 878 Highway 592 (McGregor).

Carried

Resolution No. 2025-332

Moved by: Paul Sowrey

Seconded by: Joe Lumley

Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry receives the report prepared by Jordan Fraser, Development and Planning Coordinator Intern and Beth Morton, Clerk-Administrator, for lands legally described as Lot 21 and Part of Lot 22, Concession 5, in the Township of Perry located at 878 Highway 592.

Carried

Acting Mayor Margaret Ann MacPhail as the Chair advised that this is a Public Meeting to hear public comments and answer questions regarding the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for lands legally described as Lot 21 and Part of Lot 22, Concession 5, in the Township of Perry.

She outlined how the Public Meeting would be conducted. She stated that the Clerk-Administrator, Beth Morton, would advise as to when, how, and to whom notice of the public meeting was circulated and outline the purpose of the proposed By-law.

She noted that the public meeting is not a public debate on the matter. The public will be afforded the opportunity to provide their comments or questions. She outlined that persons in favour of the application would go first. Those in opposition to the application would follow. She also advised that people providing comments or questions are asked to present them through her as the Chair.

She then noted that Council will have the opportunity to question the applicants, planning consultants, or agents. She also advised that Council will consider the Zoning By-law Amendment at the October 15th, 2025 Meeting of Council. She stated that all persons addressing Council must state their full name, full mailing address and postal code, and must direct their comments through the Chair.

Acting Mayor Margaret Ann MacPhail then requested that the Clerk-Administrator, Beth Morton, advise as to how and to whom notice of the public meeting was circulated.

The Clerk-Administrator, Beth Morton, advised that Notice of this Public Meeting was given by posting the application on the Township's website, www.townshipofperry.ca on September 3rd, 2025; posted at the property; and forwarding it to all persons and public bodies as prescribed under the Ontario

Planning Act Regulation, including owners within 120 metres of the applicant's property; and to those requested.

The Clerk-Administrator, Beth Morton, advised that on September 11, 2025, it was brought to the attention of Staff that there was a mapping error on the Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting. The error was corrected, and a revised Notice of Complete Application and Public Meeting was circulated on September 11th, 2025.

The purpose of the proposed By-law is to rezone a portion of the lands owned by the applicant from the current General Industrial (M2) Zone to the General Industrial – Exception (M2-2) Zone.

The purpose of the proposed application is to reduce the minimum required Interior Side Yard from 30 metres to 8 metres within the General Industrial (M2) Zone, to allow for the development of a shop and an accessory single detached dwelling in an existing clearing on the subject lands. The proposed shop will be used for storing and fixing equipment related to a septic business and vehicle repair. The proposed development will also include outside storage which will be used to store vehicles and equipment related to the applicants septic pumping business. The business typically operates from 8 am to 5 pm with employee vehicles parked at the property during the day and company vehicles stored on the lands over night and on weekends. No raw sewage will be dumped at this location, nor is that use permitted within the Township's Zoning By-law 2014-21 within the General Industrial (M2), Rural (RU) and Environmental Protection (EP) Zones. The outside storage is permitted accessory to the permitted uses within the General Industrial (M2) Zone. The owners are proposing to store vehicles and equipment associated with the septic pumping business. There have been inquiries about portable toilets and the owners have confirmed that they do not currently operate a portable toilet business. Specific exceptions within the proposed By-law is to reduce the minimum required interior side yard to be 8 metres from the existing 30 metres within the General Industrial (M2) Zone.

In all other respects, the provisions of Zoning By-law 2014-21 shall apply.

A full report was presented to Council and staff are recommending approval of the application.

Acting Mayor Margaret Ann MacPhail then declared this to be a public meeting to deal with the proposed zoning by-law amendment.

The agent, Melissa Markham, Melissa Markham Planning Consultants LTD., 1025 Rebecca Lane, Huntsville, ON, P1H 2J6, was present and made comment on behalf of the owners of the subject lands, Dave and Katy McGregor. Ms. Markham stated that the purpose of the application is to permit the development of a shop and an accessory dwelling on the subject lands. These uses are permitted on the subject lands, but the effect of the amendment is to permit a reduction to the interior side yard setback. The subject lands are approximately 120 acres and have a broken road frontage of 288 metres to the North and 120 metres to the South along the

highway. The lands are zoned Rural, General Industrial and Environmental Protection. The General Industrial Zone, which is the location where the proposed development will be located, permits a range of industrial uses. The Rural Zone also permits a range of uses, and no change to these uses is proposed through the application. It solely seeks to reduce an interior side yard setback from 30 metres to 8 metres along the North. Planning Justification Report was submitted in support of the application, which includes an overview of the Provincial Planning Statement and Official Plan policies. The lands are located in the Rural area and a shop and accessory dwelling are permitted uses on these lands. The location of the development is best suited as it is located outside of any Environmental Protection lands and the aggregate overlay that's been identified. The area is cleared and located farther from the lands to the South. In reviewing the intent of the application, a side yard setback is to maintain privacy between properties and retain vegetation. The owners are proposing to utilize an existing cleared area, as shown on the survey, for this development. The location is the most appropriate, it will maintain a large setback from the lands to the South. The reduced interior side yard setback is not anticipated to have any impact on the lands to the North, which are zoned Extractive Industrial Pit and requires a 60 metre interior side yard setback, which would result in a minimum of 68 metre separation between any development.

Ms. Markham states that she is aware of some of the comments by the public in advance of tonight's meeting and she provided a response to staff in regards to those.

In terms of the business operations, Ms. Markham states that the owners operate a septic pumping business at present. They currently employ just the owners and have 1 vehicle. The owners currently operate out of their home and purchased these lands as they are permitted General Industrial uses. The business typically operates from 8am to 5pm, with employee vehicles being parked at the property during the day and the company vehicles being stored on the lands over night and weekends. No raw sewage will be dumped at this location. Proposed work to be done on the lands also includes maintenance of vehicles in a shop.

Ms. Markham states that in regard to proposed use, the subject lands are within the General Industrial (M2) Zone, which permits approximately 20 uses. The use proposed on the Subject Lands is a Contractor's Yard, which is permitted in the M2 zone. A Contractor's Yard is defined as "a yard of any general contractor or builder where equipment and materials are stored or where a contractor performs shop or assembly work but does not include any other yard or establishment otherwise defined or classified herein". An accessory single detached dwelling is also permitted on the Subject Lands, and is proposed together with the Contractor's Yard.

In terms of outdoor storage, Ms. Markham states that it is permitted accessory to permitted uses within the M2 zone. The owners are proposing to store vehicles and equipment associated with the business. There have been inquiries regarding the

storage of portable toilets. The owners do not currently operate a portable toilet business.

In terms of the Waste Disposal Assessment Area, Ms. Markham states that there were some questions in regard to the D4 Assessment which was completed and submitted with the application. The assessment was originally completed for a severance application for the previous landowners. The report reviewed the surrounding area, including a closed dump site and a landfill refuse area which is owned by the Township. The report provides that it has been more than 45 years since waste has been disposed of at that site and little risk of ground water contamination or methane gas is present.

Ms. Markham states that it is her opinion that the application is consistent with the Provincial Planning Statement, conforms with the Official Plan, and represents good planning.

Members of the public present made comment on the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment.

Wayne Simpson, Tulloch Engineering, 80 Main Street West, Huntsville, ON, P1H 1W9 made comment and stated that he is speaking on behalf of the Clear Lake Association. Mr. Simpson states that when he first looked at the application, he was puzzled by the mapping that showed the M2 Zone as it appears as a horseshoe surrounding three sides of the crown land that a provincial owned pit is on. Mr. Simpson states that he wondered how the M2 could be purposefully designated that way in the Zoning By-law. Mr. Simpson checked the By-law from 2002 and noted that the M2 Zoning did carry out beyond the Institutional Zone that surrounds the pit. Mr. Simpson states that the M2 Zone was there at the time but the M2 Zone at that time was a pit zoning. He also states that in 2002, the M2 on this property was meant to be a pit. He assumes that the M2 Zone was meant to be used as a buffer to the crown pit and any sensitive land uses that might be built on the adjoining property. Mr. Simpson acknowledges that the M2 Zone is correctly described in Melissa Markham's report, as being what is there today. Mr. Simpson states that when the property was zoned in 2001, M1 was the General Industrial Zone and M2 was for a pit. He states that as of today, the M2 Zone is General Industrial, and the pit is a different zone. Mr. Simpson states that he is having difficulty understanding how the land can be developed reasonably with that designation. He states that when he looks at the application and notes that the sole purpose of the application is to reduce the side yard setback from 30 metres to 8 metres, he also notes that to the South of the pit there is only 30 metres of M2 Zone. Without the amendment, the M2 area to the South of the pit could not be developed as you could not meet the required setbacks. Mr. Simpson wonders what is so special about the clearing area located South of the pit, other than it is cleared. He states that there is 100 acres of land and there is space for the development to be located further from the highway by clearing more land. Mr. Simpson states that reducing the setback from 30 metres to 8 metres to be able to use the existing cleared area is not good enough justification for the change.

Mr. Simpson states that this is not just an application to reduce the setback but it's effectively going from no opportunity to develop to a new opportunity to develop a 22 metre area. Mr. Simpson states that more detail on the shop and outdoor storage should be required and that the applicants should bring forward a detailed site plan. Mr. Simpson states that it may be best for this development to be located on a different part of the property. He also states that the reduction to 8 metres for the interior side yard setback would apply to all interior side yards. Mr. Simpson states that he is concerned about the accessory dwelling and why it would be placed in the M2 Zone. He continues that if the dwelling is accessory to the shop, and if the shop closes down, then there would be an accessory dwelling that is accessory to nothing. If the house is located on a different part of the property, then the property owners would never run into an issue. Mr. Simpson concludes that he is being speculative in some ways and in his opinion there has not been a sufficient planning rationale for the change and there needs to be more information on how the lands will be developed. He advises that Council deny or defer the application until more information is provided.

Adam Grin, 44 Bay Lake Road, Emsdale, ON, P0A 1J0, made comment on the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment. Mr. Grin states that his first question is about the notice that was received. He states that if there wasn't any opposition to that notice, and the by-law was signed, then the entire lands would have been rezoned to industrial use. He states that the lands are predominantly zoned Rural and Environmental Protection Zone and the municipality sent out a notice to everyone that showed the entire lands were going to be rezoned to industrial, which he states was quite upsetting to receive. He states that he believes that this was an oversight and that the public received an updated notice. Mr. Grin states that the updated notice showed a "little sketch" that does not have much information on it. He continues that industrial uses include a sewage waste disposal site and the applicants first plan for this site was to dispose of sewage. He states that if the lands had been rezoned to industrial, the owners would have been able to get a new Environmental Compliance approval to potentially dump sewage at this site. Mr. Grin then states that the Ontario Government D series guidelines help to govern land use. The applicants have not submitted and prepared the necessary studies to remove the existing holding provision. He states that the necessary water tests have not been submitted. He continues that in accordance with D-6-1 the proposal holds a class two industrial designation. Mr. Grin states that in accordance with section D-6-3, class two industrial uses require a 300 metre distance from sensitive uses. He continues that the proposed development is closer than 300 metres to sensitive uses. He states that section B1.6.3 of the Official Plan stipulates that when a new dwelling is proposed in the Rural area, that it be a minimum of 300 metres from a pit. He continues that the rural building envelope depicted in the notice is within 300 metres and does not conform to the Official Plan. Mr. Grin states that that proposal does not conform to section C6 of the Official Plan that addresses land use compatibility. He states that in accordance with By-law 2008-16, a Site Plan Agreement is required at 878 Hwy 592 for structures which includes a septic system, parking, roadways, facilities, works and buildings. Section 5.18 includes grading, alteration, and contour of the land. A Site Plan Agreement is not

in place and development has been occurring illegally. A stop work order should be issued. Mr. Grin states that the applicants operate under waste management environmental compliance approval 10-5-096-95 which he has submitted to Council. He continues that the ECA requires a 450 metre minimum setback to sensitive uses for storage of septic waste. The proposal location is closer than 450 metres to sensitive uses and cannot be used. Mr. Grin states that storage cannot occur within 120 metres of a lake and that the Graves Lake is located closer than 120 metres to the proposed site. He states that in accordance with Schedule D of the submitted ECA the applicants have been illegally storing sewage at 173 Owl Lake Road in Katrine and that storage must be at least 90 metres from the closest well and residence. He states that the sewage dump site located at 491 Fern Glen Road is located in the Rural Zone and the applicants have been contravening the zoning by-law and illegally dumping sewage in a Rural Zone. Mr. Grin highlighted the corresponding section of the ECA for Council. Mr. Grin states that he believes it is important for Council to appreciate that the surrounding land uses are predominantly Rural, residential and recreational. Allowing an industrial use to insert itself in this location will conflict with the surrounding uses. The proposed development is not permitted pursuant to the ECA submitted, the D series guideline, the Official Plan and the Zoning Bylaws. Mr. Grin encouraged Council to vote no to this application. He states that the environmental compliance approval granted at Fern Glen Road in 2022 was granted a reduced setback to 250 metres from sensitive uses. When the issue was addressed a few years ago, the provincial standard is a minimum of 500 metres from sensitive uses for a sewage dump site. Mr. Grin states that the Fern Glen location was closer than 500 metres to a residence and they negotiated a reduced setback to a sensitive use. Mr. Grin states that there is a clearing on the land North of the pit which he was informed would be used for the dwelling and shop. He states that the applicants have now created the road and taken down trees to create the clearing that is South of the pit. He states that the one stipulation that the Ministry of Environment kept in their ECA at Fern Glen Road is that the sewage dump site needs to be 500 metres from the closest down grading well. The new clearing and building envelope in the Rural Zone is just outside of the 500 metres of where the original dump site is proposed. He states that if you took every limitation at the Fern Glen site and applied it to be this new site, this new clearing that was created is just outside the 500 metres if they want to have a well at their house. Mr. Grin states that if they had an existing clearing to the North, then the only logical reason for the new clearing would be to 500 metres from the dump site. Mr. Grin concludes that given the history, he is a little bit nervous.

Acting Mayor, Margaret Ann MacPhail reminded the public that this is an amendment for a reduce interior side yard from 30 metres to 8 metres and that is what the discussion is about.

Brian Isard, 78 Mayflower Lane, Emsdale, ON, P0A 1J0, made comment on the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment. Mr. Isard states that his concern is if everyone is aware of what happened in 2021 when the Environmental Compliance Approval was pulled back. He states that it speaks to this issue of 500 metres

setback. His concern is that the opportunity to create a situation where the ECA can be adjusted, approval given if Council allows this to go through, and it will result in a sewage disposal site on the property. He wonders if Council has considered this potential to happen.

The agent, Melissa Markham, Melissa Markham Planning Consultants LTD., 1025 Rebecca Lane, Huntsville, ON, P1H 2J6, responded to the concerns from the public. Ms. Markham states that in regards to the questions about the M2 Zone, the lands are M2 in the area and South of the M2 zone there is a building envelop in the Rural Zone. She states that in terms of the vehicles, employees, and outdoor storage, the letter she had submitted previously covered some of the issues. She states that in the staff report that a Site Plan Agreement will be required on the property and would be the next step in the process. Ms. Markham responded to the comments about sewage disposal on the property and stated that the M2 Zone does not permit sewage disposal and that it is only allowed in a M5 Zone.

Sharon Laing, 1229 B Hwy 592, Emsdale, ON, P0A 1J0, made comment on the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment. Ms. Laing states that her concern is the number of trucks that there is going to be driving on Hwy 592 and the road conditions of Hwy 592. She states that the road conditions are already terrible and there are many potholes. Ms. Laing states that this is a tourist area, and that people are walking down the road all the time with their animals. She states that the road is already unsafe with the number of cars, and she cannot imagine with the amount of trucks that will be driving, if it becomes industrial.

Adam Grin, 44 Bay Lake Road, Emsdale, ON, P0A 1J0, added to his comment on the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment. Mr. Grin states that the D studies that are required speak to the noise, traffic, dust and numerous other studies and it has not been addressed in this application.

Council did not have any questions regarding the application.

Clerk-Administrator Beth Morton advised that as of 4:30 p.m. on October 1st, 2025, staff have received the following comments on the proposed zoning by-law amendment.

On September 7th 2025, Staff received the following comments from Adam Grin:
Good afternoon Beth and Town Council,

Please see below for a response to the attached September 2nd notice regarding 878 Hwy 592:

We would also like to address the September 17th council agenda item regarding the holding provision removal at 878 Hwy 592.

- The properties depicted on this notice are zoned Rural with an Environmental Protection designation, not Industrial. The information in the notice is

incorrect. The notice, the proposed by-law and schedule A-1 therefore contravene the Planning Act, specifically O. Reg. 545/06.

- Permitted uses in the Rural and EP zones do not include the commercial/industrial shop, outdoor equipment/vehicle storage and vehicle repair for a septic business listed in the notice.
- It is important for Council to appreciate that the surrounding land uses are predominantly rural, residential and recreational. Allowing an industrial use to insert itself in this location will conflict with the surrounding uses, lower property values and discourage future investments. There is no specific reason why this location is necessary for a proposed shop for storing/fixing equipment, outdoor portable toilets/vehicle storage related to a septic business and vehicle repair. These activities can be carried out on other land where zoning permits these uses and where the surrounding lands are compatible with the proposed uses. The proposed industrial development will potentially create nuisances related to unsightly portable toilet storage, noise, dust, odours and increased vehicle traffic.
- Without a survey it is impossible to know where the property lines are to accurately measure a set back, especially one reduced to 8 meters.
- Prior to the 2014 By-Law the Industrial M2 designation was for an Extractive Pit
- The McGregor's did not purchase the extractive pit.
- The M2 Industrial Zoning does not apply to the lands owned by the McGregor's. To public knowledge there are no surveys or supporting documentation demonstrating additional zoning delimitations, other than the property lines.
- This 500 meter circle depicted on the zoning by-law does not appear to be centered at the former landfill site located at 775 Hwy 592. If moved to the correct location it would envelop the proposed development.
- The property, clearing and proposed building site are within Waste Disposal Assessment Areas
- Hydrogeological and engineering studies outlined in the Ministry of Environment Guideline D4 regarding Land Use Near Landfills and Dumps, done in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, addressing the former land fill sites have not been done by the applicants.
- The construction of a dwelling creates a sensitive use as described in D4, for which Perry Township would have the following responsibility.
- The 2018 D4 study referenced in the McGregor's re-zoning application is not complete. It did not include the closest well downgradient to the former landfill site located at the Graves property. It also did not include any water testing. We request that the holding provision scheduled to be removed at the September 17th town council meeting remain in effect until such time that required water testing is done.
- Traffic, dust, noise, odor and nuisance studies not been done with regards to the new industrial use proposed by the applicants.
- I would like to remind everyone of the previous experience with the Katy Bailey and Dave McGregor formerly operating as Northern Disposal, now

operating as Pumped Septic. (Video is linked) Please see this video from our last deputation.

- The cessation date for their current dump site located at 491 Fernglen Road is August 31, 2028, according to attached Environmental Compliance Approval, issued in 2023.
- The ECA allows sewage dumping trenches close to surface water (such as Clear Lake 440 meters away).
- The ECA allows sewage dumping trenches close to wells, such as the ones at the homes shown below.
- The ECA has a reduced 250 meter to sensitive use exception as opposed to the standard 500 meter separation normally required.
- The ECA conditions would allow a Sewage Dump Site at 878 Hwy 592, and the new set-back request would allow the proposed well, dwelling and industrial development (see red text below)

All of the required distances above, if applied to a new ECA, would permit a sewage dump site at 878 Hwy. 592.

Raw sewage dumped in open air trenches would decimate property values, lower quality of life and cause the closure of businesses. Please follow this link for former letters of opposition.

In a nutshell the proposed development is incompatible with surrounding uses. A zoning change to allow for an industrial use can lead to more intensive industrial uses, which include a sewage dump site. The industrial zoning could permit the applicants to apply for a new Environmental Compliance Approval to allow a sewage dump site, which was their original intention for the property. Given the cessation date above and the fact that the ECA attached has a 100 meter distance to surface water (such as Clear Lake) and a reduced 250 meter distance to sensitive uses (homes, children's camp, commercial tourist resorts), this is very likely. It also explains the creation of a new clearing 500 meters from the proposed trench location and the reduced set back request in the zoning by-law amendment application to put the well and dwelling as far away as possible.

The holding provision removal, public meeting, by-law amendment and development cannot proceed given the above.

As always we thank town council for their guidance and wisdom.

Yours very truly,

Adam Grin

The following comments were received by Staff on September 7th 2025 as responses to Adam Grin's initial comments.

Comment from Valerie and John Glaves:

Greetings and great work.

I've sat at many variance committee meetings and have never had a variance request that didn't have a purpose for the request stated in the application.

It looks to me that they have well over 50 acres easily. That isn't enough for their stated purposes?

Comment from Ken Core:

Nicely put together Adam , thanks

Comment from Dan Laing:

Thank you Adam for the work here and the protection of our precious Lake and surrounding beauty!!!

Comment from Dawn Mashinter:

Thank you Adam! Great work on this and I agree that the Industrial Use would be detrimental to this beautiful rural residential and tourism area, it would definitely affect the property values here. According to the MTO the entrance permit is for the subject property is for residential use only. How can they apply for a zoning amendment using the incorrect zoning in the first place? I cannot see Town Council approving this.

Let me know if you need my assistance. I hope that everyone attends the meeting, see you there!

On September 11th 2025, Staff received the following comments from Adam Grin:

Good afternoon Beth,

I left a message with Amanda...

In accordance with by-law 2008-16 a site plan agreement is required at 878 Hwy 592 for structures, parking, roadways, facilities, works and buildings, section 5.18 addresses grading, alteration and contour of the land.

If a site plan is not in place we request a stop work order to be issued immediately.

Thanks,

Adam Grin

On September 11th 2025, Beth Morton, Clerk-Administrator responded to Mr. Grin's comment:

Good afternoon Adam:

Thanks for your email.

As part of the planning process the applicant's will be required to enter into a Site Plan Agreement upon approval of the Zoning By-law Amendment.

I am not aware of any work being completed on the property at this time.

Regards,

Beth Morton, Clerk-Administrator

On September 11th 2025, Adam Grin responded to Beth Morton, Clerk-Administrator:

Hi Beth,

They are in there most days clearing trees, making roadways, adjusting the grading, and altering the contours of the land.

The first step has to be a site plan agreement, then you start doing what is approved...

The site plan should be done prior to any amendment as this would give a clearer picture of the proposal, for all to consider.

Your truly,

Adam Grin

On September 12th 2025, Staff received the following comments from Dawn & Wayne Mashinter:

Hello Beth, I am writing this email to you as a concerned resident in the catchment area for the above, and as a local Real Estate professional selling properties in the Clear Lake and Bay Lake area.

I am confused about this Zoning By-Law request as the zoning map clearly identifies this property as Rural with Environmentally Protected land. I had noticed business vehicles entering the property in January 2025 and I contacted Mike Wilmon your by-law enforcement official to this regard. Mike suggested that I contact the MTO to confirm that the driveway permit was valid. I did this and the MTO confirmed that a permit was in place for the location as described. I called

Mike Wilmon back to this regard and he asked that I get back to him if I see anymore industrial vehicles entering the property, due to the driveway permit being for residential use only. As neighbours we have been concerned about the activity on this property for quite some time since that last go around costing us many dollars to overcome the sewage lagoon/disposal use.

This area as you know is very popular for tourism and for buyers seeking a quiet residence near lakes within 15 min to Huntsville. The affect of an Industrial property storing & cleaning Porto Potties and repairing equipment will have adverse affect on property values and affect our quality of life. Questions will arise "Where is the sewage going?" "How can the Town control this?"

I would encourage the owners to look at other rural properties in the Highlands that do have residences, kids camps and resorts near them and apply for a Zoning By-Law Amendment there.

Industrial adverse effects in a Residential area include:

Increased Traffic & Noise: Warehouses, distribution centers, and manufacturing plants often generate significant truck and commercial traffic, leading to noise, congestion, and wear on local roads.

Aesthetic Concerns: Ports Potties and trucks can be considered unsightly and detract from the visual appeal and overall desirability of a residential neighbourhood.

Environmental & Health Concerns: Depending on the operation, industrial sites can contribute to pollution, dust, and other environmental factors that may be detrimental to the health and quality of life in nearby residential areas.

Reduced Residential Appeal: The inherent nature of an industrial zone can make the surrounding residential area less attractive to potential homebuyers, leading to lower demand and depressed property values.

Bottom line, local zoning laws dictate land use, thus affecting long-term property values.

We are counting on our Town Councillors and Mayor to vote "no" to this amendment.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Best regards,

Dawn & Wayne Mashinter

On October 1st 2025, Staff received the following comments from Brian and Grace Isard:

Beth, my wife and I plan to attend tonight's Council meeting. We are opposed to the proposed zoning by-law amendment(attached) that would rezone the lands from the General Industrial (M2) Zone to the General Industrial – Exception (M2-2) Zone (Attached). Specifically, we are opposed to reducing the minimum required interior sideline setback to allow for the development of a shop and an accessory single detached dwelling in an existing clearing.

We have some familiarity with this particular site. In 2020-21, we participated in an appeal made by concerned neighbours which resulted in the Ministry of the Environment Parks and Conservation issuing the attached notice of the revocation for Environmental Compliance Approval #19-NOR-97288 for a Hauled Sewage Disposal Site located at 878 Highway 592 in Emsdale. (Attached).

We wanted to make sure that the township was aware of why the ECA was revoked and in particular the matter of setbacks as it pertains to nearby sensitive areas under review in this proposed bylaw amendment.

Our concern with the proposal to be discussed tonight borders on the same one we had in 2021 and that is to allow this amendment to proceed will help facilitate the potential for new applications for sewage waste disposal at this site.

Look forward to the public meeting tonight.

Brian and Grace Isard

Acting Mayor Margaret Ann MacPhail advised that those wishing to receive further notice of the decision of the Zoning By-law must make a written request as per previous instruction. Council will consider the proposed by-law at the October 15th, 2025 Meeting of Council. Once Council makes a decision on the by-law, please be advised that there is a 20-day appeal period from the date of notice of decision of the by-law during which time any person may appeal the decision of the Council to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

Having received no further questions or comments, Acting Mayor Margaret Ann MacPhail declared this public meeting to be conducted and presented the following resolution:

Resolution No. 2025-333

Moved by: Joe Lumley

Seconded by: Paul Sowrey

Be it resolved that the Council of the Corporation of the Township of Perry hereby now adjourn from this Public Meeting at 8:00 p.m. in order to recommence the Regular Meeting of Council of Wednesday, October 1st, 2025.

Carried

Dated this day 15th of October, 2025.

"Original Signed by Norm Hofstetter"

Norm Hofstetter, *Mayor*

"Original Signed by Beth Morton"

Beth Morton, *Clerk-Administrator*