

Public Comment Summary Table – Comments as of March 13 2025

Alison Cousland March 5, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
1.	<p>Requiring property owners to obtain a permit for routine maintenance is an excessive measure that seems more like a revenue-generating initiative than a meaningful regulation. How can it be justified that property owners are unable to perform basic, beneficial tasks—such as planting shrubs, trimming trees, or removing poisonous plants—without first seeking permission from the Township? These activities not only improve individual properties but also contribute to the well-being of the community as a whole.</p>	<p>Draft By-law includes different classes of permits based on the scope of work proposed. The by-law also exempts some activities related to routine maintenance of a property.</p>
2.	<p>My family is one of the original property owners on Cawaja Beach, a cherished place we have lovingly maintained for generations. While my father remains the legal owner, my siblings and I have taken on the responsibility of property upkeep, as he is no longer able to do so. We are deeply concerned about the potential impacts this Bylaw could have—not only on the future of our beloved property but also on its valuation. This proposal represents an undue burden and a lack of respect for those of us who seek nothing more than to enjoy and preserve the serene environment that Tiny Township provides.</p>	<p>The by-law permits routine maintenance and provides for different classes of permits based on the scope of work being undertaken.</p> <p>There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.</p>

Angela Franco 308 Tiny Beaches Road North March 5, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
3.	<p>Every year the Cawaja Association and neighbours come together to clean up the beach and remove debris and non-native species. The kids are grown up participating in this event for many years and have enjoyed this very long tradition. This event creates a sense of community and pride. Requiring permits will cost the association time and money and also will be a waste of time for the township. This is overreach. This seems to be a common theme of this local government. Stop the waste of tax payers money for unnecessary bureaucratic red tape, for example complicating things like requiring permits for invasive species/non-native vegetation removal. A permit that could be denied at the</p>	<p>The Draft By-law provides some exemptions pertaining to property maintenance and provides different classes of permits depending on the scope of work proposed.</p>

	Angela Franco 308 Tiny Beaches Road North March 5, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	discretion of staff and council that could drastically affect the landscape negatively.	
4.	Given the track record of a council that does not listen to the majority of its residents, this is wildly concerning. But most importantly with this new potential by-law, there will be no consideration and no compensation for potential property devaluation and the inability to do work on our own property including CPOA property of which were are members. Therefore we oppose the Dynamic Beach By-Law in Tiny Township.	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.

	Anne Marie Lorriman 104 Shoreline Road, Penetanguishene February 23, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
5.	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Dynamic Beach Management By-law and to raise concerns about the rushed nature of its development. While I understand the importance of responsible shoreline management, this by-law introduces significant restrictions on property owners without sufficient clarity or consultation.	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents.
6.	At the recent Public Information Centre (PIC) meetings, many critical questions from residents remained unanswered. Given these unresolved issues, it is premature to move forward with this by-law without first addressing these fundamental questions. Property owners deserve a transparent, collaborative process, not a rushed implementation that may have long-term consequences on their rights and investments. Consequences that may impact the township's own long-term revenue stream.	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents.

	Anne Sanguins & Rick LeGear 210 TBRN	
#	Comment	Comment Response
7.	Since 2018 there has been increased flooding of our property and erosion especially by our fire pit and then onto the beach front because of the creek winding through our property. The Dynamic	Acknowledged. The Dynamic Beach By-law requires a site-by-site review of proposed site alternation and the construction of buildings and structures.

Anne Sanguins & Rick LeGear 210 TBRN		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	Beach Bylaw if passed would make it extremely expensive to manage this flooding & erosion of our property & beach.	
8.	I also know that Cawaja Beach Property Association are co-owners with Tiny Township of Cawaja Beach with a 2/3 - 1/3 split. So this would be in contravention to that agreement. If this bylaw should pass we would be forced to sell at a discounted price.	The by-law does not address property ownership. All land within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation is subject to the by-law.
9.	These pictures show the fluctuations of the shoreline at Cawaja Beach in the different seasons. The environmental impact of the beach is affected more from the changing water level of Georgian Bay than anything that the waterfront property owners can do on their own private properties. That should be where your priorities lie.	Acknowledged.

Andrew Turner February 23, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
10.	We oppose the bylaw and the rushed process by which you are trying to pass this bylaw. There are precedent cases which prohibit the onerous restrictions you are putting the existing properties within the 45 meter setback. Look forward to seeing legal pushback to this Bylaw and hopefully find some middle ground.	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents. The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time. Noted that this process has been in front of Council for over two years.

Anne Hardcastle February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
11.	I opposed this bylaw	Acknowledged.

A.Rczewski February 8, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
12.	The proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw is an egregious example of overreach of control of a municipal government that may well impact private property of many ratepayers . There is a	Acknowledged.

A.Rczewski February 8, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	great deal of existing infrastructure that would need to subject to unnecessary and punitive permit requirements to maintain property	
13.	It could adversely affect property values and create bureaucratic nightmares for property owners.	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
14.	The purposed bylaw is nothing more than political overreach to satisfy a special interest group. It is another example of the current Tiny Township Council having complete disregard for ratepayers and not hearing any concerns of the residents that are most directly affected. The 178 + 45 would in some cases affect the entire property of some residents.	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents.
15.	The lack of provision for existing infrastructure is irresponsible, the bylaw must provide for grandfathering of existing situations to maintain a safe beach environment. I would ask council to amend the current bylaw provisions to reflect the interests of all ratepayers.	The Proposed Shoreline By-Law would grandfather existing development, with some exceptions. Different classes of permits are proposed based on scope of work. Replacement of existing structures and infrastructure is proposed to be captured under a Class 1 or Class 2 permit.

Barbara Bain & David Guidolin 550 Tiny Beaches Road South March 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
16.	We are providing our feedback in writing on the proposed municipally initiated Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments regarding the management of shoreline areas in the township. We do NOT support this proposal	Acknowledged.
17.	Please be aware that many of the beaches outlined in the draft dynamic beach by law are privately owned, and the owners have clear title. Ownership of property allow owners to manage buildings, structures, and use of their entire property, which includes a shoreline that reaches the waters edge. There are already sufficient by laws in place regarding building requirements, and septic tank management etc. These current bylaws already limit potential impact to human health and safety and the natural environment. Owners already respect these bylaws and adhere to them.	Acknowledged. The Zoning By-law regulates building and structures whereas the Shoreline By-law will now also manage site alteration, grading, in-water erosion control structures and shoreline retaining walls.
18.	We feel that there is an alternate purpose to the introduction of this draft dynamic beach by-law,	Acknowledged.

Barbara Bain & David Guidolin 550 Tiny Beaches Road South March 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	which is to further restrict the owners current right of unrestricted use of their own properties. We feel that these bylaws should either be applied to all residents of Tiny since septic tank management etc. are used by a wide number of residents (rural properties/farming properties/back lot properties on the beaches) or none. All residents of Tiny (regardless of location) should be subject to the same bylaws, not just beach front properties. With this proposal you are specifically targeting beach front owners and restricting our ability to complete maintenance and management of our own private property within the 178 metre GSC elevation.	
19.	Please ensure that our comments, and our position that we DO NOT support this proposed restrictive proposal will become part of the public record. Please also ensure that we receive written notification of the Councils decision and the vote count. We will then be able to forward it to our legal representative.	Acknowledged.

BA Robertson February 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
20.	How will this bylaw be enforced? When will the MNR be called in for enforcement?	The by-law will be enforced by Township Municipal Law Enforcement. The MNR does not have jurisdiction of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law. The MNR provides permits and regulates shoreline works under the <i>Public Land Act</i> . It is noted that the Township will be working closely with MNR on implementing the permitting system.
21.	What are the projected enforcement expenses?	Unknown.
22.	What legal challenges do you anticipate?	Unknown.
23.	Given that restrictions on property use could create financial burdens for residents, how do you plan to address compensation?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
24.	Beachfront property owners may face additional costs for compliance, such as permits, structural modifications, or limits on shoreline development. Will property taxes decrease as a result? What is MPAC's position on this?	We are unaware of any potential impacts to property taxes. We are unaware of MPAC position on the Proposed Shoreline By-Law.

BA Robertson February 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
25.	If restricted beach access or enforcement leads to economic consequences for tourism and real estate values, how do you plan to respond?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
26.	If legal disputes over the bylaw result in costly litigation that diverts funds from other municipal priorities, what steps will you take?	Council is responsible for making decision related to the prioritization of municipal project and the allocation of funds.

Bernie Treidl 1044 TBRS February 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
27.	Thank you for the recent PICs. Although informative, if attended on-line as I did, questions submitted were not as fully discussed as those coming from the on-site audience. Given that half of Tiny's residents are summer residents, I suggest that another 1 or 2 PICs be held in the summer months. I realize that this creates a problem for the Township in that the interim control by-law cannot be extended again but in my view, it is far more important to allow the summer residents (as well as full-time residents who could not attend because of the snow) to have fulsome input.	No summer PIC's are proposed. Residents have had an opportunity to participate in person or virtually and have been encouraged to provide written comments throughout the review. There will be information available on the Township webpage and Township staff will be able to assist residents with questions about the by-law and permitting system once the system is in place.
28.	With respect to the by-law itself, I suggest that the definition of the Dynamic Beach Hazard (DBH, on page 7 of the by-law) be amended to read "the distance of the MNRF 100 year level plus the lesser of (1) 45 metres, and (2) the distance from the MNRF 100 year level to the nearest structure.	The Dynamic Beach Hazard is defined in the Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) and the PPS definition has been used.
29.	I suggest this amendment because it seems unnecessary to have the DBH overlap with an area already governed by the existing zoning by-law. As you know, many of the existing cottages are well within 45 metres of the MNRF 100 year level.	Proposed Shoreline By-Law generally grandfathers existing building and structures. It also regulates site alternation.

Beth Hardcastle		
#	Comment	Comment Response
30.	As a Tiny property owner I oppose both this proposed bylaw and the rushed process.	Acknowledged.

Bill & Wendy Liebl 6 Walker Road February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
31.	We have a seasonal cottage at 6 Walker Road on Cawaja Beach. We are very concerned about the proposed dynamic beach regulations. We know where the 178 meter elevation line is for our property based on the high water levels in 2020. For most of the 45 meter setback our property is forested with 60-80 year old trees. This area has not been changed by beach dynamics in the almost 100 years that our cottage has been in existence. It seems like a ridiculous burden for us to have to pay for an \$8-10,000 survey to establish that this property is not affected by beach dynamics. It would be much less burdensome for taxpayers if the building department could use common sense in situations like ours that are obviously not part of the dynamic beach. As you know, beachfront owners have had large tax increases due to reassessments recently, and this additional requirement seems like regulatory overkill. Please understand that such unnecessary costs like this are particularly difficult for legacy owners of older properties.	The requirements for a survey will be determined on a case-by-case basis.
32.	From Balm Beach north to the end of Walker Road, almost every existing cottage appears to be within the 45 meter set back you have proposed. Perhaps 15 meters would be a much more practical setback.	45 metres is provided by the Ministry and is the Dynamic Beach Hazard Limit; which is comprised of Flood Hazard Limit (15 metres) plus a Dynamic Beach Allowance of 30 metres.
33.	Per your information meeting, Tiny is the only township implementing a dynamic beach regulation. If there is no driving Provincial requirement forcing this effort please don't make this a one size fits all regulation, when common sense says it doesn't apply to all properties. Putting unnecessary burdens on homeowners is not providing a service to your constituents, and is not a good way to get re-elected.	The proposed Shoreline By-law implements the Natural Hazard policies of the Provincial Policy Statement. Different classes of permits are proposed bases on the scope of work.

Bogdan Stanescu February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
34.	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed new shore bylaw in Tiny Township. As a resident/property owner in the area, I believe this bylaw imposes unnecessary restrictions that will	Acknowledged.

Bogdan Stanescu February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	negatively impact property owners, local communities, and responsible shoreline stewardship.	
35.	The proposed changes fail to recognize the long-standing rights of property owners while adding undue limitations that could diminish the enjoyment and responsible use of our waterfront properties. Rather than fostering a balanced approach that respects both environmental conservation and property rights, this bylaw appears to impose excessive restrictions that do not fairly consider the needs of those who have invested in and cared for these lands for years.	Acknowledged.
36.	I urge council members to reconsider this bylaw and engage in more transparent, collaborative discussions with the community before proceeding. A fair and balanced approach is essential to ensure that any new regulations serve the best interests of all stakeholders.	Acknowledged.

Brian Harvey February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
37.	Does Tiny intend to control invasive species or undertake ecological restoration of dune vegetation where property owners have stripped natural grasses in the critical zone?	This comment is beyond the scope of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law.
38.	Is surface cover of driveways and parking areas of private property (ex. asphalt vs more permeable materials) already covered in current bylaws?	No. The site design of non-residential properties is considered though the site plan process.

Bruce & Susan Waddell		
#	Comment	Comment Response
39.	It is our belief that the proposed draft by-law is a necessary and well thought through piece of work. You deserve to be congratulated on your efforts, and we are aware that doing the right thing is not always the smoothest or easiest path. Our family developed Sandcastle Estates, (between the 17th and 18th concessions) and we sold lots beginning in 1965. Georgian Bay predated our development by about 11,000 years. We completely agree that the shoreline is in fact dynamic and that best management practices	Acknowledged.

Bruce & Susan Waddell		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	minimizes disturbance of the area and considers all aspects for a healthy future for all species.	
40.	Our concerns, which I believe the by-law addresses, are the encroachments onto the public beach, below the 178m mark, made by beachfront property owners in the name of "erosion control". These rock encroachments, appear to only act as an addition to the owned property, to the detriment of all others beach users. Contractors, who do not comply with the by-law should also face repercussions.	Acknowledged.

Bryan & Kathryn McLeod February 13, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
41.	We oppose limit the Dynamic Beach Management Bylaw proposed by Tiny Township which restricts all construction within 15m mark of the 178 elevation (20 to 30m from water) This proposed bylaw is an unnecessary, invasive restriction to our building lot. The 15-meter limitation was designed to be temporary, and this proposal will impact our lot for building and resale in the future. This law makes no sense on Melissa Lane and we are requesting that Melissa Lane be exempt from this proposed bylaw.	Acknowledged. The Proposed Shoreline By-Law implements the natural hazard policies in the Provincial Planning Statement. Applications will be evaluated on a site-specific basis. Vegetation and unique site characteristics will be taken into consideration when evaluating applications.
42.	For Example: When we build a boathouse will now need to be around 20 -30 meters from the water; we will need to go to the 178 elevation and 15 more meters from there. This creates a much worse environmental impact as it requires clearing trees and landscaping a much bigger area for no good reason. Not only does this bylaw not make any sense for the Melissa Lane lots, it will have an big environmental impact which is not necessary.	See comment 41.

Carole Baron February 25, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
43.	Please do not let this BYLAW go through. This cottage has been in my family for over 50 years. It is a waterfront lot and if this bylaw goes through I will not be able to add an addition to my cottage	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.

Carole Baron February 25, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>which is presently 800 sq. ft. I will not be able to sell the property without losing a lot of money due to the fact that any potential buyer will have severe problems building on this lot if at all rendering this unsaleable.</p> <p>I have just put in a well costing me 45,000 which I wouldn't have had done knowing of this potential bylaw if I thought I couldn't sell for the price I was quoted at present values. The value of my property will sink well below the prices of today and therefore the taxes I will have to pay will be a lot lower which affects township revenues.</p>	
44.	<p>Another item I wish to address is that I wish to have the cottage sold upon my death. This Bylaw will make it impossible for someone to buy it due to the limitations of this Bylaw and the estate will be held up for a very long time since the cottage is only 800 sq ft and is a tear down. I am 72 and getting ready to sell it. This is my retirement fund. If this Bylaw goes through I will be in financial distress. The value will have decreased substantially I am also upset that this process is taking place in the winter when people who are seasonal residents like myself cannot attend the meetings due to location and weather. Please consider all these things I have written before you decide to pass this Bylaw and STOP IT!!</p>	See comment 43.

Catherine Hudson 154 Tiny Beaches Road South		
#	Comment	Comment Response
45.	<p>Our family has been waterfront residents for over 70 years, I can say with certainty that property owners along the shore are the most dedicated to preserving and maintaining the beach. These actions by the Council appear to unfairly penalize waterfront residents and undermine their rights over their private property.</p>	<p>The by-law is intended to protect shoreline areas from site alterations and buildings and structures that could cause flooding/erosion of subject and adjacent properties, protect from negatively impacting Dynamic Beaches, Natural Heritage Features and overall enjoyment of the area. The by-law is intended to protect the value of shoreline areas.</p>
46.	<p>Why is Tiny Township the only waterfront community that feels the need to limit property owners' ability to build on or maintain their private property?</p>	<p>Can't comment on other municipalities.</p>

Catherine Hudson 154 Tiny Beaches Road South		
#	Comment	Comment Response
47.	If zoning bylaws already regulate these areas, why is this additional bylaw necessary?	Shoreline By-law regulates site alteration. The existing Zoning By-law already regulates buildings and structures within the setback from the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation.
48.	Why does the Council believe it has the authority to impose restrictions that could negatively impact the value of private property?	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents. Residents have had an opportunity to participate in person or virtually and have been encouraged to provide written comments throughout the review.
49.	While I believe this bylaw is unnecessary, the language should clearly grandfather the maintenance and upkeep of existing structures on private property.	The by-law does provide for grandfathering of existing building and structures.
50.	Additionally, the approval of new construction permits should not be left entirely to the discretion of the 'Director.'	The by-law enables appeals to Council, similar to other by-laws passed by municipalities under the <i>Municipal Act</i> .

Cody Morden February 20, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
51.	How will the township approach the existing septic systems within the 45M setback? As new building codes have rolled out over the years most existing septic will require an increase in size for both tanks and beds? Will the increase in size also be allowed "like for like" for replacement at current building standards?	Septic systems are proposed to be exempt from the by-law, they are not considered structures as per the Zoning By-law and they have their own separate permitting process. However, it would need to be taken into account the condition and treatment of the ground cover impacts after the septic system is installed.
52.	How will the township approach the existing septic systems that are found in coastal shoreline engineer reports showing them inside the wave up rush? Will residents be allowed to construct shoreline protection to protect their septic systems? What would be the process to construct shoreline protection on private property to protect an existing system?	Septic systems are exempt. Permits will be required for site alteration and structures proposed to protect septic systems.
53.	How will the township address dredging, groins and in water work that isn't on municipal both private and public? As this is federal property outside township limits?	Any "in water works" will require a permit under the Shoreline By-law. Township staff will be working with MNR/DFO in the evaluation of permit applications.
54.	During the public meetings there was a proposal of a tiered system for permits within the 45M set back, when will this be available for review? Will	Different classes of permits are proposed. Material will be available for review in advance of the statutory public meeting and more final

Cody Morden February 20, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	there be a similar review and revision period after the next version of the by-law?	materials in advance of the system coming into place.
55.	When a survey, coastal engineer and a design is submitted who from the township will review the submission? Will this person be a shoreline engineer doing the review? What is the appeal process if denied by this person?	Submitted material will be reviewed by township staff. The Township also has the option of retaining a peer review consultant. Appeals may be made to council.
56.	After a property is deemed non-dynamic by a coastal engineer and surveyed will they be allowed to construct structures or will they also need to follow the same rules as a dynamic beach anyways? Can you please send a detailed explanation of what is allowed, and the process of both a dynamic beach and a non dynamic beach for the requirements?	A permit will be required for any proposal within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation of Georgian Bay. The website will have details about the permit application requirements and the different classes of permits.
57.	It was mentioned at the meeting that rock protection isn't something that tiny township wants to have along its shoreline, can you please send the study showing information to back up this claim? If not naturally and locally sourced rocks from local companies than what products does that township approve? Please provide documentation from a shoreline engineer to back up this claim.	Naturalized beaches are preferred over altered shorelines in accordance with the Natural Hazard Policies of the Provincial Planning Statement. There may be instances where shoreline alteration is required to protect certain features, building or structures. Where shoreline works are permitted material selection will a component of the permitting process.
58.	How will the township approach the existing cottages, boathouse and structures that are found in coastal shoreline engineer reports showing them inside the wave up rush? Will residents be allowed to construct new shoreline protection? How will insurance companies look at properties that are denied the ability to protect their assets? If shoreline protection is denied at the township level what exposure to litigation will this open up?	The Shoreline By-law grandfathers existing structures. Enlargement of existing structure may require a report from a costal engineer, as already required through the Zoning By-law. New Shoreline protection will require a permit and be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Unable to comment on insurance industry requirements.
59.	In multiple cases shoreline protection has been found on public property in front of existing cottages and boathouses, how will the township allow for repair to existing structures and shoreline protection that have been installed on public land?	The by-law applies in these instances and permits will be required.
60.	How will the township deal with beach access from existing cottages? Will the tiered permit process allow for a standard set of steps, walkway, and patio without having to have a full shoreline engineers report? If you have a handicap or disability, or elderly how will you be able to have access to the beach?	Different classes of permits are proposed based on the scope of work. See website for examples.

	Cody Morden February 20, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
61.	The interim control by-law has an exception for single family dwellings, will this exception carry over to the new by-law? if not please explain why?	All development within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation will require a permit under the Shoreline By-law.

	Cate Dewey February 22, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
62.	Our beach front property on Tiny Beaches Rd N has been in my family since 1930. We have taken pride in caring for the property and the beach front, including removing phragmites and other invasive species. This bylaw that removes our rights to make improvements to our cottage and the property is shocking. It is removing the right of ownership and serves to reduce the value of our beach front property. We belong to the CAWAJA Beach Association whose goals are to work to improve the beach. The additional oversight and bureaucracy is necessary. How can you as a council decide to take our property unilaterally? Surely you are expecting to purchase the land for a high price!	Acknowledged.

	Chuck Glassier 224 Tiny Beaches Road North January 21, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
63.	This proposed Dynamic Beach Management by-law introduces unnecessary redundancy to existing regulations enforced by the Ministry of Natural Resources or MNRF and the Ontario Provincial Police(OPP). The MNRF enforces regulations that govern all activities near shorelines and within natural habitats, requiring permits for construction and modifications to protect ecosystems. It oversees sustainable practices and environmental protection efforts across Ontario, ensuring the responsible use of natural resources. If violations in Tiny Township fall under the jurisdiction of the MNRF or require police intervention, our township staff and executive can formally refer these cases to the appropriate	The Shoreline By-law will require a permit for site alteration in the water, along the shoreline and on land. While DFO and MNR have jurisdiction over the water and shoreline respectively, the proposed permitting process provides additional measures that must be met. Which protect the shoreline area environment and protect against hazards to property and public safety.

	Chuck Glassier 224 Tiny Beaches Road North January 21, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>authorities. The process involves submitting reports or complaints detailing the violations and requesting action. This ensures that our local officials can effectively address violations while leveraging existing provincial enforcement mechanisms to manage compliance and protect community interests.</p> <p>Why then is the township staff not more effectively engaged with the OPP and the MNRF if Council believes they have issues with property owners building boat houses, retaining walls, patios, decks, fences or landscaping near the Georgian Bay shoreline that is not already covered by our building code and its enforcement process?</p>	
64.	<p>While investigating this I found that most affected property owners I have spoken to are not aware of this bylaw or implications if it is approved. A lack of proactive communication by Tiny Township has left many residents in the dark while a rushed timeline for implementing this bylaw raises serious concern about its potential impact on our property rights and shared financial responsibilities.</p>	<p>The Township has provided a significant amount of communication related to this topic and has provided notification to residence for various consultation opportunities.</p>
65.	<p>Moreover, Tiny Township Council is already grappling with more pressing issues such as road maintenance, flooding from streams overflowing in the spring and inadequate basic services like community water distribution and sewage disposal to name just a few.</p>	<p>Council is responsible for the prioritization of municipal projects.</p>
66.	<p>Concerns in the community already exist about the potential financial and administrative burden on taxpayers to monitor and enforce the proposed new regulations, especially given the involvement of outside contractors like Aqua Solutions 5 Inc.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
67.	<p>Additionally, at least one Ontario municipality has faced limitations in enforcing similar Dynamic Beach bylaws on private properties without owners' consent. This precedent suggests that enforcement maybe problematic, leading to potential legal challenges that could further burden Tiny Township taxpayers.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
68.	<p>There is also a significant risk that this Tiny Township bylaw could negatively impact Dynamic Beach homeowner property values, as</p>	<p>There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value.</p>

Chuck Glassier 224 Tiny Beaches Road North January 21, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	restrictions on usage may deter potential buyers. This situation may subject the council to legal challenges from property owners who believe their rights are being violated.	Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
69.	It also brings up the question of bylaw fairness across taxpayer groups with the proposed Dynamic Beach Management bylaw introducing additional complications and restrictions specifically targeting beachfront property owners.	Acknowledged.
70.	For these reasons I urge you to shut down the development of this by-law and to prioritize transparency and community engagement with taxpayers on the real issues that affect the quality of our lives in Tiny Township and the good governance of our property tax.	Acknowledged.

Chuck Stradling, President Lafontaine Areas Homeowners Association		
#	Comment	Comment Response
71.	As proposed, the new Dynamic Beach By-Law intends to restrict any and all development within 45 Metres (approx. 150 ft.) of the 178m contour. Will this result in: the need for permits to maintain or repair walkways, decks, patios, fences, stairs, retaining walls, erosion control/shoreline protection, boathouse and, in some situations, even cottages?	Permits required for all development within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation.
72.	Need for a permit to remove sand that has blown up and accumulated?	If no machinery is required a permit is not necessary. Annual relocation of sand using machinery due to seasonal wind/driving sand movement requires a Class 1 permit.
73.	Need for permits to remove phragmites?	Depending on the scope of work, machinery required, no permit may be required under the Shoreline By-law.
74.	Incurring significant costs and delays?	No comment.
75.	Only interior renovations being permitted to existing structures in the Dynamic Beach zone?	Exterior repairs and interior renovations do not require permits. Exterior expansions would require a permit and are already regulated under the Zoning By-law.
76.	Loss of ability to build, or even repair existing, boathouses, deck, patios, walkways, steps, homes/cottages, erosion control measures?	Shoreline By-law grandfathers existing building and structures. Permits are required.
77.	Any shoreline work requiring expensive coastal engineering studies/reports, surveys, building consultants, etc.?	Replace and repair would require a Class 2 permit. Expansion or significant alteration would require a Class 3 permit.

Chuck Stradling, President Lafontaine Areas Homeowners Association		
#	Comment	Comment Response
78.	The Township having the rights to deny a permit, without explanation or any way to appeal?	Permits that are denied would include a written rationale and opportunity to revise plans.
79.	Any work within the Dynamic Beach Hazard Area requiring studies and engineering reports in addition to permits/studies from MNR and DFO, prior to any work commencing?	Based on the nature of work proposed professional studies may be required. Permits from MNR and DFO may also be required.
80.	Waterfront property values being significantly and adversely impacted?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
81.	Loss of property value appreciation due to the inability to improve your waterfront properties or even maintain them?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.

Cawaja Property Owners Association Board of Directors		
#	Comment	Comment Response
82.	The Cawaja Property Owners Association (CPOA) is writing to express its opposition to the proposed Dynamic Beach Management by-law brought forth by the Township. We are concerned in the lack of transparency surrounding the process for its development and its implications for affected stakeholders of Cawaja Beach. As you all are aware, the Cawaja Beach community is unique in Tiny. The Township and the CPOA are co-owners of the beach property with the Township holding a one-third undivided interest and the members of the CPOA holding two-thirds. In addition, with the support of the CPOA a special bylaw governs the use of our jointly owned property.	Acknowledged.
83.	Environmental Protection & Beach Preservation – While environmental protection is important, the bylaw imposes excessive restrictions that hinder responsible property management, preventing landowners from removing hazards, managing invasive species, or maintaining safe beachfronts. A balanced approach that promotes stewardship rather than outright restrictions would be more effective. It is counterproductive to the proposed by-law that the Township can exempt itself from these rules, raising concerns about fairness. If protecting the environment is truly the goal,	The Shoreline By-law requires permits and provides exemptions for some vegetation removal.

Cawaja Property Owners Association Board of Directors		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	regulations should apply equally to both landowners and the Township.	
84.	Avoiding Encroachments – The by-law assumes that all property alterations are detrimental, yet it fails to recognize that many improvements, such as erosion control, invasive species and dune restoration help protect the shoreline. The proposal ignores the fact that responsible shoreline management—can benefit the environment. The proposed by-law will risk diminishing property values on Cawaja Beach.	The Shoreline By-law promotes responsible shoreline management. Where this is demonstrated permits will be supported and issued.
85.	Neighbouring Property Impacts – While preventing harmful property alterations may be important, the by-law takes a one-size-fits-all approach across Tiny that ignores individual circumstances. The by-law unfairly targets beachfront owners, restricting them from responsibly protecting their land that they have deeded access to.	The Shoreline By-law provides different classes of permits based on the scope of work proposed. Each application is evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
86.	Short timeline - For consideration and implementation raises additional concerns about the potential impact on our co-owned property, particularly individual property rights. Implementing this by-law in the winter when many seasonal residents are away is unjust. The Council is pushing this through currently to ensure minimal input from residents.	Process has ongoing for two years. Notification has been provided at various stages. A number of opportunities have been provided for public comments.
87.	Enforcement of the proposed by-law – More bureaucracy will be added to the Township processes and Cawaja residents with this by-law. It will undoubtedly lead to potential costly legal challenges by landowners. It also will create an unnecessary financial burden on Cawaja taxpayers. By-law enforcement, if judging current by-law enforcement in our area will be complaint based only and have limited success.	Opinion acknowledged.
88.	In summary, the proposed bylaw introduces new complications and restrictions that disproportionately affect property owners, despite offering no clear benefits to the community. The by-law is overreaching in many aspects of its intended purpose. Good governance should focus on protecting Cawaja taxpayers' interests, resolving urgent community challenges, and fostering trust between the Township Council and its residents.	Acknowledged.

	Cawaja Property Owners Association Board of Directors	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	We look forward to continuing to work with the Township to achieve these goals.	

	David Hudson 12 Sand Road March 3, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
89.	As a member of the beachfront community, I feel that this bylaw creates an unjust burden on residents who already face challenges and responsibilities tied to living in such a unique area. The measures proposed are overly restrictive and fail to consider the significant implications they will have on the quality of life for those of us who reside here. Imposing this bylaw unjustly prohibits residents to maintain or build on their private property. If zoning bylaws already cover these areas, why is this bylaw necessary?	The Shoreline By-law applies to site alteration and building and structures, whereas the Zoning By-law only applies to building and structures.
90.	I urge you to reconsider the impact this bylaw will have on beachfront property owners and residents. It is my hope that the concerns of our community are addressed, and that a more balanced approach is taken that reflects the needs and realities of living in these special areas.	Acknowledged.

	Domenic Loschiavo 2134 Tiny Beaches Road North March 7, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
91.	I was just advised that there is a pending new Dynamic Beach Bylaw being considered. Is it possible for me, (and all other residents of Tiny), to be notified via email or regular mail whenever important decisions are being made regarding our properties our mailing address is 23 Blair Athol Cres. Toronto, Ont. M9A 1X6. In Addition, please tell me where I can read what the proposed new by law is all about. Or email me an electronic copy of the proposed new by-law. (preferred)	You have been added to the notification list for the decision.
92.	Will existing structures be grandfathered into the wording of this new proposed by-law? For example if I have a boathouse, bunkie, storage shed, tool shed or a cottage or permanent home that will be deemed to be non complying based on the new by-law, will I be able to enlarge,	Legal existing structures are grandfathered. Replacements/repairs are grandfathered but still require a permit. Expansion is already regulated through the Zoning By-law.

	Domenic Loschiavo 2134 Tiny Beaches Road North March 7, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	repair or replace,(in the event of a fire, or for any other reason) on the same existing footprint that my existing structure(s) are on now? Is this new By-law intended for new builds only?	
93.	Will this new By-law change the building permit system, or fees in any way?	The Shoreline By-law does not change the building permit application process itself, but the Shoreline By-law does require a permit for buildings and structures proposed within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation. This permit would be considered concurrently with a building permit application.
94.	Why are seasonal residents excluded from participating in the meetings, because we don't live in the area year round? Why can't the meetings be held in late spring, summer or fall?	This process has ongoing for two years. Notification has been provided at various stages. A number of opportunities have been provided for public comments, including virtual options.

	David Seaborn 234 Tiny Beaches Road North	
#	Comment	Comment Response
95.	I support.	Acknowledged.

	Don Parker February 18, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
96.	I own 2 properties in Tiny and I am against the Dynamic beach bylaw trying to get passed.	Acknowledged.

	Donald Guloien & Irene Boychuk March 12, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
97.	As taxpayers and residents in Tiny Township, we are deeply opposed to the proposed Shoreline Bylaw, which seems to have morphed from something which was advertised as protective of beaches to a wholesale expropriation of the rights of shoreline residents to repair, develop and improve their properties. It will have a highly detrimental impact on property values, and ultimately, in tax revenues for the Township, and it will encourage our neighbourhoods to deteriorate over time. We are all in favour of protecting our beaches and the surrounding environment and ecology from excessive and/or undesirable encroachment. Full stop. However, the proposed bylaw is so	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.

Donald Guloien & Irene Boychuk March 12, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	vague and so broad that it would seem to encumber almost any activity involved in maintaining or appropriately enhancing properties along the shoreline, and as far as one street back from the shoreline.	
98.	Now the drafters and proponents of the bylaw claim that "reasonable requests will be denied" but there is no language, guidelines or other specificity which ensures that this will in fact be the rule. Further, it seems that every request will be subject to individual interpretation by staff without the guidance of any rubric governing their decisions. Permits are already difficult and time-consuming to obtain. What is going to happen when every routine maintenance project has to go before the already-busy staff, when it is the express intent of council to not increase staffing to accommodate the obvious needs that will emerge from this bylaw? Weeks and months will become quarters and years! And for people trying to get something accomplished within a summer, very unlikely that they could achieve that, even for the most trivial project.	The Shoreline By-law contains criteria upon which applications for shoreline permits are to be evaluated.
99.	Finally, the approach seems to be one of "guilty until proven innocent" rather than the other way around. The applicant who wants a permit must hire surveyors, consultants and engineers in order to prove that their tiny project will not causing a problem before they apply for a permit. And then wait months for that application to be heard, with a highly uncertain outcome. High costs and long durations for approval will ultimately discourage maintenance and improvement, effectively destroying the neighbourhoods we cherish and love.	Acknowledged.

XXX Date		
#	Comment	Comment Response
100.	A bylaw that is genuinely trying to prevent detrimental development would clearly delineate what is acceptable and what is not. A comprehensive list of projects which are not in any way detrimental would be fast-tracked, requiring no or limited approvals or permits. Others that run the risk of damaging our beach	Acknowledged.

	XXX Date	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	ecosystem would be subject to a quick review that would lay on conditions, such as requiring a survey, hydrological engineering report, environmental impact report, et cetera as warranted.	
101.	<p>Ladies and Gentleman, we live in a country that is governed by the rule of law, not by the individual assessment powerful officials. Our police are wonderful, but they are not given the power to arrest people for behaviour they don't like with no guidance. Rather, they have a clear set of rules to be followed: and it is very distinct and codified what is against the law, and what is a protected constitutional right.</p> <p>Your proposed bylaw does nothing to provide this kind of clarity.</p> <p>Further in our society which is governed by the rule of law, the decisions of the police are subject to review by a judge or court, and those decisions are appealable to higher courts.</p> <p>Your bylaw provides no such process. There is no equivalent to a judge, and the only appeal to the Council itself.</p> <p>Your bylaw is analogous to our Province and Country having no codified law, all decisions about what is legal and illegal are made by individual police, and the only appeal of their judgement is to the Supreme Court. What a disaster that would be!</p>	Acknowledged.

	Eva Firla 1588 Tiny Beaches Road South	
#	Comment	Comment Response
102.	I'm a resident of Tiny and I'm concerned about the restrictive nature of the proposed Dynamic Beach Management Bylaw	Acknowledged.

	Eva MocarSKI March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
103.	I own property at CAWAJA BEACH. I have noticed several invasive species on our beach especially PHRAGMITES. We have always had a beach cleanup to control this unsightly invader. Your DYNAMIC BEACH BYLAW would make keeping our beach free of phragmites and other unsightly invaders unenjoyable. Please do not go through	Depending on the scope, machinery used, no permit may be required under the proposed Shoreline By-law to remove Phragmites.

	Eva Mocarski March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	with this and other questionable township projects namely a new township office	

	Elizabeth Sawyer February 26, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
104.	Are you grandfathering all of this? Are you seriously proposing all of this? If Tiny is really serious about" managing, regulating and controlling the removal and protection of natural areas including but not limited to natural vegetation, habitat ..." " preventing erosion and slope instability hazards", why aren't you protecting the Tiny municipal beaches and streams?	Existing legal buildings and structures are generally grandfathered.
105.	I live right beside Wahnekewening beach. Tiny owns it. Go look at it. Nothing grows and it's eroding. Every summer day, you have young people patrol the beach and parking lot. Your patrolers do not enforce garbage, drinking, pulling out the grasses and loud music. Sadly some people come to the beach to party. You cannot protect your "natural vegetation", "habitat", wildlife or erosion while allowing this kind of behavior on Your property.	Acknowledged.
106.	Rather than demanding others, do what you are not prepared to do, why not protect your own property first. Tiny is a wonderful place but Tiny municipality needs to get serious about protecting the amazing natural features it already owns.	Acknowledged.
107.	I am all for "improving human health and quality of life". I am all for "maintenance and protection of natural areas". I love seeing the birds, deer, martens, coyotes etc. I work hard at encouraging native grasses, pulling invasive plants and clearing garbage but Tiny needs to start by treating municipality owned properties like the jewel they are. You are wasting time and money. Clean up and renaturalize your beaches and streams.	Acknowledged.

	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations	
#	Comment	Comment Response
108.	FoTTSA has not seen or heard a comprehensive persuasive scientifically sound rationale to justify the Township of Tiny's plans. Accordingly, FoTTSA is opposed to the Township's proposal and would urge	Acknowledged.

	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	the Township to withdraw the proposed Dynamic Beach Management (DBM) Bylaw for further consideration. Existing legislation and regulation offer the Township, like other municipalities in Ontario, satisfactory ways and means to ensure environmentally responsible use of its shoreline.	
109.	That said, FoTTSA nevertheless wishes to advance some comments and questions related to information provided to the public in this matter. Representatives of the Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations (FoTTSA) attended virtually and in person both the Feb 3 the Feb 4 PIC. We have also reviewed the video recording of the meetings posted on the Township website. In spite of the fact that these PICs were held in the middle of winter when many seasonal shoreline taxpayers are not present in Tiny Township, nor in touch with the actions of Tiny Council and staff, we were impressed by the level of interest in the draft DBM Bylaw demonstrated by the public both in person and online. There was heartfelt concern expressed by many people about the various potential, perhaps unintended, negative impacts of the measures proposed.	Acknowledged.
110.	Unfortunately, the adopted PIC format meant that there was only a limited amount of time and consequently many questions and comments were not able to be brought forward. Nevertheless, as possible, the public asked considered questions and made constructive comments. The Township did indicate that all questions, including those submitted in writing online during the PIC and subsequently would be answered fully in a timely manner.	Acknowledged.
111.	During the PICs there were questions such as: Why is the Township determined to enact this DBM Bylaw given that there are few, if any, other municipalities that have deemed such measures applied to privately owned properties to be necessary? Many attendees were surprised at the frank admission that even after two years of research the Township is " <i>not aware of what other municipalities are doing at this time.</i> " The Township committed to addressing this significant oversight, presumably in documentation, so that the public may become suitably well-informed.	Acknowledged.
112.	What is the unique and significant problem that Tiny is attempting to solve in this manner? What	Township proposing to implement the natural hazard policies of the Provincial Planning

	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	has happened that is so terrible that the Council has directed the expenditure of many thousands of dollars in consultant and staff time to research, draft, re-draft, and otherwise prepare this DBM Bylaw? Is there an actual documented scientific need for a bylaw to address significant current dynamic beach issues in the Township? The public heard staff say that: even though " <i>the Zoning Bylaw already regulates much of what we are talking about</i> " and that " <i>the majority of property owners respect the beach,</i> " it is simply the expressed will of Council to " <i>draw a line in the sand</i> " and through enactment of the DBM Bylaw grant itself a powerful role in management and regulation of privately owned shoreline property. Is this understanding of the initiative behind the DBM Bylaw, correct?	Statement and for the reasons outlined in the introduction of the by-law. The proposed Shoreline By-law regulates site alteration, buildings and structures. The Zoning By-law already regulates buildings and structures.
113.	Why could not any actual problem that exists be addressed in some other simpler and more efficient way? It was not made clear that the Township has adequately evaluated all possible options. Such options might include the Township having more effective involvement in the various upper tier government permit processes already in place, and/or making suitable amendments to the Zoning Bylaw? Would the Township please clarify whether there was an evaluation of options undertaken, and if so, provide any resulting documentation?	Different options have been considered. The program approach is similar to the permitting process that is used in jurisdictions where a conservation authority exists.
114.	Section 8.2 of the draft DBM Bylaw would, if adopted, confer very considerable discretionary power upon the " <i>Director</i> " who may deny any permit should they be dissatisfied with any one of ten — not at all well-defined — conditions. In the PIC it was stated that the " <i>Director</i> " in question is the Planning Director. In the draft DBM Bylaw Section 2.14 it is stated that the " <i>Director</i> " in question is the Director of Engineering. There seems to be confusion, and/or disagreement, with respect to who will ultimately holds this significant discretionary power. Will the Township clarify the situation and also indicate how DBM Bylaw will ensure that the powers of the " <i>Director</i> " will be exercised fairly and consistently over time and with a good measure of predictability based on available technical standards and guidelines?	The Directors of Planning and Public Works are required to issue permits based on the requirements outlined in the Shoreline By-law.
115.	In the draft DBM Bylaw, Section 11 Appeals, 11.1 states " <i>Any person applying for a permit shall have</i>	At the second PIC was clarified that if a permit is not issued, an appeal to Council can

	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p><i>such rights of appeal to the Ontario Lands Tribunal in relation to refusal thereof as set out in the Municipal Act, 2001.</i>" The relevant slide presented to the public at the PICs restated that rights of appeal to the OLT would be available. Indeed, during the Feb 3 PIC, the Township asserted that, if a permit was not granted by staff, appeal could be made to Council and if that were unsuccessful final appeal could be made to the OLT "<i>as ingrained in the Municipal Act for certain bylaws.</i>" At the second PIC it was indicated that the draft Bylaw, the slide and the previous night's statement about appeal rights under the Bylaw were misleading and that appeal rights to the OLT may not be available. The Township indicated that it would seek out some additional input before the public meeting. So, the public is left with the knowledge that the Township has spent years and many thousands of dollars to prepare a Bylaw which has been before a concerned public for more than a month and yet the Township cannot say what the approval and appeal process involves. It follows that the Township cannot say what the process may cost applicants or indeed what it may cost the Township. Will the appeal process necessarily bring the parties to court on a regular basis? Will the Township please fully clarify this vitally important matter?</p>	<p>be made. There is no appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal.</p>
116.	<p>In response to legitimate concerns raised by the public during the PICs, there were a good many comforting statements made by the Township including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent is to create a situation where "<i>people feel comfortable coming to the Township.</i>" • The process going forward will be "<i>leaving a lot of room for review of the process and program for any improvements that can be made along the way.</i>" • The 45m setback established by the province and referenced in the draft DBM Bylaw refers to a "<i>precautionary area — a yield sign — where there could be an issue, and the Township should proceed with caution.</i>" 	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"All we are talking about is the site alteration piece" and "the process will be quite streamlined."</i> • Where an applicant requires more than one municipal permit, the permit required under the DBM Bylaw <i>"will be rolled into that other approval... to make it more user friendly and seamless."</i> • There will be a <i>"tiered permit system"</i> requiring only the suitable range of information to be prepared and provided with a permit application — <i>"a real scaled approach."</i> • <i>"Anything you have existing and are maintaining or replacing will have no issues."</i> (The several statements made by the Township implied that the detailed provisions for grandfathering outlined the report prepared for Tiny Township jointly by Aqua Solutions 5, Gardiner Roberts and Planning Solutions in Section 4.0 New Provisions A. Setbacks from Georgian Bay would all apply to the proposed DBM Bylaw.) • The current thinking is that <i>"septic systems have their own permit system and will be exempt from the DBM Bylaw except as it relates to the cover on the tile bed."</i> 	
117.	<p>It would be fair and accurate to observe that none of these seemingly comforting statements are reflected in the draft DBM Bylaw tabled at the Committee of the Whole in December. Indeed, the language of the draft is opaque, the tone is aggressive, the conditions are highly restrictive, and any indication of reasonableness and flexibility is absent. There is no mention of a streamlined or tiered approach. There is no mention of exemptions. There is no mention of an ongoing refinement process. There is no mention of grandfathering of existing structures. Accordingly, the public hopes and expects that, if the Township chooses to actually proceed with a new DBM Bylaw, the next draft of the Bylaw will be significantly different in order that the indications provided during the two PICs are clearly set out in the document and that the public can thus be assured that the Township has adopted a collaborative flexible approach.</p>	<p>Refer to the Township website for information on the different classes of permits and details regarding each class of permit.</p>

Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations		
#	Comment	Comment Response
118.	Given that the second draft of the proposed DBM Bylaw may be significantly different than the draft that was tabled in December, in all fairness, the public should be afforded a reasonably generous period of time to review and consider the revised draft and to prepare deputations and submissions. FoTTSA believes that a considerable amount of further meaningful consultation with the public is essential should the Township intend to continue to advance this Bylaw. Will the Township please ensure that all documentation is made available to the public at least 20 days in advance of the statutory public meeting scheduled for March 31? Will Tiny commit to, and outline a process for, further meaningful public consultation?	The documents are available on the Township website.

Grace & Glenn Davis 554 Tiny Beaches Road South March 11, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
119.	When we learned of the Zoning By-law Amendment regarding the township managing "buildings, structures, and uses, in proximity to Georgian Bay" it made us wonder how we would handle the up keep of our property. Of course there are by-laws that cover these things: we are thankful for them; they are essential, and we will always be in compliance with them, but if we have to get approval to prevent our property from following the Second Law of Thermodynamics - the natural decay and chaos that occurs everywhere when there is no maintenance, we fear that time will be on the side of deterioration, and not on the side of preservation and conservation; and this will not be good for the property values and reputation of Tiny Township.	Acknowledged.

Geraldine Macdonald 73 East Beach Road February 23, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
120.	I have owned a cottage at Thunder Beach since 2009. I oppose the new Dynamic Beach by-law because it will place an excessive burden on cottage owners, will create another layer of paperwork to frustrate cottagers and Tiny staff, and will in no way contribute to the well being of	Acknowledged. There has been opportunity for public comment; and all comments have been taken into consideration in preparation for the final documents.

	Geraldine Macdonald 73 East Beach Road February 23, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>our beach experience. People who live in Tiny and have waterfront cottages love the beach and generally take good care of it. People who try to build inappropriately on their beachfront should not be granted a permit to do so by Tiny - there is no need for a new by-law to protect our beach from the beachfront owners. I also oppose the speed which is driving this by-law through approval. I suspect this speed is needed to try to get the bylaw passed before more people in Tiny find out what Tiny Township is trying to do.</p> <p>Please do NOT pass this bylaw - send it back for a proper environmental assessment and to obtain significant support from the taxpayers - or just cancel the by-law.</p>	<p>The proposed Shoreline By-law is intended to prevent inappropriate construction and/or site alteration to avoid flood/erosion/dynamic beach hazard impacts on subject and adjacent properties.</p> <p>The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time. Noted that this process has been ongoing for over two years.</p>

	Gordon Pridham February 25, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
121.	<p>Our family is writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed Dynamic Beach ByLaw, in addition to the process and timing that the Tiny Township council is using to try and get this ByLaw passed.</p> <p>Although we have read meeting minutes and listened to recordings of council members discussing the proposed Dynamic Beach ByLaw, we are yet to find anything that demonstrates this ByLaw is in the best interests of Tiny Township or its constituents, let alone what problem the ByLaw is trying to solve or prevent. It appears to be a complete invasion of the principles of property ownership for all those directly affected and for no apparent reason.</p>	Acknowledged.
122.	<p>Isn't it the responsibility of a Township council to represent the best interests of their constituents and the tax base they generate? Assuming so, how does this proposed Dynamic Beach ByLaw represent the best interests of the Township and, specifically, the constituents directly affected?</p>	Shoreline By-law implements the Natural Hazard policies of the Provincial Planning Statement and provides a program for managing site alteration and buildings and structures within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation.
123.	<p>Secondly, the lack of full disclosure as to why this ByLaw is important to the future health and growth of the community is exasperated by the process/timing the Township Council is using to secure approval. Simply put, why is the Council trying to push this through without feedback from a majority of its constituents? What evidence does</p>	There have been many opportunities for public comments over the past two years.

Gordon Pridham February 25, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	the council have that this idea has any support, let alone majority community/constituent support?	
124.	As property owners and seasonal residents of the community, we request that all meetings relating to the proposed Dynamic Beach ByLaw be held with plenty of notice, include advance disclosure of the problem we are trying to solve or prevent, and meeting times/dates during the four months of the year(June-September) when most of the affected residents and community members are present in the area. These operating principles and the conduct around them are the core tenets of council membership. We strongly request you act accordingly.	Notice has been provided well in advance of all meetings. Township business is conducted year round and meeting have been virtual and in person to enable participation from those unable to attend in person.

George Replansky March 4, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
125.	One concern is with respect to the removal of invasive species where permits will be required to control the spread of encroaching vegetation that shrink public beaches. Property associations would not be able to implement controls to their own beaches without the townships approval. Also, unless some pre-approvals are available, delays in starting the control processes may occur negating any benefits that may accrue in removing the species in an appropriate and timely basis.	Permit under the Shoreline By-law is not required for the removal of invasive species.
126.	In addition, township-owned areas should not be exempt from these same bylaws.	Township is proposed to be exempt from the Shoreline By-law. Township does intend to require costal engineering studies where appropriate for public works in proximity to the 178 metre contour.

Heather Hudson 42 Sand Road March 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
127.	We are residents of Tiny Township & have been my entire life. We are concerned about the proposed dynamic beach management bylaw and its restrictive nature. Why is Tiny Township the only waterfront community restricting property owners from maintaining or building on private property? If zoning bylaws already cover this, why is the bylaw needed? Why does the Council feel it has the right	The amendments to the Zoning By-law and the Shoreline By-law grandfather existing legally existing structures and do not prevent maintaining/replacement/repairing buildings and structures on a one-for-one basis. The amendments and the new Shoreline By-law are proposed to implement the PPS policies on natural hazards, protect natural

Heather Hudson 42 Sand Road March 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	to impose restrictions that could reduce property values?	heritage features along the shoreline and to limit potential negative impacts of buildings and structures on neighbouring properties.
128.	Our family has been residents of the beach for 70 years, we take pride in maintaining the beach. These actions seem to unfairly penalize property owners. If the bylaw moves forward, it should grandfather in existing structures and ensure that new construction permits aren't solely at the discretion of the 'Director.' We look forward to the revised bylaw and hope the Council listens to its taxpayers.	Existing legal structures are grandfathered.

Heather February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
129.	We oppose the Dynamic Shoreline By-law and the rushed process you have undertaken, prior to when the Interim Control By-law expires, on April 29,2025.	Acknowledged.

Ian Cole February 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
130.	I am writing as a member of the community to provide my support for the Dynamic Beach Control By-Law. Appropriate development of the ecologically sensitive shoreline in Tiny is of vital importance to ensure current and future generations have the ability to enjoy the natural beauty of what we have herein Tiny. This by-law will ensure appropriate development along the shoreline, protecting vital natural structures and habitats to ensure ongoing biodiversity and health of the Georgian Bay ecosystem.	Acknowledged.
131.	Unchecked development will result in continued degradation of this precious environment. It is a privilege to be a member of this community and we should all be supporting this by-law as stewards of the land and water.	Acknowledged.

	Irene Kourtalis February 18, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
132.	I am writing to express my opposition to both the Interim Control Bylaw, the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw as well as the rushed process. Please help us to do the right thing here.	Acknowledged.

	Jeremy & Phoebe Conway 394 North Shore Drive February 25, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
133.	We have a cottage at 394 North Shore Drive and are opposed to the Dynamic Beach Law.	Acknowledged.

	Jean Beauchesne February 5, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
134.	I've looked at the map showing 178 level mark and a different one with the Property lines, however I can't find them in conjunction. An overlay of the 178 mark on the property line to determine where it sits on the property. Is there a map that shows that, or would you have access to getting one?	The Township is not producing a map to illustrate the 179 metre G.S.C. elevation. Surveys will be required on a site by site basis where new development is proposed that is in close proximity to the 178 metre contour or where the location of the contour is needed to confirm zoning compliance related to a proposed building or structure. Only the most complex and potentially impactful applications would require a survey. It is noted that surveys are already required for construction of buildings and structures adjacent to Georgian Bay through the Zoning By-law and building permit zoning compliance review process.
135.	The Property is presently on the market for sale via the bank. I realise they probably would need a new survey to properly determine the exact location of the 178line mark would fall under the new owners responsibility but were trying to get a decent idea of it's location via the property line. (to determine where we start counting our 45 metres inward). Its an old summer cottage but wondering also if the existing footprint would be grandfathered in. Your help is greatly appreciated.	Acknowledged.

	Janet Boyer March 9, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
136.	I would request that you please do not extend the contour line by 45 meters. This change complicates property maintenance for beachfront owners trying	Acknowledged.

	Janet Boyer March 9, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	to maintain their forests, beaches & repair their structures. More permits & rules make it hard for contractors too. We try to keep the land & waterfront we own in good safe condition including sand, rock & stone placements & the removal of weeds. The purpose is to keep it safe for our families, especially children & the elderly. Also it is hard for seasonal owners to be up there in the winter to deal with these important matters.	

	Judy Jarvis 596 Silverbirch Drive February 23, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
137.	I would like to register my opposition to the Interim Control Bylaw and the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw and the rushed process you are undergoing. In Canada, we always allow for open dialogue and perspectives.	Acknowledged.

	Janet Marks February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
138.	I am writing to express my strong concern and opposition to the proposed Dynamic Beach By-Law. Over the past two years, I have followed the Interim Control By-Law, reviewed all extensive documents, and attended both PIC meetings. This by-law contains significant flaws infringe upon property owners' rights and diminish the enjoyment of Tiny Township's shoreline. I am particularly concerned that the proposed by-law will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create further tensions among residents, pitting neighbors against each other 2. Fear that our beautiful beaches will disappear 3. Be difficult to enforce consistently, especially when existing by-laws on the beaches are already not adequately enforced. 4. Potentially decrease property values across Tiny Township due to its excessive restrictions. 	Acknowledged.
139.	Tiny Township encompasses a diverse landscape of neighborhoods, farms, lakes, and beaches. This by-law is overly restrictive and fails to	Acknowledged.

	Janet Marks February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	achieve its intended purpose of protecting both residents and the environment.	

	Joy Stringer 282 Tiny Beaches Road North March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
140.	I wish to inform council that I strenuously object to this proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw and the imposition of further limitations to my property. The time I will waste in applying for a permit is unnecessary and will result in additional work for Tiny staff and ultimately extra costs for all taxpayers who are already paying HUGE municipal taxes.	Acknowledged.
141.	This could greatly limit the work to be done on my own property and ultimately lower my property values, which will obviously limit the taxes Tiny collects. I fail to see why this should apply to my property while the property owned by Tiny does not have to follow the same procedures.	The amendments to the Zoning By-law and the Shoreline By-law grandfather existing legal structures and do not prevent maintaining buildings and structures. The amendments and the new Shoreline By-law are proposed to implement the PPS policies on natural hazards, protect natural heritage features along the shoreline and to limit potential negative impacts of buildings and structures on neighbouring properties.
142.	I am also greatly concerned about the possible delay, or possible denial of permit, particularly in relation to invasive species. Cawaja has always been aware of our responsibility to protect this treasured resource in cooperation with Tiny. We do not need additional obstacles to caring for this valued property.	In most cases, and depending on the scope and nature of the works, no permit is necessary for the removal of invasive species.

	Joan Condie 24 Lakeside Drive February 6, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
143.	Given that the focus of this project is to protect our shoreline, I am wondering if Tiny is able to provide resources to beach communities that wish to further protect their own shoreline? I live in a community that communally owns the main beach and has been vigilant about protecting the dunes and grasses. Nevertheless, we experienced major erosion several years ago and would like to know what we could do to help build up the	Beyond the scope of this exercise. Please contact public works regarding this inquiry

Joan Condie 24 Lakeside Drive February 6, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	dunes. Advice in this area would be appreciated. For example, temporary snow fencing is sometimes set up in the fall and affects not only snow buildup but sand as well. Location and types of new planting are also of interest.	
144.	Would a representative from Tiny be able to come to a meeting of community members to explain the new bylaw and answer questions once it is officially in place?	Yes, Township staff will be able to meet with groups to answer questions and clarify process.

Joanne Devisser February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
145.	As you review the changes to the Official Plan regarding the Shoreline, it would be significantly beneficial –and complimentary - to also implement a tree protection bylaw that would reduce the constant clear-cutting of treed lots. If the goal is truly to protect our environment and the strains on our beaches, a tree protection bylaw is needed to ensure ALL properties retain the tree canopy, wetland and other natural environments.	A tree cutting by-law is not being contemplated at this time.
146.	Additionally, proactively enforcing beach bylaws - or adding in sections of the new bylaw- to reduce the human impact on our beaches (dog waste, litter, and dumping...) can play an important role in managing our beaches.	Additional by-laws are not being contemplated at this time.

John Bryant March 12, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
147.	The Town's website indicates Grant's Tomb Island is within Tiny Township. If so, is it being addressed within the scope of the study?	Yes.
148.	What are the origins and justification for having a building setback from 15m to 45m to the 178contour?	45 metres is provided by the Ministry and is the Dynamic Beach Hazard Limit; which is comprised of Flood Hazard Limit (15 metres) plus a Dynamic Beach Allowance of 30 metres.
149.	How many cottages/ homes are currently within 15 m of the 178 contour ?	Not aware of the number of cottages/homes within 15 metres of the 178 metre contour. Any that are would be either legal non-complying, or would have had Planning Act approval to locate there, or have been illegally placed without a building permit.

John Bryant March 12, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
150.	How many vacant lots on the shoreline are in the township that the bylaw hopes to address?	Shoreline By-law applies to all lands within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation. Vacant lots or developed.
151.	Only a minor number of incidents seem to have occurred over the years resulting in little or no environmental damage (according to staff). Issues tend to be back lot owners claiming ownership on lands they have no rights to. The new bylaw is trying to address lesser pressing community issuesa bit of a diversion.	Acknowledged.
152.	I find it troublesome that the Township has no mapping of what may or may not be a dynamic beach? How can such wide sweeping assumptions be made with no evidence as to the magnitude of the problems. Surely there must be dated historical records that can be updated. Differing the cost for a property owner to hire a coastal engineer is an overreach and may be cost prohibitive. Another reason to not invest in Tiny.	Proposed Shoreline By-law applies to all areas of the shoreline within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation. Dynamic beach policies and regulations to apply to dynamic beach areas as determined through site specific study were necessary. This approach is similar to the approach employed with natural heritage features in the Township Planning Documents.
153.	May I suggest that the draft bylaw be circulated to DFO, MNRF and perhaps Simcoe County for peer review. Using own tax dollars better as they may have the expertise on staff and may have innovative suggestions they are currently considering. The goal is to provide an accurate science based and streamlined document that is user friendly.	These agencies have been circulated the documents and any comments received will be taken into account. Township staff anticipate working with MNR and DFO as the permitting process gets underway.
154.	I can recall at least one Tiny Councillor who has a home on the waterfront. Clarification for the public is needed as to why he is not in a conflict of interest?	Cannot comment on individual conflicts or perceived conflict. It is noted that the proposed documents are not site specific.

Ken Marks 62 Lefaive Road February 19, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
155.	Having been in Cawaja area since 1999 I have seen our association work hard to remove invasive species; remove dead and dangerous trees; non-native vegetation and every year do a beach clean up to remove fallen branches, litter and other items not associated with the sandy shore.	Acknowledged.
156.	I am concerned the proposed dynamic by-law will:	Acknowledged.

Ken Marks 62 Lefaive Road February 19, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	1. Be extremely bureaucratic in the administration with the needs for permits, permissions, etc.	
157.	2. Create more tensions across Tiny pitting neighbours against neighbors	Acknowledged.
158.	3. Very difficult to enforce on a regular basis (by-law doesn't enforce many of the by-laws on the beaches today)	Acknowledged.
159.	4. Possible added staff with an additional cost to the tax payers who are already upset on increases	Acknowledged.
160.	5. Possible decrease in property values due to over reaching restrictions	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
161.	As a member of the Cawaja Property Association we have a unique relationship with the township and it has been a good working one. Annual beach clean-ups; debris removal, addressing safety items, pathways, etc have been reacted to quickly with volunteers and town labour. Now with this proposed by-law I fear the need for permits will reduce this cooperation. Tiny is a large area with neighbourhoods, farms, lakes and beach areas. This by-law is overreaching and not doing what is intended to protect people and the environment.	Acknowledged.

Ken Cole 304 North Shore Drive		
#	Comment	Comment Response
162.	How does this bylaw affect boat docks, both permanent and seasonal?	Zoning By-law contains regulations that would apply to new structures. New docks would require a permit under the Shoreline By-law. Existing structures are grandfathered by the Zoning By-law.

Lee Sims March 2, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
163.	Are you trying to kill the golden goose you have through such onerous regulations?	Acknowledged.

Lisa Clark March 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
164.	<p>At apprx 8:40 until 9:25 in the video, while describing Slide 5, the speaker says the following: "Anybody who's been around these beaches for a long period of time, if you remember what the beach looked like in 2020 there was hardly any beach left at all, that was the highest water levels in history, then you look back on in 2012/13, when they're the lowest in history, and it's amazing when you look at our dynamic beach, it recovers every single year, and I've been going to the beach every single year since I was 4 years old up here and to me, the beaches come, they go, but at the end of the day, they're still here and they're still vibrant, and that's because they're being managed properly and allowing nature to heal itself."</p> <p>What is the issue that has caused the township to take the dramatic step of implementing an interim bylaw in the first place?</p>	<p>The amendments and the new Shoreline By-law are proposed to implement the PPS policies on natural hazards, protect natural heritage features along the shoreline and to limit potential negative impacts of buildings and structures on neighbouring properties.</p>
165.	<p>On Slide 6, an image is shown illustrating natural dynamic beach movement. This slide, and the bylaw as written, appears to disregard that most of the shoreline has structures/cottages/decks etc already in place, with many lots almost fully consumed by a 45m setback from the 178 mark. How is this setback a reasonable distance, when the current setback is 15m for many activities?</p>	<p>Setback is provided by the Province. Existing buildings and structures are grandfathered.</p>
166.	<p>Why are township owned lands exempt from this bylaw? The township should demonstrate leadership with public lands. This seems to be even more important given that the Tiny Strategic Plan for 2022-206 lists "Public Lands Management including shoreline" as a priority.</p>	<p>Township works are exempt from the Proposed Shoreline By-Law. Depending on the scope or any Township work proposed, a coastal engineering study may be required to support the Township works, even without the requirement for a permit under the Proposed Shoreline By-Law.</p>

Larry Totton 284 Tiny Beaches Road North February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
167.	<p>I would like to express my displeasure and opposition to both the Dynamic Beach Bylaw changes and the rushed process in a bid to give the municipality total control of our shared ownership of our Cawaja Beach and all beaches.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
168.	<p>The planning department has an obligation to protect the beaches for all users but it also has a duty to help owners use the property in an environmentally safe manner. You taking control</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

Larry Totton 284 Tiny Beaches Road North February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	doesn't help anyone because we know what happens when the planning department flexes their muscles and harasses and bullies property owners into spending an inordinate amount of approval time and money to make minor building changes.	
169.	A case in point is you demand a full survey for an addition even when the addition is no where near the high-water mark. The municipality should be charged with the onus of finding the high-water mark for all beach front property owners.	No change is proposed to the current approach of requiring proponents to identify the location of the 178 metre contour to determine zoning setback compliance.

Mike Baldesarra February 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
170.	As seasons change, the rocks that form the groins shift, so that annually it's a process of manually repositioning some of these rocks back onto the groin. What is the amount of this type of work that can be done without requiring a permit. Is it only if a heavy machinery is used, that requires a permit?	Generally, if no machinery is required a permit is not necessary. Annual relocation of sand using machinery due to seasonal wind/driving sand movement requires a Class 1 permit. Replace and repair would require a Class 2 permit. Expansion or significant alteration would require a Class 3 permit. See draft permit class guideline.

Maggie Carveth		
#	Comment	Comment Response
171.	What will be the enforcement process for the Dynamic Beach By-Law?	Enforcement will be completed by the Municipal Law Enforcement Department in accordance with the terms outline in the Shoreline By-law.
172.	It will infringe upon the rights of beachfront owners in terms of their ability to manage their own property – for example – the requirement for permits to remove invasive species, have dead trees that need to be removed, plant replacement trees, move sand around on their property because of displacement during the winter and spring storms. Routine tasks that will be encumbered with the time- consuming, costly, permit process.	Generally, no permit is required to remove invasive species or minor plant removal (depending on scope). Larger tree removal or larger sand removal will require a Class 1 permit.
173.	Also, the value of properties of beach front properties will be reduced. This will have the knock-on effect of the shortfall in property taxes from these properties that will have to be borne by non-beach property owners. All of this will	Acknowledged.

	Maggie Carveth	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	create tensions among residents, pitting neighbours against each other.	

	Michelle Dada February 20, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
174.	Following the Public Information Sessions (PICs) held earlier this month, it is understood that a revised version of the proposed Bylaw is being prepared to address comments from the public, including feedback from contractors and consultants.	Available on website.
175.	The PIC referenced specific "classes" of permits and "grandfathering" provisions, which do not appear in the current draft of the Bylaw.	Classes of permits are available on website.
176.	Additionally, the date of the public meeting, mentioned at the PIC as March 31, 2025, has yet to be formally confirmed.	Notice for public meeting on the website.
177.	Could staff please provide confirmation regarding the anticipated release date for the next draft of the Bylaw for review and comment? It is essential that the public be given adequate time to thoroughly review and provide meaningful input on the proposal before the statutory Public Meeting (tentatively set for March 31). Ensuring this opportunity for engagement is critical to maintaining transparency and fostering informed participation through the planning process.	Available on the website.

	Mary Ellis February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
178.	Suggesting that a coastal engineering study be obtained was referred to quite frequently. As the bylaw was prepared by a coastal engineering company, as a solution it sounded self serving & not an independent recommendation.	Study consultant is not a coastal engineering company. Technical information may be required to justify proposed developments.
179.	When a coastal engineer asked what guidelines would be in place, for a coastal engineer to be able to work with their client, the answer seemed to be that the town staff would look at each case individually -a subjective versus objective process.	Acknowledged. Each situation is different and may require site specific terms of reference.
180.	When the parking issues were being addressed, it was tested in problem areas and developed and rolled out in segments, eventually being blanketed across the township. This approach using known environmentally sensitive areas and	Acknowledged.

Mary Ellis February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	the towns land could be used to test the implementation of the bylaw to work out the kinks.	
181.	Has an economic impact been considered - for example, how many of the building permits issued in the last 5 years come from the dynamic beach zone. How much job loss will this be? Could the bylaw be implemented incrementally, 20 to 25 feet annually as the township, builders and property owners get use to the new reality.	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
182.	And perhaps some clarity - once the bylaw is in place, would a new owner be able to rebuild on the existing footprint. The township may have existing homeowners that upon selling will be selling vacant land as rebuilds are not allowed.	Zoning By-law grandfathers location of legally exiting building and structures. A Shoreline By-law permit and building permit would be required to rebuild an existing dwelling.

Morley Forsyth & Margot Kontak Forsyth 632 Silver Birch Drive March 4, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
183.	The proposed dynamic beach bylaw and the rushed process. It will have the same effect on Tiny as the thoughtless Trump tariffs.	Studies have been on-going for approximately two years. The ICBL expires in May 2025 and the project is working towards Council approval prior to the expiry of the ICBL. The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time.

M. Mallo, President The Pennorth Beach Corporation February 4, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
184.	We were able to participate with the meeting this evening. We note that it was repeatedly stressed by township staff that the effects of works and infrastructure be viewed through the lens of not affecting adjoining properties and with a view to the protection of the beach as an asset regardless of ownership. That being the case please identify who is responsible for failing to address removal of the man-made isthmus thereby preventing thousands of cubic meters of sand from flowing naturally downstream to the other beaches.	Beyond the scope of this exercise.

M. Mallo, President The Pennorth Beach Corporation February 4, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
185.	With a view to keeping with the intent of the bylaw to prevent one owner from adversely affecting neighbouring properties and avoiding a situation similar to the inaction with the Island isthmus, please advise whether a coastal engineering report was completed for the newly constructed pier at Lackie Point and did such a report address ensuring natural sand flows would continue. Was such a report reviewed, acknowledged and commented on by the township as the staff indicated is required? Who was responsible for approving construction of the pier and span to the shoreline which clearly appears to fall within the realm of the intent of the current bylaw being proposed.	Beyond the scope of this exercise.

Mark VanderHeyden 60 Wahnkewening Drive February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
186.	I have attended the PIC session and read much of the material related to the proposed beach bylaw. I am a member of Beach Rights and an owner in Tiny for almost 40 years. The proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw is over-reaching, damaging to many property owners and not required due to existing zoning and bylaws tools in place.	Acknowledged.
187.	In the 1990s, I participated in the Strategic Plan that had the outcome of designating/confirming Open Space (OS) along the shores of Tiny, with Bylaws that controlled any building or modifications to OS. These tool shave been and are available to the township to ensure that the shoreline remains free of alteration and open /available for use by residents. Over the years, some changes have been made in violation and the real objective is to ensure that no further changes are made to OS designated areas and to support removal of obstructions. I think many and most Tiny residents support that alignment with the Strategic Plan.	Acknowledged.
188.	Implementing a Bylaw that reaches 45m behind the 178m high-water mark is punitive to property owners that help drive the economy of Tiny. It will restrict property improvements and drive	Acknowledged.

	Mark VanderHeyden 60 Wahnkewening Drive February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	down use of trades and services in the community. In addition to a negative impact on the local economy, Council will be “picking a fight” with homeowners impacted which may not achieve the desired outcome – maintaining the beauty and use of our shoreline by all.	
189.	In my recent build project, we were subjected to a 15m setback from the 178m high water mark, which seems reasonable – there are current standards and controls which exist and should be the future reference. I do not support the proposed Bylaw and the over-reaching limitations to owners and control to Tiny that it implies. I ask this Council to use their efforts to expand OS zoning, if required and enforce existing bylaws to improve beach access and protection.	Acknowledged.

	Margaret Louise White 30 Rowntree Lane February 20, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
190.	Regarding any form of plantings or invasive species removal in the Dynamic Beach zone, would a resident or beach association require a permit to undertake this? The thought is that plantings help protect the beach from moving during peak storms and winds. And invasive species are a menace on our beaches which many associations address annually.	Generally, depending on scope, no permit is required to remove invasive species or minor landscaping.

	Mary Carmichael 160 Centre Beach Road February 5, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
191.	Yes, we need to protect our beach plus the people that enjoy the beach and the water. There has been a significant rise in the geese population over the last 20 years. The geese are polluting our beach and water. You cannot walk the beach without stepping in their excrement. The waters edge is polluted and a concern for swimmers. Because most of the geese are migratory, I now have concerns about Bird Flu, how long is it going to take before we have a health incident in Ontario. Please take the time to explore a cull...I know this	Acknowledged.

	Mary Carmichael 160 Centre Beach Road February 5, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	is possible! Our safety and health needs to be protected !!	

	Michael Frustaglio February 11, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
192.	I have been introduced to tiny from my parents who bought a cottage and land in Tiny in 1962. Who became shoreline residents since 1968 The Tiny Beaches Dynamic Beaches need to have protection from some who would not understand the nature of the dunes in high and low water marks. Where I feel their should be different criteria then has been presented. In particular I see that groins/peninsula's composed of Georgian bay stone and sand that are not dynamic beach. These groins in high and low water marks become shoals when under water. However in the extreme high water marks of 2000 etc, severe damage was done to these groins by the washing away of sand leaving behind a desert of 6 to 12 inh stone.	Acknowledged.
193.	Furthermore, the original grades were washed away and the new grades dropped along these water edges as the water dropped by as much as 2 to 3 ft. Many of owners of these groins would restitute these groins to the original grades and pre-existing conditions where the peninsula's were once walkable and enjoyable. A Homeowner if they can show these grades prior to the high-water vs where the grades are today, should without penalty and with minor permit cost to oversea proper materials are replaced ,should be able to restitute these types of shorelines being the groins that are not dynamic beaches. This is an important aspect where the citizens of Tiny can contribute to repairing the damages of the extreme high water marks that damaged all the shorelines of Tiny.	Acknowledged. Different classes of permits are proposed based on the scope of work. See permit class guideline document.
194.	But unlike a dynamic beach that can re correct itself with the sands that make part of the geography in and out of the water ,some areas do not have that capability and need help to repair. These Peninsula's that are non dynamic in nature above and below the water in front of them cannot recover without help of replacing the	Acknowledged.

Michael Frustaglio February 11, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	sand and stone mix and as well to allow natural stone and fabric cloth that will assist that if extreme high water marks happen again they do not destroy these groins as they did in 2000.	
195.	Please consider this from a long time resident and observer and supporter of protection of dynamic beaches and Non Dynamic Beaches. I would be happy to share shoreline tours to show and demonstrate the damages that have occurred and what the shoreline looked like previous to the extreme high water marks That no more then a few years ago were of such great concern for all those who reside and enjoy these shorelines	Acknowledged.

Michael Pearce		
#	Comment	Comment Response
196.	Explicitly clarify grandfathering in the by-law: As a long time shoreline owner in Tiny, I can appreciate your objective to protect our natural heritage. I attended one of the PIC meetings last week. You must now be aware that the proposed by-law has stirred up a great deal of concern, much of which could have been foreseen and headed off with better wording in the by-law and better communication prior to the meetings. No resident will want to be labelled as being in a Dynamic Beach Zone the way the by-law is currently written. I offer one strong suggestion: clarify, in writing, in the proposed by-law the "grandfathering" provisions that were discussed at the meetings. Otherwise, all of us who believe we are headed to "non-compliance" will oppose this initiative.	Acknowledged.
197.	How many properties are on Tiny's shoreline? Will you have adequate staff to handle questions and permitting from that many properties during the busy summer season in a timely fashion?	Staff requirements will be monitored.

Michelle Dada MNT Consulting Group Inc. February 19, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
198.	I am seeking clarification on the process for obtaining an exemption or clearance from the proposed Dynamic Beach Management Bylaw. It	The Shoreline By-law applies to all lands within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation.

Michelle Dada MNT Consulting Group Inc. February 19, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>is understood that this bylaw would only apply to properties within the Township that are identified as containing a "dynamic beach hazard."</p> <p>Given that the Township does not currently have accurate mapping for these hazard lands, it seems that the responsibility for providing this confirmation may fall entirely on the landowner (i.e., dynamic beach hazard unless proven otherwise). Could you please outline the expected time, fee and procedural steps involved for landowners in this regard?</p>	<p>As is the case currently through the Zoning By-law, land owners will be responsible for identifying the location of features including Dynamic Beaches.</p>
199.	<p>As an example, to apply for an MNR permit, a municipal planning sign-off is required. In Tiny, even for shorelines that are demonstrably non-dynamic, a planning sign-off is being denied on the basis of the Interim Control Bylaw. How will the proposed Dynamic Beach Management Bylaw affect this process, especially in cases where the bylaw does not apply due to a non-dynamic shoreline but the Township still needs to verify this?</p>	<p>The Township will continue to comment on MNR applications and anticipate working with MNR as the permitting process gets underway.</p>

Norm & Anita Naumoff 314 Silverbirch Drive February 25, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
200.	<p>Gentleman this letter is to formally submit our concern on the process to establish this bylaw, specifically the no grandfathering clause. Considering the extensive impact on many established beach properties this no grandfathering restriction, and even the distance setback from the 178m Contour seem excessive.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>
201.	<p>Frankly this is an attempt at expropriation without compensation, and I am sure you gentlemen did not intend that position. I would expect that a review of the issues raised will lead to a final bylaw that accommodates existing properly permitted shoreline structures and landscaping and still ensures safe shoreline preservation.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>

	Nadia Chapin 612 Silverbirch Drive February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
202.	I am deeply concerned and opposed to the present interim Control Bylaw and the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw. I believe that as an owner of waterfront property in Tiny Township we have a right to a voice in this matter. This bylaw is being rushed through without proper discussion and study and at a time when most seasonal residents are not around.	The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time. Noted that this process has been in front of Council for over two years.
203.	I believe that much of the proposed bylaw will be a detriment to our waterfronts, the ability to create better access and landscaping and ultimately decrease our property values. Let's take the time to look at what other townships are doing and create a better proposal for all.	Acknowledged.
204.	I am firmly opposed to the present Interim Control Bylaw and Proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw and the rushed manner in which the PDB is being handled.	Acknowledged.

	Neville Taylor February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
205.	<p>Dear Sirs, having had a chance to look at the legislation proposed to "protect" dynamic beaches and shoreline in Tiny Twp and the output from two PICs as summarized by FOTTSA I can only say that my sense of alarm about your efforts to control the shoreline has only grown. I fully support efforts to manage and protect the shoreline of Tiny but what you are proposing here is control rather than management and protection.</p> <p>Although you have apparently spent a huge amount of taxpayer's money on consultants the legislation itself manages to be overly complicated while at the same time vague, incomplete and in FOTTSA's estimation "aggressive and restrictive". At the same time it appears to largely redundant as most of what is dealt with is covered by existing zoning legislation. In that case you are evidently attempting to add another layer of bureaucracy and expense in pursuit of some objectives which you have not yet fully elaborated.</p>	Acknowledged.
206.	At the PIC meeting Councillors allegedly offered comforting words about avoiding repetition and redundancy and streamlining the application	Details regarding permitting, processes and potential fees are provided on the website.

Neville Taylor February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	process. As we have not been told the application process will be, how long it will take, how much it will cost or even who will make the decisions how can we assess these comments? Without that these are empty words that are not written down anywhere and are unlikely to reflect in outcomes.	
207.	Having been in Tiny for over 50 years myself I would challenge you to suggest any shoreline area that hasn't actually improved over that period of time and without the benefit of this proposed legislation, which only points to its unnecessary nature and brings its true intention into question. The potential for unintended consequences in this type of legislation is manifold. As an example I have a county maintained road between my cottage and the shoreline. Your proposed legislation gives the township free rein to do what they want with the road while, in light of the vague proposed language on grandfathering of existing structures, I would have to go through a costly and time consuming approval process to upgrade the windows in my cottage building. This kind of overreaching administrative hurdle will act to prevent or delay shoreline property owners from proceeding in a timely manner with projects that they consider essential to protect their shoreline property and instead refer this decision to some faceless group that is not familiar with the area. This is control, not management or protection. Nonsense.	The Shoreline By-law establishes parameters with the issuance of permits.

Pat French March 3rd, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
208.	Can you please provide disclosure or any potential conflict(s) of interest of Council and the Consultants attached to this proposed bylaw? Examples: Do the Stakeholders have interest in land in the township or businesses in the Township where they benefit from this Proposed Bylaw?	Not aware of potential conflicts, the Shoreline By-law applies to all areas within 45 metres of the 178 metre contour.
209.	Can you please share what revenue projections you have forecast for this proposed Bylaw?	There are no revenue projections, revenue will be dependant on the number of permits.
210.	How will this new Bylaw address Waterfront Assets such as the New Docks at Cedar Point and Christian Island, the old Government Dock at Thunder Beach etc? New Docks at Cedar Point is	The Shoreline By-law does not consider historic uses. Permits will be required for new development.

Pat French March 3rd, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	changing movement of sand.. beach in the area...old Government Dock at Thunder Beach requires periodic maintenance.	
211.	Would you undertake a 'Design Charette' with DFO & MNRF on this Proposed Bylaw with the Tiny Taxpayers before May?	A "Design Charette" is not proposed.

Pat & Stan Seymour 140 Tiny Beaches Road South March 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
212.	We Pat and Stan Seymour of 140 Tiny Beaches Road South, strongly disagree with the direction being taken around the beach limitations in relationship to private properties. We think further open discussion on this matter is required.	Acknowledged.

Paul & Cathy Floyd February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
213.	Paul and Cathy Floyd, as long-time residents for over 23 years of Tiny Township, oppose both the by-law and rushed process of the Dynamic Beach by-law.	Acknowledged.

Paul Fahey February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
214.	We are long time residents of Tiny and we are extremely concerned that Tiny's Council is sponsoring this ill advised bylaw. It is wholly unnecessary, incomplete, and provides very little assurance that beachfront owners will be able to make reasonable improvements to their properties without subjecting themselves to costly and arbitrary bureaucratic headaches. FoTTSA has made representations to the council expressing their concerns about this contemplated bylaw. I sincerely hope that Tiny's council either drops this ill conceived initiative, or alternatively, makes the requested amendments FoTTSA has recently requested.	Acknowledged. The Shoreline By-law proposes different classes of permits based on the scope of work proposed. See permit class guideline document.

Paul Macdonald 18 East Beach February 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
215.	May I say at the outset that I am currently travelling in south east asia and have had little or no opportunity to gather information to understand the bylaw or its potential effects on my property in particular, or on the Thunder Beach/Tiny shoreline generally. I find the extremely tight timeline for proposed passage of the bylaw to be very troubling and unacceptable.	The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time. Noted that this process has been in front of Council for over two years.
216.	1. Is my property at 18 East Beach considered to be part of a dynamic beach and therefore subject to the restrictions imposed by the bylaw?	The proposed Shoreline By-law would apply to all lands within the 45 metres of the 178 metre contour.
217.	2. I have an existing retaining wall at the edge of the current beach. How will the proposed bylaw affect my ability to repair/replace/improve this breakwall?	Based on draft documents, generally a Class 1 permit will be required. If the retaining wall is in water or on the shoreline a Class 2 permit would be required.
218.	3. How do I determine if my existing cottage and deck are within the restrictions of the by-law?	The proposed Shoreline By-law would apply to all lands within the 45 metres of the 178 metre contour. A survey may be required to determine the location of the 178 metre contour, depending on the scope and nature of the works.
219.	4. I have an existing 1 story cottage. If my property is within the dynamic beach set-back, will the by-law prevent me from modifying the exterior and/or adding a small second floor bedroom?	Depending on the location of the cottage, a minor variance to the Zoning By-law may be required. A Class 1 permit would also be required under the Shoreline By-law for the second floor. No permit is required for exterior alterations; provided there is no expansion.
220.	5. The proposed by-law appears to severely restrict improvements/renovations/additions to existing buildings. This will undoubtedly negatively affect property values. Has the township conducted any sort of study/appraisal on the effect on property values (either property specific or generally)? If not, why not?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
221.	6. What will the process be for individual property owners to determine if their property includes a dynamic beach and is therefore subject to the bylaw? Who makes this determination and is there an appeal process? What is the projected cost of having the determination made and who pays it?	A review by a costal engineer may be required to determine the limits of a Dynamic Beach. The proponent would be responsible for the cost of any study and Township peer review, should one be necessary given the complexity of the works.
222.	7. What are the projected new permit/study costs for owners wishing to improve/renovate and who pays these costs? What is the projected timeline for the application process? Will extra staff need	Potential permit costs are provided on the website. Application time lines are dependant on the scope of project, additional staff are not proposed at this time.

Paul Macdonald 18 East Beach February 10, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	to be hired to review applications and how will this extra staffing cost be recovered?	
223.	8. Assuming the bylaw has a negative effect on property/building values, has Tiny considered potential liability to homeowners who have suffered damage (ie loss value of property)? If not, why not? If yes, what has been considered and has a legal opinion being obtained?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
224.	9. What is the quantum of this potential liability and has Tiny set aside any reserve for this amount?	There is no known liability.
225.	10. Has Tiny conducted any study/analysis to determine potential lost revenue resulting from lower taxes becoming payable by owners whose properties decline in value as a result of the bylaw? If not, why not?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
226.	11. How will the by-law be enforced? Will extra staff/inspectors be required to check for non-compliance? What will be the projected cost of these extra staff?	The Shoreline By-law will be enforced by Township Municipal Law Enforcement officers in accordance with the parameters of the By-law.
227.	12. The timeline for passage of the bylaw is extremely tight. It appears that even though the current draft is not even close to being finalized, and many important details remain unclear and/or unknown, council is proposing to impose the bylaw in May, just over 2 months from now. This would prevent most seasonal residents (who do not return until May) from having any meaningful input, or in some cases even being aware of the pending passage. Why has this extremely tight timeline been imposed? Would it not be much more fair to all affected parties to circulate a draft bylaw (once it has been finalized by Tiny) to all parties once the draft has been finalized and then give all affected parties, including seasonal residents, an opportunity for meaningful input. Why the rush?	The timing of the process is a decision for Council. It is noted, that if the by-laws are passed, they could be amended by Council at any time. Noted that this process has been in front of Council for over two years.

Michael Pearce March 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
228.	Please be very specific about what, if anything, will be "grandfathered" under the proposed by-law. For example, existing cottage within the 150 feet zone, docks that were built decades ago, etc.?	Legally existing buildings and structures will be grandfathered.

The Pennorth Beach Corporation January 30, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
229.	We understand that it is not the responsibility of Tiny Township to issue permits for work or construction outside of the lands under your jurisdiction. However, in light of the proposed amendments to the Official Plan to give effect to consideration of public access to the shoreline and the movement and flow of sand to and from neighbouring lots, are you able to advise whether any studies with respect to sand flows were completed in the Pennorth/Wahnekewaning Beach area prior to the construction of the new pier located south of Tiny Island? Stating the obvious, approval to construct and failure to act responsibly to address removal of the isthmus connecting the shoreline and Tiny Island has very nearly halted natural sand flows south to the other beaches. The pier's construction appears to make matters worse.	Beyond the scope of this exercise.
230.	We (property owners) are noting reductions in sand flows to the beachfront areas immediately south of the pier and down the entire shoreline, affecting numerous beaches, including, we believe, the public beach at Concession 13. Would impairment of sand flows south due to obstructions placed in the water not fall under this by-law amendment, and if not, then who would be responsible for conducting the requisite studies that permit for this to take place?	The proposed Shoreline By-law would apply to new construction not existing development.

Rick Green February 6, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
231.	This bylaw is a cash grab by the township. It's is very discretionary in favour of the Township and will cause the loss of many jobs in tiny. Property values will go down as a result of this bylaw.	Acknowledged.

Robert Easto 34 Trew Avenue March 12, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
232.	Thank you for the opportunity, as a Tiny owner for almost 20 years, to express my concerns about this proposed By-law. I participated in the February 3	Acknowledged.

	Robert Easto 34 Trew Avenue March 12, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	information session, at which both Tiny staff and longtime residents noted that despite wildly varying water levels in the past 15 years (2012 low; 2020 high) our beaches remain valuable and beautiful assets. In fact, this has been the case for decades, probably centuries, without a beach management by-law. I believe most residents acknowledge that individual threats to our beaches occasionally arise, but the proposed By-law weaponizes a cannon when all that is required is a fly-swatter.	
233.	<p>The proposed By-law is exceedingly heavy-handed and constitutes a serious violation of existing property ownership rights. The proposal goes far beyond environmental protection (MNR and DFO protection already exists) and will have many adverse implications for Tiny Township including: unreasonable cost increases for environmental and engineering surveys and reports, and for permit applications; increasing staff resources to handle a huge increase in permit applications in a timely manner; decreasing property values due to owners' inability to maintain, repair or improve their properties (potentially impacting Tiny tax revenues); negative impacts on Tiny tradespeople and businesses.</p> <p>In short, I request that Council and staff reconsider this I'll-advised By-law and act appropriately for the good of the Township.</p>	Acknowledged.

	Roman Rosol February 23, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
234.	I completely support the dynamic beach bylaw.	Acknowledged.

	Rosemarie L. Humphries Humphries Planning Group Inc February 6, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
235.	I have a client that has obtained approval for setbacks from the CofA in relation the 178 elevation. No building permit has been submitted to date. How does the proposed bylaw deal with	The proposed Amendments to the Zoning By-law would not impact the minor variance approval. A permit will be required under the Shoreline By-law.

	Rosemarie L. Humphries Humphries Planning Group Inc February 6, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	this? Do we need to seek a site specific exception. We do not want to have to amend any other documents when and if this proposed bylaw comes into effect.	

	Sue & Dean Morrison 756 Tiny Beaches Road South March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
236.	<p>We are writing to express our deep concern regarding the proposed Dynamic Beach By-law. We have reviewed the documents and are shocked at what is proposed. The by-law seems unduly punitive, restrictive, and unreasonable. There also does not seem to be any compelling reason for this by-law OR a precedent set by any other township. What is the reason for this?</p> <p>Beachfront cottage owners are people who have a great love for the beach and its dynamic ecosystem. We are the people who walk the beach daily, picking up the garbage and ensuring that animal waste is never left on the beach. We also look after dead, washed up animals and fish in a safe way, so that they will not harm the water. We are people who care.</p> <p>We suspect that we are also the constituents who shoulder the load of the highest taxes in the township, yet we use the services minimally. It is completely unrealistic to think that if we want to improve or upgrade our properties and ensure that they are not in a state of disrepair that could affect the surrounding environment, we would have to go through a much more difficult, and we imagine, expensive process.</p> <p>Our hope is that you will reconsider this by-law.</p>	<p>Township proposing to implement the natural hazard policies of the PPS and for the reasons outlined in the introduction of the by-law.</p> <p>The proposed Shoreline By-law regulates site alteration, buildings and structures. The Zoning By-law regulates buildings and structures.</p> <p>Property maintenance and landscaping does not require a permit. The permitting process serves to project the values you identified in your correspondence.</p>

	Shophie Hudson 162 Tiny Beaches Road South	
#	Comment	Comment Response
237.	We are residents of Tiny Township, the recently proposed Dynamic Beach Management Bylaw, causes us great concern for the entire township. We are concerned about the restrictive nature of the bylaw, the fallout that will occur to property	Acknowledged.

Shophie Hudson 162 Tiny Beaches Road South		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	values, property sales & the resulting loss of tax dollars.	
238.	Why is Tiny Township the only waterfront community imposing such limits on property owners' ability to maintain or build on their private property?	Unable to comment on other municipalities and their shorelines.
239.	If zoning bylaws already cover these areas, why is this bylaw necessary?	The Zoning By-law regulates building and structures proposed in shoreline areas. The Shoreline By-law would regulate site alteration.
240.	Why does the Council believe it has the authority to impose restrictions that could lower property values?	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
241.	As long-time waterfront residents, we take pride in maintaining the beach. This bylaw seems to unfairly penalize beach front property owners. If the bylaw proceeds, it should grandfather existing structures and ensure that new construction permits are not solely at the discretion of the 'Director.' We look forward to the revised bylaw and hope the Council considers the concerns of its taxpayers.	Acknowledged. Existing buildings and structures are grandfathered.

Susan Inwood Thunder Beach March 6, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
242.	Please note that I strongly oppose both the proposed bylaw and the rushed process.	Acknowledged.

Stephanie Myhal & Mary Patroniak March 9, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
243.	I am writing on behalf of my family and senior neighbors who do not have access to a computer. My family has been a resident of this community for over 50 years, and in recent years, we have been struggling with the dangerous invasive phragmites on our beautiful, pristine Cawaja beach. We are deeply concerned and surprised by the Township's recent actions regarding future beach maintenance. Specifically, it is troubling that the Township is moving forward with a bylaw requiring a permit to remove invasive species and non-native vegetation from Cawaja beach—a permit that could potentially be denied—while seasonal	Standard beach maintenance and invasive species removal does not require a permit (subject to scope).

Stephanie Myhal & Mary Patroniak March 9, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	cottagers are absent and unable to attend the meeting to voice their concerns. This adds unnecessary red tape and delays addressing a serious environmental issue that directly affects the safety and health of our beach.	
244.	A portion of our tax dollars have always gone toward maintaining the Township, including the beaches. Why has this suddenly changed?	Beyond scope of this exercise.
245.	If maintaining the beach is now to be the responsibility of volunteers, will our taxes be lowered accordingly? This is not an argument for lower taxes, but rather a plea to ensure our taxpayer dollars continue to support a clean and safe beach for all.	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
246.	These invasive phragmites and other vegetation pose a serious risk to adults, children, and pets. As taxpayers, we expect our Mayor and Council to prioritize a clean, hazard-free beach and safe, clean water for all, both now and in the future.	Acknowledged.

Steve Ranson March 11, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
247.	As a homeowner in Tiny, I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw. It is a significant regulatory over-reach that will add unnecessary cost and delays to any reasonable development, not to mention restricting a homeowner's ability to repair or renovate existing structures. I am not aware of any other municipality which has such a restrictive bylaw that covers an area 45 metres from the shoreline.	Acknowledged.
248.	I believe this bylaw should be completely reconsidered to reduce the 45-metre dynamic zone and to provide greater latitude for homeowners to manage their existing structures and landscaping.	Acknowledged.
249.	Many of my neighbours have written with similar concerns. Given the significant impact this bylaw will have on all homeowners, I ask that you increase the public consultation period and delay the planned implementation of the bylaw until these concerns have been address and public consultations have been completed.	Acknowledged.

Sean Ouellet February 21, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
250.	I've been updating myself on this bylaw. The 1 item that strikes me as not being discussed is septic systems. Septic systems would require site alterations. Movement of soils & possibly plants. How are we going to deal with this? If I don't need a MV, but need to provide a new or enlarged septic inside the 45m are we required to provide a separate permit? What about the test holes? Do I need a permit now?	Septic systems are proposed to be exempt from the by-law, they are not considered structures as per the Zoning By-law and they have their own separate permitting process. However, it would need to be taken into account the condition and treatment of the ground cover impacts after the septic system is installed.

Sebastian Basualto February 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
251.	Can the Township confirm whether Sawlog Bay Beach has ever been considered public land or subject to public access under previous zoning or planning laws?	Beyond the scope of this exercise.
252.	What steps can be taken to formally recognize the community's longstanding use of the beach as a justification for its preservation?	Beyond the scope of this exercise.
253.	Given that the Interim Control By-law (24-027) prohibits development near the 178-meter contour of the Georgian Bay shoreline , can the Township confirm whether Sawlog Bay Beach falls within this restriction?	All shoreline lands within 45 metres of the 178 metre G.S.C. elevation are subject to the by-law.
254.	Can the Township formally classify Sawlog Bay Beach under the Dynamic Beach Hazard designation , thereby limiting any future development?	A costal engineer would be required to determine the extend of the Dynamic Beach Hazard.
255.	As part of the Township's Environment First initiative , how will the preservation of this beach align with the broader goals of protecting natural waterfront areas?	While the limits of the Dynamic Beach are to be determined; Dynamic Beaches are natural Heritage features identified for protection.
256.	Has an Environmental Impact Study been conducted to assess the risks of altering the shoreline through development?	EIS are conducted on a site-by-site bases.
257.	How would development at Sawlog Bay Beach impact erosion, water quality, and local biodiversity?	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
258.	What infrastructure considerations (such as road access, wastewater management, and emergency services) have been accounted for in the case of development?	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
259.	Given the importance of this issue, we ask that any rezoning or development proposals for Sawlog Bay Beach be subject to additional	Any future application will be subject to this by-law and Planning Act consultation requirements.

Sebastian Basualto February 3, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
	public consultation beyond the scheduled Public Information Centre (PIC) meetings.	
260.	What legal mechanisms exist for the community to formally oppose zoning changes that may allow private development?	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
261.	Will the Township consider amending its zoning by-laws to classify Sawlog Bay Beach as Open Space (OS1) or another protected category to ensure it remains undeveloped?	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
262.	Clarify the legal status of Sawlog Bay Beach and its historical public use.	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
263.	Extend the Interim Control By-law to protect the area while further studies are conducted.	The ICBL cannot be extended per the Planning Act.
264.	Ensure that the Dynamic Beach Management By-law includes Sawlog Bay Beach under protected categories that restrict development.	The Zoning By-law regulates the use of land and the Shoreline applies to all shoreline areas that are within 45 metres of the 178 meter contour.
265.	Commit to additional public consultation and transparency regarding any proposed changes to the zoning or sale of this land.	Beyond the scope of this by-law.
266.	Explore conservation or municipal acquisition options to secure the beach as a public asset.	Beyond the scope of this by-law.

Sharon Moncarz February 24, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
267.	I am opposed to the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw and the rushed process. I trust that you will reconsider both.	Acknowledged.

Simon & Sandra Etherington 19 Card Ave February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
268.	My wife and myself are opposed to the proposed adjustments to Cawaja Beachfront. Additionally we suggest the date to make the changes do not provide sufficient time form any of the landowners. To date, we the landowners have been responsible for the removal of invasive plants, small trees etc. We see no reason to change this process, wasting time and money requiring permits and supervision. We suggest a later date so the landowners have	Acknowledged. Generally, no permit is required for the Shoreline By-law for the removal of invasive plants and vegetation (subject to scope).

	Simon & Sandra Etherington 19 Card Ave February 18, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	time to review together and provide the appropriate, unified response.	

	Susan Barbi January 9, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
269.	<p>We have a waterfront property with a huge problem. The number of geese on the beach is completely taking over. There is poo everywhere on the sand and I don't know what they are doing in the water. This is a huge health issue and I wonder if this may be the problem for the escalated number of water advisories that we've had last summer and the summer before.</p> <p>These geese are having babies and their babies are having babies and they are pooping everywhere. It's getting disgusting to the point that we are considering selling our property. We pay hefty taxes for the blessings of living on the water but not to have children stepping on poo. Something really has to be done to rectify this huge, unsanitary problem. And please don't tell me that there isn't a solution because every problem has a solution, you just have to think of it and think outside the box.</p>	Acknowledged. Beyond the scope of this by-law.

	Tina Brillinger 67 Green Pt Road March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
270.	As a resident of Thunder Beach, located at 67 Green Pt. Rd. Tiny, I am opposed to the proposed new Dynamic Beach Bylaw which is placing undue and unnecessary restrictions and hardship on those who own shoreline properties in Tiny. The fact Council is trying to push this through by April 29th is alarming given that many in our community are out of the country such as myself who I am sure would like to have their voices heard.	Acknowledged.
271.	It is very concerning that the draft Bylaw provisions related to existing development are extremely limited and very restrictive. For many residents who own waterfront properties this area encompasses existing buildings, landscaping, driveways, walkways, fences, decks and septic systems. The draft Bylaw has no "grandfathering"	The Proposed Shoreline By-Law generally grandfathers existing building and structures. It also regulates site alternation.

	Tina Brillinger 67 Green Pt Road March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	provisions to accommodate existing structures or infrastructure within the defined Dynamic Beach Hazard area. This omission is completely unacceptable and unworkable and I can't even believe anyone with common sense would not take these things into consideration and allow grandfathering to these existing shoreline structures.	

#	Comment	Comment Response
272.	I personally would like to know what the expectations are for existing structures on these properties. Until I have more information, I am I am requesting that this proposed bylaw be stayed and to allow enough time for local and seasonal residents to respond adequately as these are life-limiting measures that will affect many people in the community for generations to come.	The Shoreline By-law grandfathers existing structures.

	Tom Johnson February 26, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
273.	As a taxpayer in Tiny, I oppose the subject Bylaw and the rushed process. The proposed Bylaw lacks justification, intent and clarity. I feel any changes to the current status unnecessary given the protective measures that are already in place.	Acknowledged.

	Victor Moncarz February 24, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
274.	I am opposed to the proposed Dynamic Beach Bylaw and the rushed process. I trust that you will reconsider both.	Acknowledged.

	Walter Sydorshyn 8 Pauline Ave March 4, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
275.	I ask you to stop this ridiculous effort to impose bylaws that only serve to hamper and frustrate the same taxpayers and voters that elected you. You must know that the impact to the entire area will be detrimental to the beauty and uniqueness of this area.	Acknowledged.

Walter Sydorshyn 8 Pauline Ave March 4, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
276.	Of particular concern: Permitting for tree removal, you are adding administration to something that is obviously the responsibility of the property owners that wish to have clean and safe properties. I do not understand what business it of yours.	Acknowledged.
277.	Permitting for removing invasive species and non-native vegetation, this is a critical problem for Cawaja beach, and now you want to add a layer of costly administration to an obvious issue that we have been dealing with. You would only be costing the beach unnecessary time and cost in dealing with this issue.	Acknowledged. Removal of invasive species does not require a permit (depending on scope).
278.	Now your team wants to impose these bylaws and unfairly at that. I believe we are all considered equal taxpayers but it appears there are preferential areas and businesses that are more equal.	Acknowledged.
279.	The long-term implications could affect property valuations, discourage purchasing in the area due to the degradation of the area due to poor support, slow administration and cost of this program. The short-term and long-term problems are a greater risk than any benefit your team sees today.	There is no plan to consider the impact of the Proposed Shoreline By-Law on property value. Should this be an issue, it could be something that is considered in the future by Council.
280.	As a property owner, I purchased and pay taxes on my property. I should be entitled to do as I please without 'Big Brother' controlling every action on my property and beach. Please work for your constituents and not against them.	Acknowledged.

Yola Kulaga February 18, 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
281.	I am writing in response to the new bylaw that is being proposed over beach maintenance. I strongly oppose this bylaw and the fact that u so covertly try to remove our rights. You also think that by trying to pass all this quickly while the majority of owners are still not in their cottages is underhanded to say the least. Your actions, to do this so quickly before the season starts, are not overlooked but quite obvious as we the people of tiny/cawaja are well versed in your dishonest ways.	Acknowledged.

	Skip & Nancy Sutherland 90 Shoreline February 19, 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
282.	As a tax payer and cottage owner I object to the proposed by law for water front cottage owner and the way present council is pushing the bylaws	Acknowledged.

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
283.			

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
284.			

#	Comment	Responder	Comment Response
285.			