

Completed	Source	Name	Comment	Tone (+/-)	Theme
2025-09-19	Webform	Thomas Cavin Armitstead	we are particularly interested in any changes made to the construction of sheds on an owners property	Neutral	Accessory Buildings
2025-09-10	Webform	Monique Lunardo	I am really excited that clearview is looking into additional small home bilaw to assist in affordable housing.	Positive	Affordable Housing
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Jenny Nash	How will this impact our ability to have a second dwelling, which is currently allowed in Simcoe County. Currently there is nothing noted in the plan in regards to 2nd dwellings. At a time when we are in a housing crisis and would like to provide a dwelling to our ageing moms or children is needed. This is the reason why we have stayed in our current residence to be able to offer this opportunity and there is currently nothing in the new bylaw proposed to address this.	Negative	ARU
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Derek Nash	Would like to ensure an additional dwelling be allowed. Also currently looking to rezone as Agri.	Neutral	ARU
2025-09-25	Email	Susie Cosack	Rossalyn Workman, I live at 4 Elizabeth St. West in Creemore and this location will be zoned C1 now, no transitional commercial, just commercial. Does this mean we will have to pay more taxes or will the commercial taxes only apply if and when a business is officially opened on this property ? Thank you, Susie Cosack and R. Levant	N/A	Commercial
2025-10-17	Webform	Amy Bennett	Under Commercial properties I request the zoning bylaw include the allowance for temporary trailers/mobile units during a renovation. Allowing retailers and restaurants to operate a temporary trailer or mobile unit keeps businesses open to serve the community and to keep employees employed. There should not be the requirement for a minor variance application to be completed - just submit for a temporary permit.	N/A	Commercial Temporary Uses
2025-09-12	Webform	Kayla Enslow	It would be appreciated to consider expanding the zoning to allow for childcare in commercial spaces. There is limited childcare available in Stayner and my family has been greatly impacted by this. I work in Collingwood and have to drive to Angus for childcare. It is very inconvenient and unfortunately the thought of relocating is very much on our mind due to this. Please consider expanding the zoning so that way the many families raising children who live in Stayner, can continue living here	Neutral	Day Care
2025-09-30	Webform	Melissa Welke	I had a chance to attend the open house , however was unable to discuss a zoning change that would be beneficial to Clearview. I currently run a successful school program that benefits Clearview Meadows. I have been looking for a location for over a year for expanding my program. However my issue is C1 is not zoned for Childcare which currently in Stayner makes up most of the businesses downtown which for walking distance to the schools including True North Christian Academy would be a benefit to all. I constantly am turning parents away or adding them to my very long wait list. I have listened to the concerns of parents as current school hours make it difficult to maintain a full time job without having to rely on others which sometimes is not consistent for them. Other towns surrounding Clearview allow childcare to operate in commercial, which as our area grows we will need the flexibility for different childcare programs just not full time care. I would be happy to discuss this further about the current zoning concerns.	Negative	Day Care
2025-09-16	Webform	Jeremy	Parts of our property that are active farmland have been re-zoned as EP1. The EP limit previously extended only to the edge of the forest land, which made sense. Now it extends to include part of the farmland and also includes our house (10 yrs old) and old barn location. It is noted that our house (10 years old) complied with the required setbacks and from the creeks required by NVCA at the time, and was found to be outside of the flood plain based on a flood study completed. As the house and surrounding property is now EP-1 this would restrict us from constructing a new barn or greenhouse. It would also require us to complete another study in order to prove (again) that any proposed building would be outside of the flood plain, causing additional expense. The forest has been re-zoned from EP to EP1 and EP2. We periodically perform agro-forestry to harvest trees for commercial purpose. Under the new zones, this would not be permitted in the EP2 areas, which has an impact to the viability of future harvest.	Negative	EP1 - Farmland

2025-09-29 Webform	Jeremy & Melissa Cubitt	This land has been farmed for many generations and is agricultural land. We don't see a reason why this should ever be EP zoned. We oppose this proposal.	Negative	EP1 - Farmland
2025-10-02 Webform	Patrick Bedford	<p>I am an owner of 6572 Highway 26, Clearview. My property consists of 1.4 acres. It is flat with one dwelling and 3 accessory buildings. It is currently zoned AG but the proposed by-law would re-zone it to EP1.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this rezoning.</p> <p>There is no environmental feature on my property, so there is no reason to rezone as EP1. The Greenland mapping in the Official Plan has not changed since 2001 and it is only approximate.</p> <p>The Green land mapping should follow the creek but only for a short distance, like a 30 ft width, and arguably be on both sides of the creek. Currently in the draft zoning by-law, it is an arbitrary straight line on only one side of the creek.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Farmland
2025-09-17 Email	Tracey and Brian Atkinson	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your draft zoning by-law for the Township of Clearview. Our comments are limited to the Environmental Protection Natural Heritage Zone (and the undue restriction that it may cause the agricultural community) and updating zoning on some of our own lands to reflect current agricultural productivity and delineations.</p> <p>Our comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EP1 (Environmental Protection Natural Heritage) zone appears to cover a large amount of land, and in some cases full properties and full farms, some of which are currently in crop and do not have a single detached dwelling. The draft provisions of section 12.1 b(i) appear to prohibit a single detached dwelling on prime agricultural lands in the EP1 zone. We would ask that you reconsider the restrictiveness of this zone and allow a single detached dwelling on a property with prime agricultural land to support farm families and allow the agricultural business to expand and adapt to changing commodities. It is noted that this zoning would also not permit a livestock or implement shed, again on properties that are prime agricultural lands. We would ask that you return the flexibility to the farming community. 2. It appears that the NVCA regulated areas is included as an Overlay Zone. Our understanding is that the NVCA has recently updated its mapping and will continue to do so. Have you considered excluding it from the zoning schedules or including it on an appendix opposed to as an overlay zone? The Hazard mapping on some of our lands do not reflect current agricultural drainage. It also does not reflect most recent topographical data supplied to the NVCA to support building permits. 3. The EP1 zoning appears to reflect old aerial photo imagery or MNR layers. We would ask that you update the EP1 zoning, NVCA hazard on the subject lands to prioritize the prime agricultural land. We have included maps from the Clearview Interactive mapping, showing the zoning with the aerials underlain, followed by the proposed mapping for the same parcel. With recognition of the Federal Department of National Defense's Radar project and land acquisition occurring in Clearview Township, abutting some of the lands identified herein, and resulting in a significant number of hectares of prime agricultural land being removed from food protection we would urge you to provide flexibility to farmers and encourage agriculture in Clearview to the extent possible within the Ontario planning framework. <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration of our requests, and reviewing our lands with an agricultural lens.</p> <p>Please include us on your future circulations and provide us with a copy of the Notice of Decision and a response to this letter on how our comments have been addressed in the final version of the zoning by-law.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brian and Tracey Atkinson, Pongside Poultry</p>	Negative	EP1 - Farmland
2025-09-19 Webform	Jennifer Ferguson- Meijs	<p>I'm having a difficult time trying to find what zoning changes are pertaining to my property but from what I can see it would appear that the majority of my property is being changed to environmentally protected land.</p> <p>Our house was just built on this property in 2022 which would appear to be when all these changes were being proposed yet we were uninformed that our property could be this grievously affected. As I stated I could be incorrect as I'm having a hard time trying to find out how to look specifically at my property online.</p> <p>I definitely oppose any changes that restrict the land usage, especially when this is a newly developed piece of property which we were permitted to build upon.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural

2025-09-19	Webform	Jennifer Ferguson-Meijs	<p>I strongly oppose any changes to our zoning. Our house was just built in 2022. Looking at the map more than half our house is environmentally protected and our building at front of property which was permitted to be built around 2020 and 2021 is also affected. Most of our yard immediately surrounding our home is also EP land in this new zoning bylaw. This is unacceptable!</p> <p>How could you allow us to build on property you were planning to restrict the ability to live on?</p> <p>This zoning change can NOT be approved and isn't acceptable</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-20	Webform	Darrin White	<p>We are opposed to the changing of designation of any part of our property from Rural to Environmentally Protected. We feel this change will greatly affect our investment that we have made in this property. When we made the purchase, we agreed on the changing of designation from Rural to EP for the back half of the property. If it had been designated as per your proposal, we would not have made the purchase.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-21	Webform	Gwen Allen	<p>Please accept this as opposition to the new zonig by-law as it applies to the formentioned property. This proptert does not contain any of the features required for this designation, this has been cleared farm land for more than 80 years.</p> <p>Definition: Natural Heritage Features: These include diverse areas such as significant wetlands, woodlands, fish habitat, and habitat of endangered and threatened species, as well as natural and scientific areas of interest.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-25	Webform	Deb Bronee	<p>I would like to comment on the change being proposed whereby the current RU zone is being changed to EP. As I discussed with Colin the current RU zone contains a dwelling and trees that were planted and will need to be harvested in the next 10 years. By changing this area to EP if when the trees are harvested, the property owner would like to revert to a more RU use they will be required to jump through hoops to change the area back to RU. I would like to see the zoning to remain as it is.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-25	Webform	JAMES FRASER	<p>Re: Zoning Changes from Rural to EP " Definitely Apposed". Have property values been considered in this potential decision to change my property from Rural to EP. As I am in the understanding that property values will drop due to this change. No potential buyers can add buildings etc therefore less potential sale value. If property drops in potential sale value or sale potential how is the Township of Clearview going to compensate for this to the owners.</p> <p>Irene Fraser Per: James Fraser</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-25	Webform	Kathryn Hannan	<p>The RU zoning for these properties needs to be maintained at the existing line. The area was planted in trees and a number of years ago and those trees are reaching maturity and will have to be harvested. It makes no sense to force the property owner to have to have a study done or have it rezoned to revert back to RU acceptable uses.</p> <p>As well the houses that exist in this area should also continue be in the RU zone as the EP would restrict the uses that have been historically done at these dwellings.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-26	Webform	zandile malaza	<p>How do I appeal for EP1 the property is on one acre as the entire property has been protected including the house? We would like to extend the house in the future so protecting the entire property makes it impossible for our future plans.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural
2025-09-28	Webform	Frank and Nellie Curran	<p>We oppose to changing zoning to this property. We requested rural on original plan and wish it to remain the same. We wish to do some agricultural on this eight acres. This zoning would only cause our property to lose its value, causing stress and anxiety.</p>	Negative	EP1 - Rural

My property is located at 6572 Highway 26, Clearview. It consists of approximately 1.4 acres with a single family dwelling and 3 accessory buildings.

My current zoning is AG, with the exception that there can be no livestock.

The draft by-law proposes to rezone my property to EP1.

I strongly object to this re-zoning.

The proposed rezoning is not appropriate to my property and would deprive me of a number of uses which I currently enjoy as of right in the AG zoning. It would also have a serious negative impact on my ability to use and eventually sell my property and significantly reduce the market value of my property.

For example, under the proposed by-law, it would not be permitted to build a dwelling on my property since my lot did not legally exist in 2016 but was created by severance around 2019. I could not demolish my house and build a new one.

Another example is that under the proposed by-law, a home business would only be permitted in a dwelling – accessory buildings are not included.

The proposed rezoning is not appropriate to my property because there is no feature on my property which gives rise to any environmental or natural heritage concern.

My property is flat, and other than the buildings, the driving areas are gravel and the rest is grass. It is completely fenced on 3 sides. There is no water feature. It is assessed by MPAC as fully Residential.

My property is not a woodland, not a valley land; there is no wildlife habitat, no endangered species habitat or fish habitat, nor is it near a stream, not in a flood plain, no ANSI, no wetland and not a linkage area.

The proposed EP1 zone in the draft zoning by-law copies the Greenland Schedule in the 2024 OP.

The 2024 OP, Schedule B - Land Use Plan and Schedule C – Natural Heritage System, depict an area in green which includes my Property and designates it as “Greenland”.

However, the Greenland Schedules in the 2024 OP are only meant to be a general guideline to where Greenlands may be located:

Sec 4.9 of the 2024 OP states that “The boundaries of the Greenlands designations, as shown on Schedule B to this Official Plan, should be considered approximate, with their precise location to be determined by the Township, ... Minor adjustments to the boundaries of any of the “Greenlands” designations, as determined through more detailed mapping ... will not require an amendment to this Official Plan, provided the overall intent of this Plan is maintained.”

2025-10-02 Webform

Lysanne Cholette

That the mapping is only approximate is evident from the fact that the boundary of the green land area around my property is

Negative

EP1 - Rural

I am emailing with concerns about how the Zoning By-Law Review will affect my property (at 9303 County Road 91). I purchased this property with the intention of building a future family home. I worked very hard to purchase this land, invested my savings into it, and have continued to save toward building. In reliance on the current zoning and regulations, I invested in architectural plans for this home. I also obtained a topographic survey of the potential building site, which was deemed most suitable by both a local builder and architect. This building site appears to be potentially compromised by the new zoning proposed in the Zoning By-Law Review.

Additionally, at the time of purchase, NVCA staff advised me that the property was “probably overregulated” and that the slope of the land had been “overestimated.” I also received email confirmation the “home location appears to be acceptable given our policies and available knowledge of the site.”

Participating in public meetings is a challenge for me, and I want to ensure I am provided with a fair and accessible opportunity to participate in the planning process going forward.

Accordingly, I respectfully request:

1. Clarification of how the proposed Environmentally Protected boundaries were determined.
2. Copies of any supporting documents, mapping, and rationale used in developing the proposed zoning changes.
3. A webmap including the draft zoning layer, or a map showing the draft zoning overlaid on aerial imagery with measurements, so that the actual boundaries are clear.

The PDF map currently available splits the property between two pages and does not clearly show what portion will remain zoned Rural. Without accurate mapping, it is very difficult to assess the real impact of this proposal.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your clarification and to working toward a balanced outcome that both protects the environment and allows for fair and reasonable use of my property.

2025-10-02 Webform Rachel Pollacco

- Rachel

Negative EP1 - Rural

I am opposed to my property at 5430 concession 2, sunnidale New Lowell, becoming zoned EP1. The zoning remaining at mostly Rural is appropriate.

The Homesteader movement is a trend in which rural properties are using their acreage as a means to sustain their lives via small scale farming. I propose that Rural Properties are not held to the zoning bylaw in which a property of 4.99 acres or less is not able to house more than 4 chickens, as a livestock maximum. An acreage that consists only of grass is a terrible waste when it has the possibility of feeding people.

2025-10-14 Webform Lisa Moyer Squire

Negative EP1 - Rural

I am opposed to the zoning bylaw being proposed for our property. I am concerned the blanket change to EP will affect our property value and minimize the future uses / changes that may be made on it.

I want to acknowledge the EP sub categories as a positive change. We obviously need to protect EP areas but also need to be aware that not all areas under this designation require the same restrictions.

2025-10-14 Webform John squire

With increased pressure/requirement to be more self sufficient I would like to see changes made to minimum property sizing requirements for small rural farming. We need to maximize property usage.

Negative EP1 - Rural

2025-10-15 Webform Courtney Van Severen

Firstly we don't really understand the need to change the zoning here. The reason has not been clearly stated apart from wildlife. We have a forest management plan in place and run a sugar bush. I understand the proposed zoning does not impact that. However, potential future use of the property will need an extra level of approval. We strongly oppose the proposed changes and prefer our zoning remains unchanged. Thank you.

Negative EP1 - Rural

2025-10-16 Webform Nicole Teremchuk

I OBJECT to the rezoning of my property as EP1; it should remain as RU. The designation as EP1, Natural Heritage -Woodland Feature is INACCURATE as my property is NOT treed. A look at the zoning map clearly shows this, which leads me to wonder how such a fraudulent designation could have been made? Please leave the zoning of my property as is, designated as RU. Thank you.

Negative EP1 - Rural

I am writing to formally express my deep concern and strong objection to the proposed rezoning of my property from RU (Rural Residential) to EP (Environmental Protection) under the Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law currently under review.

When I purchased my property, it was zoned RU Residential—a designation that has been in place for decades. The proposed change to EP zoning would significantly and unfairly impact my rights and investment in the following ways:

1. Loss of Development Rights: EP zoning would severely restrict my ability to build, expand, or modify structures on my land, which I believe is a fundamental right of property ownership.
2. Reduced Property Value: The limitations imposed by EP zoning make land less desirable to potential buyers, thereby diminishing the market value and equity of my property.
3. Increased Regulatory Burden: Any future improvements or changes to my property would require costly environmental assessments and permits, placing an undue financial and administrative burden on me as a homeowner.

Additionally, I would like to highlight that my property does not possess the environmental characteristics typically associated with EP zoning. The land is largely bare, with only a few struggling trees due to poor soil quality. It does not contain significant natural features that would warrant an Environmental Protection designation. Applying such a restrictive zoning label to land that lacks ecological sensitivity seems arbitrary and unjustified.

This proposed change feels akin to a form of regulatory expropriation, stripping away the utility and value of my land without compensation. I urge Council to reconsider this rezoning initiative and maintain the current RU designation for my property.

I respectfully request that my concerns be formally recorded and considered during the public consultation process. I am prepared to participate in any upcoming meetings or provide further documentation to support my position.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Nathan Teremchuk

We are very concerned with the proposed expansion of the EP zoning on our property.

When we purchased our undeveloped land in 2016 we were well aware of the existing EP zone and where it was located. We took this into careful consideration when building our home to provide adequate space for the future for any additional projects: like a pool, accessory building or even possibly a accessory residential unit for our children.

The proposed change to the EP zone on our property would now not allow any of these plans to be possible. We are concerned about the negative impact this will have on the value of our property, as well as the ability to try and provide additional living spaces for future generations (which is supposed to be a very important thing to the township)

I also don't understand the rational behind the change to our land and nobody at the first public meeting was really able to explain specifically what environmental factors required the change. Where the current EP zone is, is completely understandable and we were accepting of that when we purchased the property. But to move the line up to the front of our property makes no sense. The area where our house was built has been elevated over 5 feet from the original grade and is not treed anymore (and yet somehow it is to be deemed an EP zone)

I have had a GIS Specialist look at our property and he say's there are no factors that should dictate a change to our current zoning based on all of the geographical / environmental data.

Based on all of this we ask that the current EP zoning area stays as it is (and does not change to the proposal)

Thank you for your consideration.

I am the owner of 3811 Concession 12 Sunnidale Road, Stayner L0M 1S0 roll number 432904000321001

Property is multiple zoning- but my focus is on the current RU area that will now be EP1

It appears this new bylaw will assist with some of the constraints we've been exploring over the last 2 years for the size of accessory barn and ADU.

EP1 appears to streamline NVCA regulations. We love the wetlands and have been aware of thru the interactive maps (including when we bought the property)

But after a couple of read throughs, the rezoning to EP1 appears to substantially interfere with key uses we considered when moving to Clearview:

I may have interpreted it incorrectly, can you help me confirm.

To start the conversation, here are the 5 most important uses for our Family from the current bylaw that seem to be impacted and not allowed in future:

- Plant Nursery, Produce Farm
- Accessory dwelling unit
- Accessory Farm produce sales outlet, retail stand
- Home Industry
- Temporary agricultural fair or exhibition

2025-09-13 Email

Stephen Main

Negative

EP1 - Rural

Good Morning Rossalyn,

I'm hoping that you could help me out and answer a few questions regarding the draft by-law. My home is highlighted in the attached and seems to be changing from Rural to "Environmental Protection – Natural Heritage" and to be honest I'm not entirely sure what that means in layman's terms.

Also:

- Does rezoning rural to EP typically change housing insurance at all (coverage, cost etc)?
- Will the zoning change effect property taxes?
- What does the change mean for housing/property modifications?
- Addition to house, adding a separate building/garage, landscaping, septic
- Why is there a small "rural island" across from us (to the east) - and there are others - what is the reasoning behind this?

Thank you for your help on this!!!

Hi Colin,

Just to be clear, I would also like to be added to the list of names as "opposed" to the zoning change in my area.

2025-09-24 Email

Fawne Breedon

Thank you,

Negative

EP1 - Rural

Good Afternoon,

I also submitted the following via the Township's webform, but I wanted to ensure it is received in a timely manner.

I am emailing with concerns about how the Zoning By-Law Review will affect my property (at 9303 County Road 91).

I purchased this property with the intention of building a future family home. I worked very hard to purchase this land, invested my savings into it, and have continued to save toward building. In reliance on the current zoning and regulations, I invested in architectural plans for this home. I also obtained a topographic survey of the potential building site, which was deemed most suitable by both a local builder and architect. This building site appears to be potentially compromised by the new zoning proposed in the Zoning By-Law Review.

Additionally, at the time of purchase, NVCA staff advised me that the property was "probably overregulated" and that the slope of the land had been "overestimated." I also received email confirmation the "home location appears to be acceptable given our policies and available knowledge of the site."

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Participating in public meetings is a challenge for me, and I want to ensure I am provided with a fair and accessible opportunity to participate in the planning process going forward.

Accordingly, I respectfully request:

1. Clarification of how the proposed Environmentally Protected boundaries were determined.
2. Copies of any supporting documents, mapping, and rationale used in developing the proposed zoning changes.
3. A webmap including the draft zoning layer, or a map showing the draft zoning overlaid on aerial imagery with measurements, so that the actual boundaries are clear.

The PDF map currently available splits my property between two pages and does not clearly show what portion will remain zoned Rural. Without accurate mapping, it is very difficult to assess the real impact of this proposal.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your clarification and to working toward a balanced outcome that both protects the environment and allows for fair and reasonable use of my property.

Karl Burggraf
6138 Conc. 2 New Lowell

My name is Karl Burggraf and I reside at 6138 Concession 2 New Lowell.

I purchased approximately 46 acres and built my house roughly 26 years ago with intentions of eventually making it a hobby farm.

The property had been farmed prior to my ownership and has continued to be farmed. First through Sommerville farms for 13 years, and currently through Fresh Acre Farms. I am registered through Agricorp.

I received a letter in the mail from a concerned neighbour regarding the proposed rezoning which would directly impact my property.

I did attend the first meeting and found it to be very disorganized, however, I was to speak with a representative who informed me that my property would be rezoned to EP land.

I am extremely opposed to this change. Not only would it devalue my property, it prevents me from building a desperately needed drive shed to store my equipment in.

Now that I am retired, I finally have the time to make these improvements and this rezoning would prevent me from doing so.

I am requesting that a significant portion of land surrounding my house remain rural to allow for these improvements.

I would like to speak with someone directly regarding these concerns.

I can be reached by email or by phone at the number listed above.

Sincerely
Karl Burggraf

2025-10-11 Email

Karl Burggraf

Negative

EP1 - Rural

Thank you again for taking the time to meet with me this morning. It was very helpful to review the maps together and discuss the issue in person.

As discussed, there appear to be inconsistencies between the mapping and the Official Plan. For example, the Woodlands and Wetlands map clearly shows there are no trees in the area where I hope to build my future family home (I will refer to this as the “cleared area”), yet the Proposed Zoning map includes much of this space within the EP1 Zone. In addition, the map identifies the immediate surrounding areas as “Other Woodlands,” not “Significant Woodlands.”

While I fully understand and appreciate the importance of protecting natural heritage features, I do not see a clear rationale for designating this particular area for protection given that there are no significant features to preserve. This location is the most suitable for construction and also the only site that avoids disturbing the surrounding forest. There is also an existing driveway from County Rd 91 that leads directly to the cleared area. This driveway is already wide enough for construction vehicles, and the cleared area itself is large enough to accommodate construction without removing any trees.

I understand that EP1 zoning does not necessarily prohibit future development, but it does introduce significant barriers that I am hoping to avoid; particularly if there is no specific reason to apply them in this case.

Accordingly, would the Township consider revisiting the proposed EP1 boundaries?

Specifically:

- Could the EP1 zoning be focused more directly on Wetlands and Significant Woodlands?
- At the very least, could the Township consider excluding the treeless portion (the “cleared area”) and the existing driveway (if relevant) from the EP1 Zone?

On a personal note, I feel it is a little unfair that the majority of the property is proposed to be rezoned from Rural to Environmentally Protected, as this represents a significant and restrictive change. While our goals align in that I also want to see the natural features of the property preserved, I hope we can arrive at a more balanced and practical outcome.

2025-10-20	Email	Rachel Pollacco		Negative	EP1 - Rural
------------	-------	-----------------	--	----------	-------------

OPPOSED! When Clearview twp drafted their official plan in 2006 we requested rural zoning. That was designated as such. There has been no changes to the property, no development nearby. We heated with wood cut from our own junk trees on property. There has been many trees planted, replacing ones cut.

To change zoning to environmental protection, will devalue the property and waste time & resources. We oppose to the proposed zoning. This has caused nothing but stress and anxiety!

2025-09-24	Comment	Frank & Nellie Curran		Negative	EP1 - Rural
------------	---------	-----------------------	--	----------	-------------

Luis & Krystalyn

We are opposed to the new zoning!

2025-09-24	Comment	Mendoza		Negative	EP1 - Rural
------------	---------	---------	--	----------	-------------

We attended the Open House, spoken with councillors and staff, neighbours, and friends regarding the proposed zoning changes.

We are not in agreement with the proposed changes for our property at 5430 Concession 2 Sunnidale, New Lowell.

We feel that the change in zoning in some areas is random. More consideration should be given to the radical changes in zoning for many properties.

We look forward to the informative Public Meeting on October 29 to discuss the future.

2025-09-24	Comment	John and Sandra Squire		Negative	EP1 - Rural
------------	---------	------------------------	--	----------	-------------

Hello Colin and Team

Given your clarifications, I will have to provide extensive feedback.

The impact of this sudden rezoning is very material for Marija and I. We are thoughtful stewards of the significant Environmentally Protected component of our land but this proposal of reverting from Partial Rural/Partial EP to 100% EP1 will have adverse affects.

To elaborate on my earlier questions/commentary, some of the example impacts include

1. We have always had plans to add a seasonal farmstand, another greenhouse, plus a drive shed/equipment storage (e.g. for items required to support the significant forested areas of our 30 acre property)
2. Accessory Dwelling Unit - we bought the property with intent to age in place, and also have multi-generational needs- with plans for an ADU outside the primary residence
3. OFDU- as we continue to build our lives here in Clearview- and when I retire from Full Time work, expected to leverage one or more of the OFDU's listed as a source of income.

I don't think the Council meeting is the right forum. If I take time off work to attend the Open House, would your team be able to walk through what specifically drove the rezoning proposal for our property per the draft map. Or is this better suited to a scheduled virtual meeting.

Thanks

Stephen Main

EP1 - Rural
ARU

2025-09-22 Email

Stephen Main

Negative

OFDU

I am opposed to my property being re-zoned as EP1. I do not have national heritage landmarks on my property and the change from rural to EP1 drastically limits or eliminates my ability to use my property. It is in my family's plans to be able to support our children into adulthood with a place to live while the rest of the housing market is wildly unaffordable to them, and to potentially support our parents with housing as well. This would require an A.R.U. Zoning our area as EP1 would prevent this from being an option for us. I would like to see the zoning stay the way it is with my property rural and overlaid with NVCA if required (currently part of my property has this) I feel that my area has been blanketed without warrant as EP1 and this should not be the case EP(1,2,3) should only be for areas that truly have heritage landmarks and not a sweeping area that blocks progress. The Ontario planning act states that an A.R.U. is permitted (not exact wording). As well the provincial government has made amendments to acts to make it easier to build additional housing to support the housing crisis in Ontario. Simcoe county also offers credits to build additional housing. This change in zoning is contradictory to both the planning act and the programs in place to build affordable housing. A secondary recommendation is include ARU in table 12.1 for EP zone permitted uses, this would give anyone in any EP zone the ability to have a study completed and still be able to build, this is not ideal but the current verbiage and table setup prevents this completely. ARU is included in table 6.1 for rural permitted uses. A property that does not have any national heritage landmarks should not have to have the same restrictions as property's that have landmarks.

Thank you for reviewing my comments and concerns and I look forward to seeing the changes to the zoning in my area.

Kris Sutton

EP1 - Rural
ARUs

2025-09-24 Webform

Kris Sutton

Negative

- We strongly oppose the following changes on our property:
- Zoning change of lower portion from Residential to Rural
 - Changing the settlement area to exclude our property
 - Creating Environmental protection zoning on large portions of our property
 - Extending the flood risk zoning up the hill and at the bottom part.

These changes make no sense and are devaluating our property. We were promised to not have the settlement area changed during the official plan process. Why is that done now. Also the zoning change of the lower half of the property from residential to rural is illogical. That part would make an ideal extension of the county Rd. 9 buildings, especially when there is a shortage of building lots in Creemore and the federal and provincial government are pushing to create more housing.

2025-09-24 Webform	Matthias + Catherine Marti	We also oppose the process of this bylaw change. How can you propose sweeping changes of zoning bylaws without contacting the affected landowners.	Negative	EP1 - Rural EP1 - Residential Property Value
--------------------	----------------------------	--	----------	--

Difficult to provide any sort of logical comment to an agency that operates outside of any form of logic and normality, and when the level of insanity in this proposal is not fully understood. In reference ONLY to the extensive rezoning of Rural lands to EP within the entire municipality, specifically my property No. 2 above, 90% of the current RU zoning will be changed, including all of the lands that the house and driveway sit on. Your draft proposal will be aggressively appealed to the OLT along with all legal forms of compensation available. The obvious question is why? What wakes this portion of my property need environmental protection? There is barely a tree in this area of change, most of which are landscape trees planted by myself. Is it my lawn and driveway that need environmental protection?. Property No. 1 above falls under insanity and ignorance to a level that can't be fully comprehended. It provides for undisputable evidence that what ever entity guided this proposal, did so based on zero real environmental concerns. This property and the proposed zoning change to EP1 completely disregards the findings of a recent, lengthy, and costly environmental impact study, one of which the NVCA also has their inept involvement in. In regards to this property, the combined ineptness of both Clearview Township and NVCA are already being appealed to the OLT. In short, it bewilders me and many area residents as to simply, why? This insanity needs to be stopped.

2025-10-17 Webform	Frank Renz		Negative	EP1 - Rural General frustration
--------------------	------------	--	----------	------------------------------------

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning of my property located at 3626 Hogback Rd New Lowell, ON L0M1N0 from its current Rural (RU) designation to Environmental Protection – Natural Heritage (EP1).

While I respect the Township’s responsibility to protect natural heritage features, this proposed rezoning would have serious negative impacts on my property value, my family’s use and enjoyment of the land, and my long-term ability to maintain and improve the property.

1. Property Value Impacts

Reduced Market Value: Rural (RU) zoning allows for a wide range of uses (residential dwelling, home business, agriculture, accessory buildings, etc.). By contrast, EP1 zoning prohibits most development and imposes restrictive setbacks from natural features (120m from Primary, 50m from Secondary). Buyers value flexibility and future potential; removing that flexibility directly reduces property value.

Perception of Constraint: Even if some limited uses are technically permitted, the “Environmental Protection” label stigmatizes properties, creating the perception that they are heavily restricted or unbuildable, which diminishes buyer interest and reduces resale value.

2. Restrictions on Reasonable Use

Current Rural Zoning Flexibility: Under Rural zoning, I can reasonably maintain my dwelling, construct accessory buildings, operate small-scale home-based businesses, and enjoy the property as intended.

EP1 Limits: Table 12.1 and 12.2 (attached) show that EP1 zoning eliminates or severely restricts:

New dwellings (only permitted if legally existing prior to May 9, 2016).

2025-09-24 Email

Brittany MacDonald

Negative

EP1 - Rural
Property Value

Rezoning from RU to EP1 and EP2 on a newly purchased property will greatly impact land owners with the change where change is not needed high and dry property is being changed making it worthless tanking property value and what we can do with the property rendering it useless

I strongly suggest my property and others be reevaluated this is wrong making hard working peoples property change for much worse saying I can't do anything with our own land.

The Planning of this township needs to be fixed more public involved when dealing with their property.

The rezoning from RU to EP1 and EP2 without actually looking at property. Very insufficient way to do planning. The rezoning drastically impacts value and what can be done on my own land. I think my property needs to be re-evaluated.

2025-09-24 Comment

Nick Melenhorst

Negative

EP1 - Rural
Property Value

16TH 2025To: [Council/Clerk/Planning Department of Township of Clearview]Re: Opposition to Proposed Zoning Change from Rural (RU) to Environmental Protection 1 (EP1)Dear [Mayor/Planner/Clerk],I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning of my property located at [insert property description/roll number] from its current Rural (RU) designation to Environmental Protection – Natural Heritage (EP1).While I respect the Township’s responsibility to protect natural heritage features, this proposed rezoning would have serious negative impacts on my property value, my family’s use and enjoyment of the land, and my long-term ability to maintain and improve the property.---1. Property Value ImpactsReduced Market Value: Rural (RU) zoning allows for a wide range of uses (residential dwelling, home business, agriculture, accessory buildings, etc.). By contrast, EP1 zoning prohibits most development and imposes restrictive setbacks from natural features (120m from Primary, 50m from Secondary). Buyers value flexibility and future potential; removing that flexibility directly reduces property value.Perception of Constraint: Even if some limited uses are technically permitted, the “Environmental Protection” label stigmatizes properties, creating the perception that they are heavily restricted or unbuildable, which diminishes buyer interest and reduces resale value.---2. Restrictions on Reasonable UseCurrent Rural Zoning Flexibility: Under Rural zoning, I can reasonably maintain my dwelling, construct accessory buildings, operate small-scale home-based businesses, and enjoy the property as intended.EP1 Limits: Table 12.1 and 12.2 (attached) show that EP1 zoning eliminates or severely restricts:New dwellings (only permitted if legally existing prior to May 9, 2016).Accessory structures unless tied to conservation or flood control.Expansion or replacement of existing buildings without costly Environmental Impact Studies.Normal agricultural and recreational uses that are allowed in Rural zoning.These restrictions effectively “freeze” my property, stripping away uses I have reasonably relied upon when purchasing and maintaining it.---3. Unnecessary Duplication of ProtectionsExisting legislation already protects sensitive features: Provincial Policy Statement, Conservation Authority regulations, and site-specific permits under the Planning Act and Environmental Protection Act. Adding EP1 zoning is duplicative and unnecessarily punitive.Environmental concerns can be addressed through site-specific studies (e.g., Environmental Impact Studies) when development is actually proposed—rather than a blanket rezoning that pre-emptively removes property rights.---4. Fairness and ProportionalityRezoning private land to EP1 without compensation effectively transfers value from the property owner to the public.This constitutes a de facto expropriation of rights without due process or compensation. If the Township wishes to preserve lands exclusively for natural heritage protection, acquisition—not unilateral rezoning—should be the appropriate mechanism.---5. RequestGiven the above, I respectfully request that Council:1. Reject the proposed rezoning of my property to EP1 and retain its current Rural designation.2. Alternatively, consider site-specific protections targeted only to genuine environmental features (e.g., wetlands, floodplains) rather than applying broad EP1 zoning to the entirety of my property.---

2025-09-16 Webform

BRITTANY & PHILLIP
MACDONALD

Negative
EP1 - Rural
Property Values

Township of Clearview]Re: Opposition to Proposed Zoning Change from Rural (RU) to Environmental Protection 1 (EP1)Dear [Mayor/Planner/Clerk], I am writing to formally oppose the proposed rezoning of my property located at 3626 HOGBACK RD NEW LOWELL ON, L0M 1N0 from its current Rural (RU) designation to Environmental Protection – Natural Heritage (EP1). While I respect the Township’s responsibility to protect natural heritage features, this proposed rezoning would have serious negative impacts on my property value, my family’s use and enjoyment of the land, and my long-term ability to maintain and improve the property.---

1. Property Value Impacts
Reduced Market Value: Rural (RU) zoning allows for a wide range of uses (residential dwelling, home business, agriculture, accessory buildings, etc.). By contrast, EP1 zoning prohibits most development and imposes restrictive setbacks from natural features (120m from Primary, 50m from Secondary). Buyers value flexibility and future potential; removing that flexibility directly reduces property value.
Perception of Constraint: Even if some limited uses are technically permitted, the “Environmental Protection” label stigmatizes properties, creating the perception that they are heavily restricted or unbuildable, which diminishes buyer interest and reduces resale value.---

2. Restrictions on Reasonable Use
Current Rural Zoning Flexibility: Under Rural zoning, I can reasonably maintain my dwelling, construct accessory buildings, operate small-scale home-based businesses, and enjoy the property as intended.
EP1 Limits: Table 12.1 and 12.2 (attached) show that EP1 zoning eliminates or severely restricts:
New dwellings (only permitted if legally existing prior to May 9, 2016).
Accessory structures unless tied to conservation or flood control.
Expansion or replacement of existing buildings without costly Environmental Impact Studies.
Normal agricultural and recreational uses that are allowed in Rural zoning.
These restrictions effectively “freeze” my property, stripping away uses I have reasonably relied upon when purchasing and maintaining it.---

3. Unnecessary Duplication of Protections
Existing legislation already protects sensitive features: Provincial Policy Statement, Conservation Authority regulations, and site-specific permits under the Planning Act and Environmental Protection Act. Adding EP1 zoning is duplicative and unnecessarily punitive. Environmental concerns can be addressed through site-specific studies (e.g., Environmental Impact Studies) when development is actually proposed—rather than a blanket rezoning that pre-emptively removes property rights.---

4. Fairness and Proportionality
Rezoning private land to EP1 without compensation effectively transfers value from the property owner to the public. This constitutes a de facto expropriation of rights without due process or compensation. If the Township wishes to preserve lands exclusively for natural heritage protection, acquisition—not unilateral rezoning—should be the appropriate mechanism.---

5. Request
Given the above, I respectfully request that Council:

1. Reject the proposed rezoning of my property to EP1 and retain its current Rural designation.
2. Alternatively, consider site-specific protections targeted only to genuine environmental features (e.g., wetlands, floodplains) rather than applying broad EP1 zoning to the entirety of my property.---

Conclusion
My property is my family’s home

2025-09-18 Webform Leona Calbeck

EP1 - Rural
Property Values

Negative

My name is Korbin Purchase. My family and I have lived in New Lowell for about 3 years and we chose New Lowell because we love the area, but also because we wanted more land we could use to build our future. We have plans to use the property in a healthy way that would enrich our lives but also bring more value to the town. Plans that the current proposed new zoning would destroy.

Under the proposed zoning changes our home which my family and I purchased about 3 years ago as a rural property would now be set on environmentally protected property. It seems to me that whoever is making these zoning changes is not looking closely enough to the specifics of the properties and simply looking at a map and drawing lines with a ruler.

There is absolutely no reason that any EP zoning could not simply surround our property rather than cutting across it. The property directly beside ours (to the south) is set to be surrounded by EP rather than drawing a line directly across the middle of it like our property.

The way the proposed line is drawn would place our physical house and shop on EP rather than rural land as it is currently zoned, and how we purchased it. Again, there is zero reason to do it this way. There is nothing on my property that differs on the side of the line you want to zone as EP from the side you wish to keep as Rural. Aside from some trees that are decorative, almost my entire property is cleared. There is nothing there to "protect".

The proposed rezoning I can only see as an error. No person standing on the property would logically conclude that this it needs to be set as EP. It seems as though whoever is drawing the line simply took a ruler from the back of the 2 properties to the south of our property and just drew a line without actually checking where any structures were actually built or what the current state of the property is. There is forest behind our property but not ON our property.

The property has been set as rural for 40 or 50 years. I am not sure what the point would be of suddenly making 2/3rds of the property worthless EP land.

2025-09-27 Webform

Korbin Purchase

This would effectively punish my family simply for choosing New Lowell to call our home; as our property would instantly and

Negative

EP1 - Rural
Property Values

Subject: Formal Objection to EP1 Zoning Designation – 3811 Concession 12 Sunnidale Rd Roll Number 432904000321001

Date: Sept 30th, 2025

Dear Planning Staff and Members of Council,

We are writing to formally object to the proposed designation of my whole property as Environmental Protection One (EP1) under the Draft Zoning By-law (PB-033-2025 Appendix A). Eliminating the current mixed Rural/EP designation imposes significant restrictions that are inconsistent with the property's current use, its historical function, and its development potential under the existing Rural (RU) zoning in the ~2.5 acres fronting on to Concession 12.

1. Inconsistency with Existing Use and Permissions

Under the current by-law (Section 3.0 Zones), the northerly ~2.5 acres (~8%) of the property is thoughtfully zoned Rural (RU), which permits the following uses that we have plans for:

- * Agricultural operations (e.g. maple syrup production, plant nursery, apiary/bees)
- * Accessory buildings and structures (e.g. another greenhouse or poly tunnel, and a driveshed/equipment storage barn)
- * Accessory dwelling unit (e.g. for multi generational living)
- * Accessory farm produce road-side retail stand (seasonal)
- * Accessory farm cidery (seasonal)
- * Temporary seasonal outdoor attractions (e.g. Nature walks, Plein Air Painting workshops)
- * Home occupations and small-scale rural businesses (e.g. existing Art Studio, including workshops)

As confirmed at the Open House on September 24th with your project team, the proposed EP1 zone would prohibit these uses that we specifically considered when purchasing the property in 2021 as we became full time Clearview residents with future goals to age in place, support rural entrepreneurship, and be good stewards of the ~92% (27+acres) of our property that are currently environmentally protected- including a portion that is provincially significant wetlands.

2. Impact on Property Rights and Value

The EP1 designation would:

- * Prohibit accessory dwelling unit

2025-09-30 Webform Stephen Main

Negative EP1 - Rural
Property Values

Hello

Our names are Janet Calwell and Kevin Hanrahan and we live at 5262 Concession 2, New Lowell, ON. L0M 1N0. We attended your Open House and met and talked with a member of your staff, he was knowledgeable and patient with our questions.

We are aware that the back of the land is Environmentally protected and have no concerns with it as there is a small brook that runs through it.

Our concern is that you are going to make our entire home Environmentally protected??

Questions:

1) Our house has many, many trees on it does that mean we can not cut down our own trees esp. when they get close to the roof or are rotten?

2) Can we never extend our house to make it bigger?

3) Will our taxes be decreased as now we can't do any of the renovations we wanted to do?

4) If you are only having the public meeting on Oct 29, 2025that does not give the public much time to respond by your first draft on Nov 5, 2025.

5) What other restrictions will you be putting on our land if it goes completely EP.

Look forward to hearing from you

2025-10-15	Email	Janet Calwell and Kevin Hanrahan	Janet and Kevin	Negative	EP1 - Rural Request for more information
2025-10-16	Webform	Helena Nevill	Our property is farmland, no fishing, and no endangered species.	Negative	EP1- Rural

Dear Planning Department,

We are writing to formally provide comments regarding the proposed rezoning of our property, 249 Kathleen Crescent, Stayner, from a Residential Low Density (RS2) zone to an Environmental Protection 2 (EP2) zone.

We do not support this proposed rezoning. Our property was established through a registered plan of subdivision process, which included the necessary technical studies to determine appropriate building envelopes and support the residential use of the land. Rezoning to an Environmental Protection zone would contradict the approvals already in place, impose additional restrictions on our property rights, and negatively impact its use and value.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that our property remain zoned as Residential, and that this objection be recorded as part of the review and decision-making process.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

Christine and Jarrod Taggart
249 Kathleen Crescent, Stayner

2025-09-17	Email	Christine Taggart		Negative	EP2 - Residential
------------	-------	-------------------	--	----------	-------------------

Attention: Planning Department

Re: Draft Zoning By-Law

Please be advised that we the undersigned, object to the proposed zoning change to our properties from the current RS2 zone to the proposed EP2 zone.

We feel this is wrong as refined flood lining and building elevations were addressed and defined through proper studies when the subdivision was created in 1999. Thus, the current RS2 zone that exists today.

We strongly feel that the failure of your planning consultants not to have acknowledged this is careless at best.

Please advise that this will be addressed prior to the passing of this By-Law.

With strong concern,

Bart and Brenda Chapman 253 Kathleen Cresc.

Gary and Carol Van Niekerk 251 Kathleen Cresc.

Jarrod and Christine Taggart 249 Kathleen Cresc.

Nathan and Amanda Westendorp 247 Kathleen Cresc.

Doug Lowe and Lorna Howlett-Lowe 245 Kathleen Cresc.

Christine and Gerard Money Penny 243 Kathleen Cresc.

Amanda Garbutt 241 Kathleen Cresc.

Ken and Angela Rolling 239 Kathleen Cresc.

Andy and Shelley Lafreniere 237 Kathleen Cresc.

John and Arlene Thompson 227 Dominion Dr.

2025-10-10 Email

Bart Chapman

Negative

EP2 - Residential

My concern is in relation to the changing of the zoning to EP3 on my current property. I am currently in the process of preparing for an application to build a house and associated accessory garage on 6155 Concession 2 Rd Sunnidale. I just purchased this property in 2025. I have a geotechnical report and engineering drawings prepared. I applied for the entrance permit and have installed a proper entrance in accordance with the townships specifications. Changing the zoning to "EP3 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION WETLAND AREA" would prevent me from constructing my home and accessory garage next year. This would also significantly devalue the property if I were to sell it since no one could build anything on it. With respect to my property at 6174 Concession 2 Sunnidale, changing the zoning to EP1 would also prevent me from building an accessory garage structure. These 2 properties were both previously allowed to have a primary residence and accessory buildings on them under the old zoning by-law. We wish to request exemptions to these to properties.

2025-09-23 Webform

STEVEN GREEN

Negative

EP3 - Rural
Property Values
Site-specific error
(Rural)

2025-09-25	Webform	Christopher Vanderkruys	I feel that the flood zone could be reduced within this area in Brentwood to satisfy local landowners for the future Hi Rossalyn I just noticed another error in the zoning of the lots along Locke Ave that we had rezoned to RS3 a few years back as they are fully serviced but are slated for the FD zone which will not permit the construction of a new dwelling. I think they need to remain R3. Your thoughts? Bart Chapman, Broker	Negative	Floodplain Overlay
2025-09-30	Email	Bart Chapman	Further: OK as long as they get a buildable zoning and the ability to sever into 50 foot frontage.	Negative	Future Development

Hello Nick,

My name is David Scarsellone, and I am a Junior Planner with Morgan Planning & Development. One of our clients owns various properties in Clearview, including 29 Wyant Road in Stayner. We have been retained to conduct an impact assessment of the Draft Zoning By-law on each of their properties.

29 Wyant Road is proposed to be zoned 'Future Development (FD)' in the Draft Zoning By-law. In the FD zone, the Draft ZBL states that permitted uses are limited to 'Any use that legally existed on the lot on the effective date of this by-law'. Does this essentially freeze development in this zone when the draft ZBL is brought into effect? Are permitted uses in the current zoning by-law still permitted in the FD zone? Is there an application path that can be taken to permit the uses currently permitted by the in-effect Zoning By-law?

Any information is very much appreciated.

Thanks,

MORGAN Planning & Development Inc.

David Scarsellone,

James Hunter

David Scarsellone, BES (Hons. Pl)

N/A

Future Development
Request for more
information

2025-10-01 Email

Enough of the taking away from us. You already tax us through the roof and now want to control us even more. Thought the government was trying to make it easier for people to build?

Negative

General frustration

2025-09-15 Webform

Jay Hewitt

character of our rural community.

Re-zoning land has significant impacts to myself and my neighbours such as but not limited to:

- 1.Restricts Property Rights: Limiting the ability to build, renovate, or make reasonable use of privately-owned land—without due process or compensation—sets a troubling precedent. Property owners who have maintained their land responsibly should not be penalized without clear justification.
- 2.Lacks Transparency: There has been insufficient disclosure about the scientific or environmental criteria used to determine which properties are being rezoned. Without public access to the data and rationale, this process appears arbitrary and opaque.
- 3.Devalues Land and Creates Financial Hardship: Many residents have invested in rural properties with the expectation of being able to build, expand, or improve their homes. These changes could drastically lower property values and create financial uncertainty for families and local businesses.
- 4.Fails to Consider Individual Circumstances: Environmental protection should be implemented based on site-specific assessments—not sweeping changes that ignore how individual parcels of land are used, maintained, or developed.
- 5.Contradicts Principles of Fair Governance: Significant by-law amendments that affect land use rights must be subject to public meetings, impact assessments, and stakeholder engagement. A top-down approach undermines trust in local governance.

Additionally, even if my property is not directly affected by these zoning changes, the impact on neighboring parcels will significantly reduce the overall value, appeal, and utility of my land. Property value is inherently connected to the surrounding area. If adjacent properties are restricted from being maintained, developed, or improved, this diminishes the attractiveness of the neighborhood as a whole, discourages investment, and reduces resale potential. It also limits future options for collaboration with neighbors, shared infrastructure, or subdivision potential—further devaluing what many of us have worked hard to build. In this sense, the negative economic impact is not isolated, and it is unfair to assume unaffected properties will remain untouched financially or functionally.

For these reasons I am strongly against re-zoning!

2025-09-23	Webform	Brittany Woodman		Negative	General frustration
2025-10-16	Webform	Melinda Magee	New zoning bylaws should never affect someone's property value especially when selling. Curious to know why these are being changed and who in the township.or outside of the township decided to do this?	Negative	General frustration
2025-10-18	Webform	Maria Fernandes	Its my property j payed for it who gives you the right to make it protected	Negative	General frustration
2025-10-22	Webform	Nicole Mead	The rezoning map is not user friendly at all. You can't even zoom in and see the legends. Nothing is labelled to even find my location of my home. I don't even know if I'm being rezoned because the map is impossible to read.	Negative	Mapping frustration
2025-09-16	Email	Frank Renz	Frank Renz Currently it would appear that there is no easy and efficient method in comparing the current zoning perimeters to the sweeping new proposed changes. The existing ZB Schedule map is of such poor quality and to flip between this map schedule and the much improved newly proposed zoning schedules lacks any real insight to proposed changes. I am aware of the GIS mapping and its disclaimer, however for a quick overview of current zones and other information, it works quite well and has been extensively used by planning staff in the past. My question is, why can't the draft zone bylaw maps be placed as an optional layer within the current Clearview township GIS mapping? This is not only a question, it is also my request to the Township. Thank you	Negative	Mapping frustration

		Thank you for the open house. It was very difficult to understand from the presentation what changes have been made to 1) mapping, 2) zoning bylaws. A flip overlay over the maps would be great! Good idea to increase EP zoning in light of climate change and the biodiversity crisis Good idea to increase intensification within settlement areas in order to protect agricultural lands & habitat for wildlife I support the general expansion of EP zoned lands, & appreciate that in so doing the breakdown into EP1, EP2, EP3 provides some degree of flexibility, for instance that an existing lot with EP1 zoning could potentially have a house if it can be proven their isn't harm in so doing.			Mapping frustration Support for Environmental Protection
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Jim Campbell		Postivie	
2025-10-15	Webform	Emily Clarkson	N/A	N/A	N/A
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	George Mikaczio	No comments left	N/A	N/A
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Giovanna Chsasanta	No comments left	N/A	N/A
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Luis Mendoza	No comments left	N/A	N/A
2025-10-17	Webform	Laura Sega	There needs to be a much more simplified and reasonable process for OFDU for small scale farms. If the process does not offer the assurance of reasonableness, farmers are likely to operate without engaging the town.	Negative	OFDU
2025-10-19	Webform	Monica Branigan	<p>Consider small farms in Clearview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32% of Clearview farms were 69 acres or less in 2016 * • 30% of land in our prime agricultural area has low agricultural capability* • farmers with smaller properties or less fertile soil are more likely to need alternative sources of income = OFDU and home businesses • Official Plan: “intends for agricultural uses to be and remain the predominant land use within the ‘Agricultural’ designation, and intends for agricultural uses of all types, sizes, and intensities.....to be promoted and protected” <p>Here’s the problem</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supporting alternative sources of income supports agriculture to continue on small farms • limits to home businesses do not support agriculture on small farms • OFDUs permissions are treated the same as subdivision proposals rather than in an expedited fashion as recommended in Guidelines to Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas <p>Home businesses on farms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited to gross floor area of 25% dwelling while live-work units are limited to 50% • no longer a home business if outdoors or uses an accessory building (allowed in residential areas) • bed and breakfast is considered an OFDU with more onerous permissions • limit to three people at a time which may preclude home daycare <p>Why make it more difficult to operate a home business on a farm when these limits do not protect farmland?</p> <p>On-farm diversified Use (OFDU)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Plan includes an initiative for “zoning permissions” for on-farm diversified use as part of its Core Business-Agriculture Priority (which does not appear on the Strategic Plan Dashboard) • Official Plan supports this initiative with more permissive requirements for OFDU which “may be permitted without an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw” and “may be permitted without site plan approval” <p>The reality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all OFDUs require Site Plan Approval • Site Plan Approval has the very same minimum completeness requirements as a proposal for a subdivision • no distinguishing between small and large OFDU • no distinguishing between prime agricultural land and land of poor agricultural capability 	Negative	OFDU

2025-10-17	Webform	Nancy Waters	<p>Thank you for making this document public and for allowing input. This property has been classified as EP1. Does this document allow for the possibility of parsing out less than 10% for some kind of structure or trails for personal use on this property.</p> <p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I have recently read through the zoning by-law review. I see 3/4 Sunnidale Sideroad on there, but cannot truly confirm where my exact location of my house is in the colour schemed areas.</p> <p>Could you please confirm if 3354 3/4 Sideroad Sunnidale, New Lowell, ON L0M 1N0 is impacted by the proposed by-law and if so, how and what the change is.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	Negative	Request for more information
2025-09-29	Email	Christina Garriock	<p>Christina</p> <p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I am reaching out regarding the Draft Zoning By-law, for lands along County Road 42 in Stayner. Are you able to advise of the source for the EP mapping? Is this based on Provincial or NVCA data?</p> <p>Furthermore, there are lands along County Road 42 that are proposed to be zoned as Future Development; however, the Official Plan recently designated these as Industrial. Are you able to provide some information related to the objective of the FD zone for these lands?</p> <p>I am also happy to set up a meeting to discuss the items above.</p> <p>Thank you and looking forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Hi Derek and Rossalyn,</p> <p>It was nice to see you at the Open House. We would like to schedule a virtual call to discuss 1146 and 1194 County Rd 42, 248 Centre Street. As you know, we had been engaged through the OPR process to convert these lands to residential; however, they remained as Employment. In the draft Zoning By-law they are zoned as Future Development. We would like to understand the proposed Future Development zone.</p>	N/A	Request for more information
2025-09-30	Email	Kayly Robbins		N/A	Request for more information Future Development
2025-09-09	Webform	Shirley O'Reilly Joost	I'm just curious about the outcome	Neutral	Request to be informed
2025-09-17	Webform	Amanda Hashimoto	<p>I want to understand clearly how this affects my home and my property and my future.</p> <p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I would like to request to be added/registered as an interested party on the proceedings of the new zoning by-law updates on behalf of Tribute Communities, please.</p>	Neutral	Request to be informed
2025-09-23	Email	Jacob Dosman	Thank you,	N/A	Request to be informed

The following is an initial submission of comments and I may provide additional comments as the matter progresses.

From a quick review it appears that the Township is are changing the provisions (the standards and regulations of a zone) that apply to most of the residential areas in New Lowell (RS1). For example, the minimum lot frontage requirement is increasing, the minimum lot area is increasing, the minimum front yard is increasing, the minimum rear yard is increasing, the minimum interior side yard is increasing, and the minimum exterior side yard is increasing.

It is unclear why these much more restrictive provisions are required. The current adopted by-law has been in force since 2006 and, to my knowledge, it is not apparent that current provisions have caused any land use planning issues or concerns and that they are in anyway inappropriate in regard to good land use planning or consistency with the PPS 2024 and conformity with the OP.

The proposed revisions would unreasonably restrict development potential on the lots and make it more difficult to accommodate an additional dwelling unit at a time when many families may need such a unit to accommodate family members or assist in paying mortgages etc. There are sufficient provisions in place to determine the appropriateness of an additional dwelling unit and increasing minimum provisions to restrict the building envelope is not necessary.

2025-09-15	Webform	Michael Wynia	Establishing title problems related to legal non-conforming status and/or requiring an increase in the number of variances is not efficient land use planning and does not make the best use of residentially designated and zoned lands.	Negative	Site & Building Regulations - R1
2025-09-22	Webform	Alfiya Kakal	The Draft Zoning By-law designates a portion of the lands as 'Agricultural'. The Agricultural zoning is not in line with the Township OP designation (Mineral Aggregate Resource) or County of Simcoe Land Use designation (Rural). We request and recommend that an alternative zoning be considered.	N/A	Site-specific error (Aggregate)
2025-09-24	Webform	Jeremy Cober	These properties have been included in the FD zoning, and should be in residential zoning.	N/A	Site-specific error (Future Development)
2025-10-19	Webform	Earle and Susan Osburn	The property located directly behind our 2 houses is zoned EP and has been since we moved here 36 years ago. Your plan is to change a huge area from County 10 and McCarthy Drive to Rural (hundreds of acres) which will encourage building more houses in the area. Throughout the years we have seen many wildlife behind us including a nesting ground for turtles, deer, coyotes, possums, foxes, hawks, bald eagles, owls (small tawny, barred and barn), and vultures. The list could go on and on. This is a wetland, marshy area that has many native species of plants and animals that work in unison with the spring run off as well as giving a protected habitat. We would like this area to be left as EP as flood plain is needed for climate mitigation. Changing it to Rural would give the means to disrupt thousands of species of plants and animals that have made this area its home for many years, and we hope for many more years to come. Thank you.	Negative	Support for Environmental Protection
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Suzanne Wesetvill	Looking forward to getting further information regarding the changed zoning plans / maps (it wasn't great to have an overall available showing old vs. proposed). Also, to hear more about proposed intensification in existing settlement areas - in general, appreciate the apparent move to encourage densification/intensification of existing settlement areas, allowing ADU/ARUs. - While protecting environmental sensitive areas and promoting wildlife corridors, which are so vital to a healthy ecosystem for Clearview. It would also be appreciated if LIDAR mapping could be included to more fully understand the protected watercourse/wetland areas. What is the status of wetlands that are less than the defined 2 hectares? Are they not protected? I think the essential outline is a good one, and look forward to seeing all the relevant concerns of the various stakeholders - including our environment! - addressed. Thanks!	Positive	Support for Environmental Protection Support for Intensification

2025-09-12	Webform	Morgan Chapman	I would like to sever off 5 acres, and build a house on the property. The area where we would like to build the house is already cleared, and we would have no reason to take down anymore trees to build. I've reached out asking if this is possible and was told it is not because the back acreage of the property is part of the NVCA but we would not be touching any of that part of the land.	N/A	Unrelated
2025-09-24	Webform	Jeremy Cober	Why is this land and surrounding residential properties zoned as waste management area. Please fix this area, and move back to rural.	N/A	Waste Management Area
2025-09-25	Webform	Deb Bronee	With respect to the Industrial Waste Disposal zoning. This site is on the very low end of waste disposal. There was a household disposal site here for approximately 2 years but it was closed due to the high water table. By calling it industrial waste I believe that it can create a reason to sensationalize the waste that is actually there. In a time where there are exceptions to other zoning by area, maybe we should use this opportunity to describe how the 9 waste sites in the Township were actually used.	N/A	Waste Management Area
2025-09-29	Webform	Karen Pratt	I do not support the zoning label "Private Waste Management Facility" as it does not align with the previous WDAA designation and appears to significantly change the size, shape, and intent of the area. I request clarification and that further studies and public consultation occur before any zoning is finalized.	Negative	Waste Management Area
2025-10-01	Webform	Linda and Scott Dermott	We do not support the zoning label " Private Waste Management Facility " as it does not align with the previous WDAA designation and appears to significantly change the size ,shape and intent of the area . I request clarification and that further studies and public consultation occur before any zoning is finalized.	Negative	Waste Management Area
2025-10-01	Webform	Michelle Puncheon	I do not support the zoning label "Private Waste Management Facility" as it does not align with the previous WDAA designation and appears to significantly change the size, shape, and intent of the area. I request clarification and that further studies and public consultation occur before any zoning is finalized.	Negative	Waste Management Area
2025-09-24	Paper Comment	Alan Riddell	The official plan shows the old landfill site on Edward St. E, Creemore as residential. The draft zoning bylaw is showing 1/2 as future residential (currently that portion is being used by Simcoe as storage of garbage/recycling bins and trucks) and the other 1/2 is shown as waste management industrial (currently it is open field with trees). Where did this change of land use come from? Why does it not match the official plan?	N/A	Waste Management Site
2025-10-19	Webform	Tracey Atkinson	Please see previous email.	N/A	
2025-10-18	Email	Monica Branigan			