

Received from Todd Bertram 7 February 2023

Client 1 – CHRISTIE – PAUDASH LAKE

Wants to cover a small portion 12' x 10' of their existing deck.

Proximity to lake = 100'+

Impact on public safety, property, and the environment = ABSOLUTELY NONE with a structure of this size.

Permit received with no issues/comments

Process took over 5 months

CVCA permit cost is 3 times more than the building permit cost.

Complaint:

Why does a project as trivial as this require a permit in the first place?

Out of the 100's of decks and porches built, how many have actually had an impact that was a concern? If the answer is very few, then the CVCA needs to re-address their policies and pay attention to the projects that are of concern and forget about the small ones that aren't.

Why did it take 5 months to receive this unnecessary permit?

Client 2 – DAVIES – PAUDASH LAKE

Wants to cover a small portion 12' x 16' of their existing deck.

Proximity to lake = 100'+

Impact on public safety, property, and the environment = ABSOLUTELY NONE with a structure of this size.

Permit submitted = April 2022

Permit Status = No Clue

Client comment: *" I have not received anything yet from Crowe Valley. I sent an inquiry off to them back in May along with their fee and have received no response from them despite sending emails and calling. Are they always this bad??"*

Complaint:

Why does a project as trivial as this require a permit in the first place?

Out of the 100's of decks and porches built, how many have actually had an impact that was a concern? If the answer is very few, then the CVCA needs to re-address their policies and pay attention to the projects that are of concern.

The status of this permit is unknown even after repeated requests for an update including the latest one addressed to you dated Nov 17/22.

Client 3 – COUPLAND/LAKESIDE – PAUDASH LAKE – I AM THE AGENT

Wants to rebuild their existing boathouse as it is in very rough shape. CVCA will allow rebuilding of the structure on the same footprint. Client wants to build a taller boathouse (on the same footprint) for more headroom (safer) and storage in the attic space. CVCA says "NO" as their policy indicates a "like" structure. What impact does a same footprint, taller, more efficient structure have on public safety, property, and the environment? Both the MNR and Municipality allow taller structure.

Impact on public safety, property, and the environment = exact same as for a single-story boathouse which is permitted

Permit submitted = July 26/22

Permit Status = Waiting for explanation from a Conservation Officer as to what further impact a taller boathouse has over one of the "like structure".

Current Status = Client had a window of opportunity booked with a contractor to do this specialized work but had to cancel due to the delays caused by CVCA.

Complaint:

I am acting as the agent for this project.

CVCA policies are too general, excessive and lack common sense with respect to the impact of the proposed structure. There should be some leniency and consideration given to the proposal since each application requires a site evaluation by the CVCA. The MNR, Ocean and Fisheries and the Municipality would allow the proposed structure. Why doesn't CVCA?

Last correspondence from Kelsey Davidson was September 30/22 and have heard nothing since. This is inconsiderate/unfair to the client and has delayed the project.

The permit was submitted 4 months ago.

Client 4 – RICHARDSON/LAKESIDE – PAUDASH LAKE - I AM THE AGENT

Client wants to replace their existing waterfront cottage with a larger one. A Zoning Bylaw Amendment was required from Highlands East and was approved. Upon application submission to CVCA it was discovered that the CVCA wants the new structure moved back 6m from the proposed location that was approved by the municipality. Neither the client or the agent was made aware of this and this was the first time this requirement was ever mentioned. In discussion with Conservation Officer, Kelsey Davidson, the reasoning behind this request was *"to allow for emergency access to erosion prone areas..... Some emergency vehicles that could be required to be between the house and the shoreline include: Fire, police and ambulance (standard emergency personnel), equipment such as backhoes/excavators for potential flood and/or structural response, and any other potential equipment required in the event of an emergency. In addition, room for both personnel and equipment to comfortably work would also be necessary in the event of an emergency."* This policy/requirement is absolutely ridiculous and hugely lacks common sense! How does one expect to drive such a vehicle to the area the CVCA is concerned with? The topography of the property as CVCA should know does not accommodate such access. I am not really sure why the CVCA has a need to ensure adequate space for emergency vehicles and equipment between the protected shoreline and the front of this dwelling. This request would only disturb more of the property. What sort of emergency vehicles are we speaking of here? And has the CVCA considered how these vehicles will access the front of the cottage if there is no driveway or access to the lake? I know Highlands East, the County of Haliburton and I'm sure the CVCA would frown upon vehicle access pathways in and around to the front of lake front cottages. This only leaves the option for a helicopter to land, however the space is inadequate even if we move the dwelling back as suggested.

The CVCA may also want to consider the fact that by moving the dwelling back 6 m, they are limiting space for "emergency vehicles and equipment" entering the property which is more likely to happen before the need to have these vehicles travel around and to the front of the dwelling.

We agreed to address this issue by twisting the structure footprint slightly which seems to have met the questionable concerns of the CVCA. This repositioning of the dwelling still does not allow for access between the shoreline and dwelling for emergency vehicles and is considered to be a wasted effort.

Permit Submitted = June 21/22

Status = Dwelling Location Approved - Regulation Officer to draft permit letter.....waiting since July 14/22 (three months ago)...still no approval letter.

On a side note....my client was waiting on approval from CVCA in order to put their house up for sale. This caused them undue stress and aggravation. They eventually put their home up for sale but found it to be too late in order to start construction as planned in September 2022. This too has had an impact on my company and employees as we now have had to cancel this project which was to carry us through to Spring 2023. We have yet to fill this void.....and still do not have a permit from the CVCA for the project.

Complaint:

I am acting as the agent for this project.

The CVCA was to provide their input for the ZBA (Fee \$265). At no point during the process was the client/applicant notified of the CVCA recommendations.

The client/applicant is expected to file a Property Inquiry Form (\$100) to determine if a permit is required. The CVCA has already visited the property and is already aware of the proposed project.

The client/applicant is then required to submit a Permit Application (\$630). The process is flawed, expensive and repetitive with each step costing the client money.

CVCA policies once again are excessive and lack common sense and need to be addressed for this application.

Information requested by Kelsey Davidson was submitted to her on July 15/22. Permit was supposed to be issued.

Permit has yet to be received.

Permit was submitted June 21/22....5 months ago

Client 5 – VAN DER ZALM/LAKESIDE – PAUDASH LAKE - I AM THE AGENT

Client wants to construct a 24' x 28' garage 60m from lake behind existing house. CVCA permit required due to the proximity to the Central Paudash Lake Provincially Significant Wetland. What possible impact could this structure have on the PSW located over 150 m away? Client's comments....."*waste of time and money*".

Impact on public safety, property, and the environment = ABSOLUTELY NONE with a structure of this size.

Complaint:

I acted as the agent for this project.

CVCA policies once again are excessive and lack common sense and need to be addressed for this application.

Realistically, what possible impact could a structure of this size have on the PSW??

Out of the 100's of garages built, how many have actually had an impact that was a concern? If the answer is very few, then the CVCA needs to re-address their policies and pay attention to the projects that are of concern.

Due to the delay in CVCA permit processing, the project became a winter project rather than a fall one.

Client 6 – PAUDASH LAKE

Client would like to build a dock. Proposed dock was to include a small shore dock (6' x 6' with 4 poles driven into the lake bottom) to anchor a floating dock and ramp section. CVCA policy, recently, does not allow for a "permanent" dock structure in the lake. How does the CVCA propose to accommodate the cottage owner who just bought a 20' boat and wants a dock to tie it to? CVCA will allow a removable shore dock, however such a structure is not capable of anchoring a floating dock and boat to. Secondly, by installing and removing this "removable shore dock" every year has way more of an impact on the shoreline and lake than if it had 4 permanent poles. The "norm" for installing such a dock system has been to install permanent poles into the lake bottom. The CVCA has just put the floating dock suppliers and installers out of business.

Complaint:

How and when did this policy come into effect?

Was there any input from the public regarding it??

By-laws in a municipality are drafted and circulated to the public before they are adopted. No where in the Minutes of the CVCA meetings do we see any such procedure.

The MNR, Ocean and Fisheries and the Municipality would allow the proposed structure. Why doesn't CVCA?

Client 7 – PAUDASH LAKE - I AM THE AGENT

Client would like to build a small dwelling on a property (not on a lake or near any wetlands). Due to the fact that this property is in a township that is regulated by the CVCA, the client must get approval from CVCA. This property is outside the regulated area. CVCA now asks that property owners file an "inquiry form" in order to tell them that they do not require a permit. This "inquiry form" costs the property owner \$100 and is of no value whatsoever to them. We used to be able to email the CVCA with the property address to find out if we need approval from the CVCA. We would usually receive an answer within 24 hours. These emails go ignored now. How did this new policy come into play? It is certainly not more efficient. My only thought is to create more revenue. Perhaps posting the mapping on the CVCA website might eliminate the need for such a process and free up some time for the staff to focus on issuing permits in a more timely fashion.

Complaint:

Why should a property owner have to waste their time and money with a Property Inquiry Form when they don't need a permit?

Client 8

Client is outside of the CVCA regulated area as per the Municipality and therefore does not require an inquiry form or permit approval from the CVCA in order to get a building permit. If the CVCA is so concerned about public safety, property, and the environment, why are they not concerned about a property such as this as it is within the CVCA jurisdiction?

Complaint:

If the CVCA is going to restrict development for "public safety" reasons such as those mentioned in Client 4 above, why do they only do so in certain areas of their jurisdiction?

The CVCA restricts such development for “public safety” reasons on Paudash Lake, yet they have no concern for development and “public safety” on Colborne Lake (for instance) which is part of their jurisdiction.

If its because Colborne Lake is not directly in CVCA Water shed, then these areas should be removed from the CVCA jurisdiction entirely.

Scenario 1

A young family purchases a cottage property on Paudash Lake. They get possession in May and want to purchase a new boat and screen in a small portion of their existing deck. They discover that after trying to submit a building permit for their screened in porch, that they require a permit from CVCA first. They have no clue who the CVCA is. They have secured a contractor and have paid a deposit for the construction of their screened porch. The contractor sets aside two weeks in busy July to do their project. Their new boat is to arrive in mid-June in time to enjoy the summer season. The property they purchased has a small, dilapidated dock so they go to the local dock company and purchase a fixed dock (4 poles banged into the lake bottom), ramp and floating dock section to dock their nice new boat at. After completing the Property Inquiry Form for the porch, and spending \$100, they now discover that they also need a permit for their new dock.....Its now the end of June and their dock and boat are sitting their waiting to be delivered. They scramble and submit their permit application for the porch (\$640) and one for the dock (\$225).....Total fees so far.....\$965.....its now end of June....no boat....no dock....no porch.

Two weeks go by and hear nothing from the CVCA.... The contractor they had hired now has to re-schedule their project.4 weeks go by and still hear nothing from the CVCA.....its now end of July. They call the CVCA to inquire about their permits. A conservation officer indicates that they will look at the application in the next week and get back to them.....two weeks go by with no reply....it's mid August now,,,,,,the new cottagers call CVCA once again only to find out that their proposed dock they purchased is against the CVCA policy as they do not allow any sort of permanent dock structures on Paudash Lake.....saddened by their findings...they go back to the dock company where they purchased their dock and the company says we have installed docks like your's for years and have in fact installed 75 of them this year without issue....the client indicates that the shore dock cannot be permanent and needs to be removed every year and reinstalled in the spring. The dock company says the ramp and floating dock must be secured in a manner that it cannot move. They also comment that by removing and reinstalling the fixed dock section every year is way more disruptive to the lake than that of 4 permanent poles.....in the end the cottager cancels the order, the local dock builder loses out on the order (and any future orders on Paudash Lake for that matter) and the client now has to search out other options...It's now Labor Day....their new boat sits on a trailer in their parking lot....no permit...no dock...no screened porch.

Thanksgiving rolls around and the CVCA permit for the porch is finally issued....they apply to the Township for their building permit which they happily receive in less than 10 business days. They contact their contractor to start construction of their porch only to find out that the contractor cannot accommodate them until next spring now.

In the meantime they have received a quote on an aluminum type dock that can be winched out of the lake in the fall. The cost is 3X more than the floating dock that the originally purchased. This dock

system requires a concrete pad to be poured near the lake's edge so the dock can be winched out....guess what?....the CVCA has an issue with the concrete pad.....

The scenario above is not far fetched at all and is a direct representation of what property owners have endured in order to enjoy their property. The CVCA's excessive Policies and Procedures also have a negative effect on the local economy, those being dock suppliers and contractors. I just reviewed the minutes of the last Board of Directors meeting and see that the CVCA is trying to hire another staff member for 2023. Unfortunately, this is not going to rectify the burden property owners must endure unless the CVCA starts relaxing their Policies and Procedures and focuses on the projects that actually do have an impact on that watershed and forget about the majority of the ones that don't.

Why is the CVCA office still closed to the public due to covid?