

Hillary Gail Thompson

May 26,
2021, 8:13
PM

To whom it may concern,

We own property at 40 Bayview Lane in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive. This bylaw is absurd and is taking away the right to do what one pleases with that land due to others need of control.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Hillary and Alex Selkirk

Mary and Mike Hennessey
Connie and Mike Egan
Kathy and Bruce Thompson
Ann Marie and Shane Carr
Beryl and Barry MacMillan

Mary Hennessey

Tue, May
25, 9:08
PM

Stephanie:

Please forward this email to all members of Planning Board and Council.

We fully support Barb Smith's comments at the public meeting tonight with respect to the proposed bylaw regarding development permits for structures that front on a private road. We request that Planning Board revisit and remove the provision which requires a registered ownership and maintenance agreement of all owners abutting or fronting on a private road.

We are also in agreement with Kathy Thompson's comments with respect to the proposed requirement

for a licensed professional engineer to design and certify an on-site sewerage disposal system for non-conforming lots. We respectfully request that the requirements of draft 2 of the bylaw be reinstated, which permitted a licensed contractor with two million in liability and errors and omissions insurance, OR a licensed professional engineer, to design and certify such systems.

Mike and Mary Hennessey

RON MURRAY

Wed, May
26, 8:19
PM

Stephanie:

We own property on Carlie Lane in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, We feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Thank You

Ron Murray and Lisa Driscoll

Candice MacKay

Wed, May
26, 10:31
PM

Stephanie:

We own property at 11 Carmody Crescent in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

We oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Thank you,
Candice & Logan

Barry MacMillan

Thurs,
May 27
6:12 AM

We would like to add our voice to the disastrous addition of 4.1 (4) of the land use bylaw. This would in fact stop development on any of the private roads on the peninsula. As the council is well aware 90% of the residents in this area are not accessed by the public Bay Shore Road or by Stanhope Lane. Residents work very diligently to improve these private roads but never is it supported by 100% of the ownership. On our road for example 36 of the owners pay into the joint account for road improvement. Two year-round residents who use the road daily have refused to pay into the fund and in fact one of them (well known to the council office) continues to berate this initiative for the good of all of us as illegal. This, unfortunately, would be the case on many of the private roads in the peninsula. 100% support is very rare in any voting issue in any level of government. Please add our voices to the disagreement with this addition.

Beryl & Barry MacMillan 19 Doc Soper Stanhope
Andrew MacMillan 18 Bayview Lane, Stanhope
Jo Ann MacMillan 31 Doc Soper, Stanhope
Craig MacMillan 8 Birchhill Stanhope

Josh Egan

Thurs,
May 27
8:32 AM

Good morning,

My wife and I have serious concerns about 4.1(4) of the latest draft. This section appears to have the effect that if someone is building on a previously approved lot – if the access for this lot is over a private lane you have to have a written agreement from all parties using that private road. That is a massive issue as in our case there would be dozens of properties using the same private road and us not being

able to build before having all them agree upon and sign a document causes a massive problem. This section must be removed as it does not take into account the practical realities of private laneways in the area.

Regards,

Josh and Laura Egan

Gerry Lajeunesse

May 27,
2021,
10:19 AM

It has been brought to our attention that this section would require everyone on our road to be in agreement to get a permit. Could see this if a major variance we needed. but for a moving or building a shed????? We consider this to be unreasonable. Would you be able to explain the the rationale behind this

Gerry and Joanne Lajeunesse

Bobby Hennessey

Thurs,
May 27
10:35 AM

Stephanie:

We own property at 22 Halmac in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

We oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Bobby Hennessey

Wayne Ellis

Thurs,
May 27
2:33 PM

Hi Stephanie

As a peninsula resident on a private road I fully support the removal of clause 4.1 4 as it definitely will be a very unmanageable restriction to development of pre existing lots on private roads. It is and has been almost impossible to get all owners on private roads to agree to anything let alone paying upkeep costs

I believe this needs to be removed from the plan

Thanks

Wayne Ellis

Kathy

Thu, May
27, 3:35
PM

Stephanie:

We own property at 31 Old Sam Rd, 22 Old Sam Rd & 99 Doc Soper Cres in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant

In your most recent newsletter you have stated that the municipality has no jurisdiction over Private Roads or any Home Owners Association. However in your proposed Draft 3 of the bylaws seem to now be dictating that home owners association be put in place in order to obtain any building permits on private roads. In our community we have been taking care of the maintenance of the private road in our area over 25 years. We do not feel that restricting everyone on private roads is fair or even realistic. Wonder who or what is pressuring the committee to take this stand? How many people live on the private roads in the municipality? Have all of these property owners been made aware of what stipulations you are proposing in your Draft #3?

We TOTALLY oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we STRONGLY feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be REMOVED from the proposed bylaw.

Kathy & Bruce Thompson

Bill Soper

Thu, May
27, 4:15
PM

Hi Stephanie.

We own property at 97 doc soper Cres in the Rural Municipality of the North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant

In your most recent newsletter you have stated that the municipality has no jurisdiction over Private Roads or any Home Owners Association. However in your proposed Draft 3 of the bylaws seem to now be dictating that home owners association be put in place in order to obtain any building permits on private roads. In our community we have been taking care of the maintenance of the private road in our area over 25 years. We do not feel that restricting everyone on private roads is fair or even realistic. Wonder who or what is pressuring the committee to take this stand? How many people live on the private roads in the municipality? Have all of these property owners been made aware of what stipulations you are proposing in your Draft #3?

We are very concerned about the negative impact on property owners on private roads for any future development.

We TOTALLY oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we STRONGLY feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be REMOVED from the proposed bylaw.

William H. Soper & Ruth Soper

Michele Manning

Thu, May
27, 6:18
PM

Dear Stephanie:

We are business owners with several properties located in Stanhope as well as residents in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, I/we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Yours sincerely,
Michele Manning and David Rigg

Susie Dillon

Thu, May
27, 9:45
PM

Stephanie:

We own two properties on Doc Soper Cr in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

We oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Mike and Susie Dillon
Andrew Dillon

anne

Thu, May
27, 9:50
PM

Stephanie:

We own property at 118 Blanchard Lane in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Alfred and Anne Morais

Wendy Hancox

Fri, May
28 10:31
AM

Stephanie:

I/we own property at (56 Vail Crescent) in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. My/our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, I/we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Mary and Mike Hennessey

Connie and Mike Egan

Kathy and Bruce Thompson

Ann Marie and Shane Carr

Beryl and Barry MacMillan

Wendy and Mike Hancox

Barbara Campbell

Sat, May
29, 12:54
PM

Stephanie:

I own property at 17 Florrie Lane in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. My feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of the Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, I feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Thank you

Barbara

Marie McAulay

Sun, May
30, 6:21
PM

I would like to respond to the ridiculous addition of 4.1 (4) of the land-use by laws.

My husband and I bought property in Stanhope, PE Canada in the early 1970's which at that time and for many years after was the place to live never imagining that this beautiful community was going to become controlled by rules/government completely in opposition to our lives here for the past 50 years. Is this by law called progress? Who created this by law and what is the rationale behind it? How many residents is this new law going to affect? Where and when have governments or municipalities or organizations been asked to be supported by a 100% vote? In my past many years of experience, it appeared to be 50% + 1.

I had a sister-in-law who lived well into her nineties who had a saying, well known to many of us, when disaster changes were made and I quote "I have lived too long." Now I know what she meant.

Please add my name to the disapproval to this very absurd bylaw.

Marie McAulay 5 Doc Soper Cres. Stanhope PE

Shannon MacAulay

Mon, May
31, 8:59
AM

Hello Stephanie

We own property at 36 Simpson in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of the Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

We oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road, is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

thank you,

Shannon MacAulay & Geordon Read

Mon, May 31, 10:40 AM

Based on the events that have happened this past year with regard to permits for a “accessory building” being granted on property, zoned Parks and Conservation, bordering wetlands, and treatment of a petition of concerned residents. The following items we would like to be considered for clarity for our new Official Plan 2021.

More transparency with regard to community input and communication, for instance; when someone is asking for a building permit “notice of intention”, should be posted to all property owners in the Municipality, on and off the Island.. This would have made things more transparent. After the fact is no good. Residents and property owners in the Municipality on/off Island need to know; as tax payers, what applications are filed for building permits. Why is everything so hush hush, in favor of the

developer. If proper procedure is followed, there should be no issue. Everything should be transparent and not so guarded. In addition, applications of a sensitive environmental nature concerning development on properties adjacent to wetlands and the National Park must be adjudicated by the Council and not just the Planning Officer.

For the most part the planning area is totally dependent on ground water for its domestic supply. The Council must ensure protection of the health of this precious resource for the long term prosperity of our community. Council must play a leadership role in promoting responsible use of water because it is a finite resource. This resource is not sustainable if stronger measures with regard to environment and building development are not put in place and controlled.

The definition of accessory building should be clarified more and clearly defined with stipulations in zones pertaining to seascapes and bordering wetlands. Presently it is so vague, that anything goes! Guidelines that we have researched from other municipalities in similar situations, stipulated an "accessory building" on a seascape or wetlands should not be permitted to exceed 300 sq. ft., nor should it be anymore than one story. An "accessory building" is just that! It should be within reasonable distance to the main residence and accessed by the driveway of that residence. Safety issues should be considered with regard to risk of residents and visitors crossing a public biking and walking paths. There should be no variances granted to accessory buildings on land zoned Parks and Conservation

The National Park is a major tourist attraction that provides many recreational opportunities. The long term health of the National Park is critical to the future of our municipality and must be included in our planning. The municipality needs to establish more of a working relationship between Parks Canada and our local Council. The long term interests of the Park must be considered a significant factor in land use of policies decisions of property adjacent to the National Park. The responsibility of our bordering lands should not end at the National Park entrance!

In summary; thank you for all your work establishing this 2021 North Shore official plan for our Municipality. We would like to remind the contributing parties to bear in mind, that Stanhope is a Community and the importance of that should not be lost. People have moved here because of Stanhope's beauty and strong sense of Community.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Power, Norma Vass, Jack and Pat MacIsaac, Debbie Buchanan, Don Gorman, Gina MacEwen, Gaylene White, Wayne Storey, Paul and Jennifer Farquharson

Linda Arsenault

May 31,
2021,
12:30 PM

Subject: DRAFT LAND USE BYLAW FOR THE MUNICIPALITY OF NORTH SHORE - IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUIRED

FELLOW RESIDENTS OF THE STANHOPE PENINSULA

RE LATEST DRAFT OF RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF NORTH SHORE LAND USE BYLAW

The latest draft of the Official Plan and Land Use Bylaw was recently posted on the municipality's website. A final public meeting was held last night to present the significant changes from the previous draft.

A small group of about ten year-round residents have diligently attended every Planning Board meeting and reviewed and discussed new drafts of both documents over the past 9 or 10 months. For the most part, and as we interpret the current draft of the bylaw, it appears that our concerns about short term rentals have been addressed. We feel that our issues have been heard and addressed and that, at least for the next little while, there will be no significant change to the manner in which short-term rentals are regulated in the municipality.

However, at the public meeting last night, a new issue was raised by an owner of property on the peninsula, which arose with the latest draft of the bylaw, and which had not previously been detected by members of our group. A new section [4.1(4)] has been added to the latest draft.

In the previous draft, this section stated:

"Where a development application is for a lot with access on a private road or over an adjacent lot, the property owner shall have legal entitlement to use the private road for access."

This section has now been rewritten to state:

" A Development Permit for a structure that fronts on a private road may be approved, provided that the following criteria are met:

a. The parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw;

... and

d. An agreement is registered in accordance with the provisions of the Registry Act, binding on all owners abutting or fronting on the private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, and such agreement shall be binding on all heirs, successors, and assigns of the owners."

This is a massive and significant change. On the peninsula, most of our properties front on private roads. If we had to reach legal agreement with 100% of property owners fronting or abutting on our private road for long term ownership and maintenance of the road in order to get a development (building) permit approved, that would be the end of development on our private roads, because of the highly unlikely outcome of getting 100% agreement from all property owners. Bear in mind that a development permit is required not only for building a home or cottage, but for many other activities including changing the use of a building, structure or lot, constructing or moving a shed, etc. etc.

Part "a" of this section means that if you own, for example, a 3 acre lot on a private road, and want to split off one acre to give to your child after these bylaws have been enacted, the child would be unable to get a building permit to build on that lot.

If you, like us, believe the new requirements in section 4.1(4) of the Land Use Bylaw unfairly restricts the ability of property owners to develop property fronting or abutting on private roads, please send an email to the office now voicing your opposition. Feedback should be addressed to administrator@northshorepei.ca, and request that the administrator copy all members of Planning

Board, Council and the consultant. Feedback must be received by 4pm on Monday May 31st to be considered.

We can't over-emphasize the need for property owners to voice their opposition with respect to this issue. We sense that the long arduous process of getting this far with the review of the Official Plan and Land Use Bylaw may tempt those concerned to decide enough work has been done and to recommend that Council approve the bylaw as currently drafted. This would be disastrous for future development on properties located on private roads in the community.

If you would prefer to use the following as a template to voice your concerns, feel free to copy and paste as an email to administrator@northshorepei.ca.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

Stephanie,

We own property at 61 Birch Hill Drive in the Rural Municipality of North Shore. Our feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board, Council and the Consultant.

We oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, we feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Peter and Linda Arsenault
May 31, 2021

jonhack

May 31,
2021, 2:18
PM

Hi Stephanie,

I'm in receipt of correspondence from the Peninsula property owners group that have been taking the lead on community feedback on the new Land Use Plan for the North Shore. The item identified as section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is a matter of concern. I understand that comments need to be submitted by 4pm today in order to be considered. My perspective is if this clause as described is a matter of concern for residents, my submission is that the matter should be

discussed fully by Planning Board to ensure that the intent of the clause and its impact are fully understood, before Council makes a decision.

As always a good plan is one that is subject to scrutiny and in this regard, discussing this item will be beneficial to all.

Regards

Jon Hack, CMC, MCIP, RPP

Michael and Connie Egan

Mon, May
31, 3:18
PM

Hi Stephanie:

My feedback with respect to the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw is as follows. Please copy to all members of Planning Board and the Consultant.

I oppose section 4.1(4) of the latest draft of the Land Use Bylaw. The requirement for a registered agreement binding on all owners abutting or fronting on a private road, providing for the long-term ownership and maintenance of the private road, before a development permit can be approved for a structure that fronts on a private road is difficult if not impossible to obtain, in most cases. The impact of enacting this section as currently drafted will be to effectively halt all development on private roads in the municipality.

In addition, the proposal to allow development of a structure that fronts on a private road only if the parcel was approved prior to the effective date of this bylaw is unfair and unnecessarily restrictive.

For these reasons, I feel clauses 4.1(4) a. and d. should be removed from the proposed bylaw.

Thank you,

Mike and Connie Egan
3220 Bayshore Road
Stanhope

Rural Municipality of North Shore
2120 Covehead Road, Rte. #25
York, PEI
COA 1P0

May 27, 2021

Attention: Stephanie Moase, CAO
Councillor Shaw – Chair of Planning Board

RE: MacLean Statement at Public Meeting regarding Official Plan

I am providing an official written submission and objection to the proposed Zoning Map changes in the Draft 2021 Official Plan and Land Use Bylaw.

Below is the narrative of the public statement as presented at the Official Plan Public Meeting held on Tuesday, May 25, 2021.

My name is Kent Maclean and I have lived at 3553 Bayshore Road in Stanhope with my family for the past 20 years.

Before providing my comments, I want to remind the Planning Board Committee there is a Conflict of Interest, as declared by the Municipal Council, for Mayor Watts involvement or attendance in any discussions or presentations regarding this property.

With regards to the proposed amendment to the Draft 2021 Official plan, the change to [Section 3.11 Appeals](#) – now to be escalated to IRAC is a positive amendment.

IRAC will be the best structured to hear appeals on development permit and subdivision issues. This removes any bias in the process.

3.11 APPEALS

- (1) **Any person who is dissatisfied with a decision of the Development Officer or Council in respect of an application made pursuant to this bylaw may appeal the decisions to the Island Regulatory and Appeals Commission in accordance with section 28 of the Planning Act.**

My wife and I have attended all meetings for the 2021 Official Plan where we heard consistent messaging from Municipal representatives about how important transparency and public input is in this process.

During this Official Plan process, we have continuously written to the Municipality in an attempt to meet and discuss a Zoning issue.

We have not had any meaningful response from these communications.

This 2021 Official Plan process has not been a fair and transparent approach for Municipal Government processes.

In fact, I am objecting to proposed Zoning Map changes in the Draft 2021 Official Plan and Land Use Bylaw.

At a Public Meeting in the fall of 2020, I stood up and provided input on Zoning Changes, this was met with a response from the Consultant (Hope Parnham) *“this is a public forum, and we will meet one on one to discuss your private issue”* ... well - that meeting never happened, even after multiple attempts on our behalf to establish such a meeting.

The Official Plan Committee that is managing the 2021 Official Plan process has the authority, and the duty to rectify any mapping errors for properties during this process.

We are objecting to and appealing the proposed Zoning changes to our Residential property. A meeting with the Chair of the Planning Board and the CAO would be prudent to address the Zoning error and procedural irregularities, prior to the Rural Municipality of North Shore Draft 2021 Official Plan being finalized and sent to the Minister for review.

In conclusion - A collaborative approach in this matter will save all parties considerable time and money and allow the Municipality to correct its error and revisit the decision without involving lawyers, IRAC and if necessary, escalation to the Supreme Court of PEI.

Sincerely,



Kent MacLean
3553 Bayshore Road
Stanhope

*cc Carr Stevenson McKay
Barb Stevenson
Maggie Grimmer*