Municipality of East Ferris

Report to Council

Report No.: PLAN-2022-04 Date: April 26, 2022

Originator: Greg Kirton, Director of Community Services

Subject: Public Consultation – Draft Short Term Rental By-law

BACKGROUND

On February 25, 2022, public consultation began related to Short Term Rentals in East Ferris. The first phase of public consultation was open from February 25 to March 11, 2022, with the municipality seeking general comments related to the operation of Short Term Rentals in the community. These comments were presented to Council at the March 22, 2022 Council meeting for consideration and were used, in conjunction with Council's input, to create a Draft Short Term Rental By-law. Public Consultation on the Draft Short Term Rental By-law was open from April 1 to April 15, 2022, where the municipality sought specific comments on the draft by-law. The comments received during the public consultation period are attached as **Appendix A** to this report. The municipality has only included comments submitted through our official consultation channels and did not collect comments from social media or other unofficial sources.

Short Term Rentals have historically not been permitted in East Ferris under our previous Zoning By-law #1284. Many Short Term Rentals were established despite the by-law restriction with a lack of ability to provide adequate enforcement leading to the spread of these types of uses. This is a situation that many municipalities around the province are experiencing. When the municipality passed our new Zoning By-law 2021-60, the decision was made to pass a separate Short Term Rental By-law outlining the rules governing their operation and in conjunction with that, a by-law enforcement officer was hired to ensure that we can meet our enforcement needs.

The draft by-law is restrictive when it comes to the operation of Short Term Rentals, but it is still more permissive than our past rules. A number of comments were submitted on the draft by-law by people operating Short Term Rentals with concerns about how restrictive the provisions are, but it is worth noting that nearly all of these Short Term Rentals are currently operating illegally in the municipality. The only exception to this would be our camps or commercial businesses that have appropriate zoning for their uses. All Short Term Rentals in Residential or Rural Zones are not legal.

One of the major points of interest in the draft by-law is the limitation on renting to 3 months of the year. The intent of this provision is to provide some flexibility to homeowners and cottage

owners to rent their own personal properties for short periods of time during the year to allow for some flexibility for supplemental income. We heard from a number of people in the first round of public consultation that some flexibility could be given to these owners renting in this capacity without significant negative side effects. The second intent of the 3 month limitation is that it should make it not viable to own a property for the sole purpose of using it as a Short Term Rental. This should result in these properties being sold to owners that intend to occupy the properties. We acknowledge the comments from the operators related to their need to sell if this by-law passes and as a result have included a transitional clause in the by-law which would allow a two month window following the passing of this by-law. The two month window would give the owners a period of time to decide whether to apply for a license or to sell their property if they are unable to abide by the by-law requirements. Following the two month window, enforcement action will be taken against all Short Term Rentals that are non-compliant with fines being issued on a daily basis, in most cases.

When developing this draft by-law, the main consideration when determining the approach to take was what the appropriate balance of the pros and cons of Short Term Rentals are. As discussed at the March 22, 2022, Council meeting, East Ferris lacks significant industries that generally benefit from Short Term Rentals such as restaurants and centralized tourism areas; however, our permanent residents continue to experience hardship as a result of the operation of Short Term Rentals. This is the primary reason behind the restrictive nature of the by-law and focusing the intent on the safeguards for permanent residents.

Respectfully Submitted,

Greg Kirton

Director of Community Services

I concur with this report, and recommendation

Jason H. Trottier, HBBA, CPA, CMA

CAO/Treasurer

Enc. Appendix A – Draft By-law Public Consultation Comments
Comments from Joyce Effinger
Comments from Tyler Ross

Appendix A – Public Consultation Comments

Name	Email/Contact Info	Comments
Darryl	darryllanglois4	* Limit the rental period to a minimum of 7 days to prevent renters for 1 or 2 nights which
Langlois	@gmail.com	are to main cause of the noise problems and non compliance.
		2.10 A fine will be considered a strike against the Licensee for the purpose of this by- law. Receiving 3 strikes within the term of the License will result in the License being revoked for the remainder of the calendar year and will prevent a License being issued for the property for the following calendar year, regardless of a change in applicants. No refund of license fees.
		* If you are giving the Licensees 3 strikes every calendar year?
		* That is way too many chances, 2 at the most, or 3 all time
		3.4 No more than 2 persons per bedroom shall be permitted to occupy the Short Term Rental. A pull-out couch, or similar sleeping arrangement, can provide for a maximum of 2 additional guests beyond what the number of bedrooms would allow. Only 2 additional guests per Short Term Rental are permitted regardless of the number of pull-out couches or other sleeping arrangements present on site. This must be outlined in the application for License.
		* Licensee turn every room into a bedroom and add a pull couch to increase the max. *people allowed? Should you not consider the sq footage of the building?
		4.8 A License shall not be granted to a corporation.

		7.1.4 Proof that the applicant, if a corporation, is legally permitted to conduct business in Ontario.
		* If I'm reading 4.8 and 7.1.4 correctly, I believe they contradict each other?
		* I agree with 4.8 if the Licensee is not a true operating lodge
		7.1.8 Proof of the proper functioning and adequate size of the septic system.
		* Septic Systems show be inspected yearly and annual pump out receipts required
Bob Osborne	cipbangeo@g mail.com	I think this in principle is a good document and the reasoning is soundto protect the local community and the environment. I have only a few requests for you to put forward (or ask me to do so in another official way)I am in Florida until the end of May.
	289-795-4957	1. With our 2022 rental agreements already signed for June to Septemberit may be impossible to get all the inspections and approvals that the by-law states and then to have the EFTWP licence obtained.
		I request that for all those short-term rental properties in East Ferris - the by-law fines/sanctions should come into effect as of January 1 2023 if there is a bureaucratic delay in inspections/approvals. Earlier than that, owners would have to cancel legal rental agreements already signedor to pay serious fines. Could legal issues here.
		2. It should be possible to obtain more than one rental licence per year – each with a 3-month period (say winter and summer). Perhaps with escalated fees. Each licence would follow the same procedures.
		3. For the insurance – there should be a minimum \$2 million liability coverage and the insurance must be for a commercial coverage (not personal homeowner insurance).

	1	4. The template of the private rental amount and are added to the days (OOVID O.)
		4. The template of the private rental agreements and any addendums (COVID, Schedules)
Manta Dana		should be shown to the clerk at the EF Twp office to make sure your By-law is included.
Mark Rose	mark rose@g	In August 2021 we took possession of a cottage on Hemlock Island on Trout Lake. The primary
	oodyear.com	purpose of this purchase was to create a short-term rental property as an investment and
		retirement plan. We have invested all we have in this purchase and property improvements and
		were continuing to improve the property which will undoubtedly increase its value and increase
		your tax revenue. It was our intention to rent the property from approximately May until
		approximately November as demand dictates and possibly the snowmobile season to make the
		investment viable. We have been full time residents of East Ferris for 16 years for our home and
		now for our cottage. I don't know why the municipality has a problem with its own residents
		bringing in tourists and their money to our area regarding seasonal residences as absolutely no
		housing opportunities are being removed from the municipality. I believe that provisions should
		be made for seasonal dwellings and perhaps also for permanent residents of the municipality.
		be made for seasonar dwellings and perhaps also for permanent residents of the municipality.
		Although hearsay, here are some examples of the impact you're by law will create, just in our
		specific bay on Hemlock island.
		opeoine bay on Floringon Iolana.
		cottage 1: retired couple, no impact
		cottage 2: new owners in 2021 intended to rent the property occasionally to cover cottage costs
		in all accessible seasons (future unknown)
		in an accession coacene (ratare ananewn)
		cottage 3: family from Toronto, no impact
		cottage 4: working couple, no impact
		cottage 5: our cottage, new owners in 2021 intended to rent, purchased for this primary purpose
		(most likely forced to attempt to sell)
		cottage 6: new owners in 2021 intended to build on lot in 2022 renting to help finance (future
		unknown, unlikely to build)
		cottage 7: young couple who currently rent several weeks from May until September when they
	•	·

can't use it, to cover costs and pay for improvements (future unknown)

Other problems for me in the by-law:

- 3.2 No person shall advertise a Short-Term Accommodation without a license. (so, we can't see if there is interest in rentals, or when there is interest until we pay a minimum of \$750 and precommit to which 3 calendar months)
- 3.3 No person shall advertise or rent a Short Term Rental outside of the period specified under the provisions of section 4.4 of this by-law. (so we can't pre book any dates prior to first rent date or determine demand months for a given year, shortening the tiny 3-month window further)
- 5.1 Tourist or Travel Trailers or Recreational Vehicles are not permitted to be located on properties being used for Short Term Rentals. This includes any Tourist or Travel Trailers or Recreational Vehicles brought by and person, including renters. (can't rent to snowmobilers eliminating winter possibility)
- 5.6 Parking shall be provided at a rate of 1 space per bedroom, with one additional space being required if additional guests are permitted as per section 3.4 of this by-law. Parking spaces must meet the size requirements of the zoning by-law. (can't be met on our property, possibly excluding the license entirely on a technicality)
- 5.8 Tents or other temporary accommodations are not permitted on the site of a Short Term Rental. (kids can't camp in the yard at the cottage, gross Municipal overreach)
- 5.9 Events are not permitted at the location of a Short Term Rental including weddings or other organized events. The maximum occupancy for the Short Term Rental is the maximum number of guests permitted on the site. (events is not defined. No extra visitors allowed so a campfire with next door neighbours becomes illegal. (Another gross municipal overreach)

6.3 Confirmation that the septic system for the property is adequately sized, up to current standards, and is in working order will be required as part of the inspection process. This will require a mandatory file review from the North Bay Mattawa Conservation Authority at the expense of the applicant. Septic inspections on License renewals may be waived at the discretion of the municipality. (this provision should eliminate 95% of current cottages in the municipality, the only exceptions would be very recent septic installations and add to the cost)

- 4.8 A License shall not be granted to a corporation.
- 7.1.4 Proof that the applicant, if a corporation, is legally permitted to conduct business in Ontario. (4.8 and 7.1.4 contradict each other, 4.8 makes 7.1.4 irrelevant)

In conclusion, if this by law is passed as it's currently written, we will be forced to try to sell the property and purchase a property outside of this municipality. For seasonal residences, the proposed by law will slow or eliminate property improvements and construction and their increased value and increased taxation. The proposed by law will not add a single permanent housing space, affordable or otherwise regarding seasonal properties as long term housing is not an option for these locations. The proposed by law will take away tourists and the dollars they add to our economy and move them elsewhere. Our plans for 2022 were to make significant financial investments in our vacation property that will not be viable with the 3-month annual rental window taking permit money and tax revenue from the municipality. The revenue created by our rental property was also to be used to make improvements to our permanent residence which will not be possible. The by-law will have a direct impact on being able to provide for our family and change my investment and retirement plans. I am also convinced that the real estate value of my property, and similar properties will be negatively impacted. I have also noticed there are no exceptions for businesses in the municipality that currently offer short term cottage rentals so I assume they will incur the same restrictions and costs, such as a 3month rental window per year, no advertising outside of the window, septic systems up to current code, no recreational vehicles, no tenting etc. In fact, should they be a corporation, they cannot get a license and therefore cannot rent anything for a period less than 28 days. I can't

		see the advantage to the municipality, or it's residence in enacting such a by-law regarding seasonal residences and ask that at the very least, they be removed from the by law as a double property taxpayer in this municipality. If the by law is to include the seasonal properties, then the 3-month window must be eliminated. I would have voiced my opinion earlier but assumed seasonal residences would be excluded.
Debra Grand	debrarogers.gr and@gmail.co m	I have read the proposed bylaw for short term rental and wanted to comment that as I now live beside one, I am fully hopeful that the new bylaws for short term rentals will be enforced in our community. My main points of concern are our rising housing market as a result of over bidding on purchases for these properties as well as environmental concerns for overused, outdated septic systems. Living on Lake Nosbonsing, I would like that protected for future generations and also want to protect my well.
Christen O'Brien	christen.obrien 8@gmail.com 61 Development Road 705-358-8725	I would like to give my input - I believe that this bylaw is unfair and unnecessary. There is no reason that homeowners shouldn't be able to do short term rentals. A 3 month per year clause is not a solution either. So, for 3 months out of the year it's fine to have disruptive guests? This is a few privileged homeowners showing force and I am saddened that you are even considering this. Most short-term renters not only show respect but are on a rating scale one mess, or problem and they are blacklisted. You can have bad homeowners as well and much more likely than a family coming to enjoy the North for a week. Not to mention the financial impact of not allowing these rentals not only to the community but also to the homeowners that may have been relying on that income to support their families and pay the mortgage. This all seems like a bunch of pettiness! Life has been hard enough these last few years can we not just live and let live?
Phil Koning	makpgk@gmai l.com	I support the operation of Short-Term Rentals subject to revocable licensing conditions. I would suggest the following some ongoing estimate/survey of the economic impact of this type of commercial activity to gauge the value of a defined social impact, environmental impact, or effects on local tourism

		businesses.
		Specific reference to the noise bylaw (which may need to be reviewed itself)
		Bylaw 2013-15 - Waste Management Bylaw should be prominently posted on the Municipal Website and searchable
		All STR will be listed in the East Ferris Business Directory.
		A record of septic pump outs for STR should be maintained
		The 3-month consecutive seems a little restrictive to me, although I confess I do not understand the rationale behind this. Provided the other restrictive rules are being complied with
		I would support a 6-month term, defined and split into four periods throughout the year. Not sure what sort of administrative resource is being contemplated outside of the enforcement officer, but the fee structure should support the cost.
Amanda and Jamie	amandaedgar @ymail.com	In response to the proposed by-law regarding short term vacation rentals I would like to have the opportunity to voice an opposite opinion.
Zintel		Vacation rentals increase the economic prosperity in our community as new guests explore this beautiful Ontario destination. Many families purchase a property in the region after renting as they are able to see how wonderful Ontario cottage country actually is. These purchases help the community tax base, local businesses and bring more prosperity to the region's real estate industry.
		If short-term rentals were to become regulated, there will be less interest in purchasing properties in the area due to the lack of potential rental income compared to other areas with no rental restrictions. In turn, this would minimize the amount of rental supply, resulting in less visitors and less local economic activity. In some cases, buyers have purchased properties based on a monthly rental return and with these new regulations it could force owners to sell and depress market prices.
		As an alternative to restricting and regulating cottage rentals within the area, we should be

		supporting a philosophy of responsible use that encourages cottage owners to:
		Inform guests of cottage living and etiquette (including information sheets and acknowledgements within rental contracts)
		Work with neighbours to promote harmonious relationships
		Be environmental stewards by ensuring the sustainable use of cottage properties, recognizing the limits of the existing septic system, road capacity and other community considerations.
		Although some may argue that educational materials and methods may cost more than restricting rentals in the area, extra by law enforcement will likely amount to more in the long run especially given that digital materials and communication are a viable option. Our community will lose financial benefits and job opportunities by decreasing the local tourism year round.
		Responsible short term rentals should be the the focus. Agreed, a licensing requirement and guidelines are important to respecting neighbours and protecting our environment. The reasoning behind choosing to restrict short term rentals to approximately 3 months of the year does not seem clear.
		Many owners that are renting their cottages are doing so for extra income to be able to afford their properties. They care about their cottages, and have deep respect for the environment as well as their neighbours. The majority of owners renting only one cottage responsibly to specifically screened guests, should not be restricted to a limited time frame for renting short term.
Shannon	shannon.apollo	A quick note to say how happy I am that the township is taking steps to regulate the STR in the
Parks	@hotmail.com	community.
		East Ferris residents have a right to enjoy their rural property in a residentially zoned area. They should feel comfort in knowing their neighbours. We moved here for a quiet rural community.
	218 Ouellette Rd	We live in Corbeil - not on the water - but we own a cottage in the Papineau/Calvin area. We work very hard to afford our cottage and while yes we could make it a whole lot easier by renting it, we don't because we respect our neighbours right to enjoy their rural properties. I can only speak for our bank, but they will not give a mortgage on recreational properties unless you can

		afford the property without the rental income. These are investments for individual financial gain and should not come at the expense of our friends and neighbours.
Marsha and Al Herauf	nosbonsing@h otmail.ca	We understand from talking with a number of our neighbors that you and the members of council have received a number of submissions from them, all containing various levels of detail but generally supporting the intent of the proposed bylaw. We are also in support of the proposed bylaw and its intent to control this burgeoning business activity within our municipality. It is unfortunate that the municipality's lack of action over the past number of years has allowed this (up to now) illegal business activity to metastasize but here we are.
		We also understand that a group of owners in support of this activity are making their presence known but we believe that they should be invited to review the previous and current municipal zoning bylaw with regards to where hotels are allowed to operate in the municipality. The short term rental business activity is a form of hotel operation and should be treated accordingly.
		Greg, potentially an argument could be made that the fees and fines prescribed in the proposed bylaw are lower than they could be but we are assuming that they were set at the current levels due to the three month activity level prescribed. We certainly would not argue against making them larger. The three month activity level is a good idea as we doubt that anyone will be able to finance the acquisition of property to set up and run this business when it can only operate as a business for three months a year. The municipal review of floor plans, parking spaces and septic systems is very important as well.
		The concept of preventing corporations from applying for an operating license is also good. We assume that due to the provision of section 4.8 being applied that section 7.1.4 can be deleted. We also believe that a corporation should be prevented from allowing a long term tenant to apply for a license either. If a property is granted an operating license we also believe that this property should be classified as "full - time residential" and pay property taxes accordingly regardless of how the property is used the remaining nine months a year.
		When this bylaw in whatever form is passed the key is going to be enforcement! As you know the lack of enforcement has led the municipality and its citizens to where we are now so let us hope those of us living directly in the "firing line" will not have to act as "policemen" as well.
Brian B	briantracf150 @gmail.com	Under License and Term, Section 4.8 "A license shall not be granted to a corporation". But in contrary to that statement, section 7.1.4 under Requirements, it states " Proof that the applicant,

		if a corporation, is legally permitted to conduct business in Ontario.
		These are contradicting statements. So, it brings ambiguity to whether a corporation is allowed a license or not. It could be because of changing revisions that made that appear? Something to clear up.
Christine Joly	christinejoly@ hotmail.com	I forgot to mention that the proposed bylaws for short term rentals in East Ferris seem very promising and thorough. The only one that may be hard to manage would be the 3-month term allowed for renting. I'm glad that the septic system management and licencing are included in the bylaw. Thank you and the councillors for caring about our beautiful lake and area. Ottawa is considering banning Short Term Rentals all together and I read an article the other day where small villages like Sauble Beach and Goderich etc are putting bylaws into effect as well.
Elisha Sloan- Keats	e.sloankeats@gmail.com 603 Nosbonsing Park Road	Thank you for the effort put into the creation of this by-law. There are many good initiatives included. This by-law will directly affect many of our residents and it is important that it is as comprehensive and clear as possible. While, on the surface, the by-law does seem to address my major concerns on this issue, I would appreciate clarification on the issues detailed below. I would be happy to elaborate on any of these points as well as any other questions you may have.
		Ability to Enforce
		- It will be difficult to monitor and prove the <u>operation of the short-term rental</u> . Other than by monitoring advertising sites, how will the municipality prove that money is being exchanged for the use of the property? Will a municipal official be knocking on doors ask these questions of strangers reported on by neighbours? Will municipal officials be available on the weekends and holidays to do this? With the officials be equipped to ask occupants to sign a legal statement of some kind stating that they are or are not renting the property? Would this statement be an adequate deterrent, and would it be enough proof to issue a fine?

- Who is responsible for monitoring <u>advertising of the rentals</u>? This will be a time-consuming task as there are several platforms being used and there are sure to be more developed in order to usurp local by-laws. People who are motivated to rent their properties will find less detectable ways to advertise their rental business. It will also be time-consuming to cross-reference advertisements with valid licences. Is this a task that can realistically be taken on by the municipal staff or is the intent for the public to monitor and report? Is the \$300 fine enough to support the funding of this task?
- I do not see a restriction regarding <u>multiple licensees</u> for one property. In other words, the way I read sections 2 and 3, there is nothing prohibiting one part-owner or operator of a property from registering a license for three months and then another part-owner or operator registering a license for a different three months on the same property. The license and prohibitions should be connected to the property as well as the licensee.
- The term expiration date for licences is December 31st. This is typically a high season for short term-rentals is over the Winter break and this is also a time when municipal staff is also normally on vacation. Using a slower period for both municipal staff and short term-rentals such as April, September or November 30th would make this by-law more easily administered including the ability to perform adequate inspections before significant snowfall.
- <u>Contact information</u> required and published as described in para 7.1.2 should also include the name with the email and phone number.

Fee/Fine Structure

The by-law disfavours short-term rentals by primary residents while catering to secondary properties being operated as businesses. The fee structure does not distinguish the type of short-term rental being authorised. More specifically, there is a significant difference in the expected revenue for short-term rentals less than three months and/or for only a portion of the dwelling. For example, the licencing fee is disproportionate and disadvantageous for a full-time resident who wants to rent their property for a few weeks while going on a honeymoon. It also doesn't account for a person who wants to only rent a room similar to a bed and breakfast for three months or

less

- How is the <u>fine for advertising calculated</u>? Is there a separate fine for each date advertised or is it for each platform used or just an annual fine for advertising in general? This fine is the one that is the easiest (though time consuming) to monitor and prove. This fine should be increased significantly.
- The current fee structure encourages property owners to take the risk of fines rather than register their properties. It is logical to risk the \$300 advertising fine rather than go through the hassle and \$750 fee to properly register. The risk of then being detected and reported are relatively low and the likelihood that the municipality would be able to prove that the property was in fact rented is even less likely. The registration fee should be lowered to encourage property owners to register and fines for infractions should be raised to increase the risk of non-compliance. Specifically, a significantly increase to the fee to advertise and/or solicit short term rentals without or outside of the parameters of a legal licence would discourage illegal short-term rentals.

General

- The provision provided in <u>para 5.1 is redundant</u>. I absolutely agree that campers should not be used to augment the occupancy of a property. I believe that this is covered in paras 5.2 thru to 5.4 which restrict the use of secondary accommodations as short-term rentals and also 3.4 which restricts the maximum occupancy of the property to the number of bedrooms. I believe there is another by-law restricting the number of campers on a property which would be applicable. I don't think this by-law should force someone to store their camper elsewhere should they decide to rent their house for a couple of weeks. Perhaps the wording of para 3.4 should be strengthened to specify that the occupancy is linked to the number or bedrooms in the primary structure on the property and that no short-term rentals are permitted for temporary structures. The by-law should also clearly state that short-term rentals are not permitted on properties with no permanent building and septic.
- The <u>parking restrictions</u> should be more detailed. Recreational vehicle is a term that also commonly refers to vehicles like All-Terrain-Vehicles (ATVs), snowmobiles, and dirt

		bikes. Para 5.6 should be clearer regarding limits on the parking of these types of vehicles as well their trailers and also campers.
		- The <u>use of tents</u> on the property in para 5.8 should not be prohibited. The occupancy of the property should be restricted by the number of rooms in the main structure. The maximum occupancy should not be affected by the use of a tent. I don't think this by-law should prohibit a visiting child and parent who would like to experience sleeping outside in a tent rather than indoors.
		- Corporate operation of short-term rentals is prohibited in 4.8 but para 7.1.4 allows for corporations that are permitted to operate in Ontario
		- <u>Trespassing</u> has been a regular issue regarding renters. Para 7.1.9 should also include stipulations that renters be made aware of the limitations of the property they are renting.
Nick Brazeau	brazeaunick@ hotmail.com	I've reviewed, and hopefully others do as well as this is a great format for communal input, the current draft by-law proposed for the Short-Term Rentals within the Community of East Ferris. As previous I have outlined some areas that I may see as concerns/objectives for the proposed bylaw.
		Long Term Rentals now being referred to as LTR.
		Short Term Rentals now being referred to as STR.
		Short Term Renters now being referred to as STR's.
		Municipal Accommodation's Tax is now being referred to as MAT.
		Municipality of East Ferris now being referred to as the Municipality or Municipality.
		North Bay Mattawa Conservation Authority now being referred to as NBMCA.
		Ontario Building Code is now being referred to as OBC.

3.3 **The Municipality says:** No person shall advertise or rent a Short-Term Rental outside of the period specified under the provisions of section 4.4 of this by-law.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Prohibiting someone to advertise outside of the "limited rental window" isn't fair. That would be the same as saying you can't advertise your car dealership, coffee shop, Municipal event, store or ectara business yearly. Advertising is how you attract business and/or sell a product. Many booking sites, including hotels, advertise the properties yearly even though vacancy may not be available. **3.3 should be removed** and left at 3.2 you can only advertise with a valid license.

3.4 **The Municipality says:** No more than 2 persons per bedroom shall be permitted to occupy the Short-Term Rental. A pull-out couch, or similar sleeping arrangement, can provide for a maximum of 2 additional guests beyond what the number of bedrooms would allow. Only 2 additional guests per Short Term Rental are permitted regardless of the number of pull-out couches or other sleeping arrangements present on site. This must be outlined in the application for License.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I agree with 2 persons per bedroom, but I believe that this should be reworded to state the word "2 adult persons" and/or exclude a child under xxxx age provided that the sleeping area is suitable for setup of a playpen/crib. Maybe its assumed, but it implies that if you have younger children that may require crib/playpen sleep arrangement we aren't willing to accommodate them. I have travelled to many hotels and STR properties with my children when they were newborns and notification was required and I was required to bring a playpen as they didn't want the liability, which worked for me.

3.8 **The Municipality says**: No person shall advertise a Short-Term Rental on a website or in any place that is not listed on their application.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Again, I find limiting one's ability to advertise unfair. Websites change, fees change, and usage/clients changes as well. Limiting one's ability to advertise limits one's ability to rent the property. I don't believe that the Municipality should be involved with setting set dates/website advertising rules, unless they are going to limit other businesses and oneself as well. Not limiting websites/advertising publications is where we should go or allow for 3.8 to be edited/amended by the STR Licensee as needed. This would create additional work for the Municipality staff though updating Licenses/licensee agreements. On a positive spin advertising also showcases our community, regardless if you're looking for a STR stay or a relocation.

4.4 **The Municipality says**: Within the calendar year that the License is issued for, a Short-Term Rental may only operate for 3 calendar months within that year.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Where are we coming up with three months from? Is this the Community consensuses? The STR average? I believe we should expand outside the proposed three months STR days, to either six months (180 days) or unlimited. With the expanded STR rental availability we instead should be looking at tightening up by-laws that would protect the Neighbourhood, waterways and The Municipality such as yearly septic dumping, garbage, inspections and water testing. By limiting to three months, we are possible encouraging LTR for the remaining nine months, not that this is necessarily negative, instead of having the house unoccupied. I don't agree to 4.4's limited days at all and in my opinion should be remove/changed to six months (180 days) or unlimited with the potential for increased inspections and/or fees. This would also affect subsections here as well.

5.1 **The Municipality says**: Tourist or Travel Trailers or Recreational Vehicles are not permitted to be located on properties being used for Short Term Rentals. This includes any Tourist or

Travel Trailers, or Recreational Vehicles brought by and person, including renters.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I understand and agree with STR's bring tourist or travel trailers, but why are we prohibiting all recreational vehicles? Is there any liability on The Municipalities part? The term "Recreational Vehicle's" isn't limited to but includes snow machines (Skidoos) and boats. Maybe we should define "recreational vehicle's" for the purpose of the STR by-law, possibly discouraging/prohibiting side-by-sides, dirt bike or four wheelers "recreational vehicle's" like that. Many STR properties are located on the lake or near trails that allow for seasonal use and STR properties may not have access for renters as their additional liability with allowing access to these items. I don't think we should limit extracurricular activities especially since OFSC trail open many doors and travel for winter enthusiasts. By allowing boats and snow machines we are also selling gas at local service stations and limiting travel to waterways and trails. I myself have travelled to STR properties with my boat or snow machine in order to access trails or lakes as the STR property doesn't provide these services and/or did provide additional services which were more costly then towing. In my opinion I would remove the reference prohibiting recreational vehicle's or further define it to limit/prohibit Sideby-sides, ATVS (four wheelers) and dirt bikes and not snow machine's and/or boats.

5.7 **The Municipality says**: Any additional garbage disposal that is required beyond what is picked up by the municipality is the responsibility of the Licensee. The Licensee shall arrange for disposal at the landfill.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I agree that it is solely the responsibility of the licensee to dispose of additional garbage outside of the three bags. My concern is that our waste provider picks up what is put to the curb regardless of the bag limit. We need to ensure that the waste service provider is ONLY PICKING UP THREE BAGS, unless additional bags are purchased and tagged properly. I see weekly the abuse of the honour system and the collection of bags in excess of three bags. I understand we offer a free Communal Bin Permit, and I am not referring to this, I am referring to single dwellings. I am not sure if the Municipality has ever explored additional purchased bag tags, for household waste. Again, selling additional tags or not we

need our waste service provider to collect only the three-bag limit and it needs to be enforced.

6.2 **The Municipality says**: The renewal of a License may not require a physical site visit if the parameters of the License remain consistent from year to year. This will be at the discretion of the Municipality.

I understand the statement, but I am on the fence with this and believe a site visit should be encouraged as violations may slip through the cracks. I am not insinuating that the STR Licensee won't follow the prescribed by-laws, but people are creatures of habit and we often become complaint (if it isn't broke don't fix it attitude).

6.3 **The Municipality says**: Confirmation that the septic system for the property is adequately sized, up to current standards, and is in working order will be required as part of the inspection process. This will require a mandatory file review from the North Bay Mattawa Conservation Authority at the expense of the applicant. Septic inspections on License renewals may be waived at the discretion of the municipality.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I believe that the Inspection should be done yearly, if not every two years in order to maintain the license. This would reflect my 4.4 opinion that sees STR days moved from three months to unlimited or minimum six months (180 days). I also believe that in order to have the inspection waived on STR, proof of yearly pump out should be required on any STR and on any rental term adopted by the Municipality. Yearly pump out should be mandatory on all STR's and is a small cost to pay to ensure the tank is in good standing, cleaned properly and not leaching undesirables into the ground, neighbourhoods or waterways.

I understand that we currently have a by-law in place requiring dwellings to have a tank pumped at least every two years, and proof provided if requested by the Municipality, but there needs to be more enforcement of pump out rules as many LTR and/or privately owned dwellings aren't

adhering to the by-law.

6.4 **The Municipality says**: If the septic system is deemed to be inadequate for the capacity of the dwelling or if it is in a state of disrepair, no License will be issued for Short Term Rentals on the property until such time as the septic system is properly functioning and an adequate size.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Just curious to what the Municipality and/or NBMCA will be doing if the license on a STR is declined or negated due to inadequate for the capacity of the dwelling or if it is in a state of disrepair? I know that septic issues fall under the NBMCA under the OBC, but is there a plan in place or does it affect The Municipality since we are declined or negated an application due to septic issues?

6.5 **The Municipality says**: An Officer may at any reasonable time inspect a property where a License has been issued under this By-law to determine ongoing compliance with this By-law.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Just curious to if there needs to be notice given to the STR Licensee or if it's on the spot? A large percent of STR's are not primary dwellings and aren't occupied during non STR periods. I believe that the STR License should be required to provide the Municipality with an active email address and mailing address, regardless of if the STR property is or isn't the licensees primary residence, and that notice's and STR communication's including but not limited to fine notices, license renewal or inspections can be emailed and/or mailed. I believe that we can include a clause that says any communication via email and/or unregistered/courier mail does constitute as received by the licensee regardless of signature or response.

7.1.7 **The Municipality says**: A listing of all websites or any other places that the Short-Term

Rental will be listed for rent.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: Please see my comments on 3.3 and 3.8.

FEES:

I find the \$750.00 application fee excessive being The Municipality is limiting income generating days to three months. I believe that we should maintain the fee but increase the time frame to a minimum or maximum of six months. Our other option is charging a lesser application fee and collecting the MAT of 4%, whichever is the greater or the two, which would create some difficulty and additional work. Example: Toronto charges \$50 plus 4% MAT and allows up to six months (180 days) STR days.

By-law/subsections recommendations, changes or opinions to consider.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I believe that the Municipality shouldn't issue any licenses for STR during the winter months/period, which winter months could be open to interpretation by the Municipality, as proper inspection of the septic tanks maybe more difficult and/or limited due to winter conditions.

Recommendation/Change/Opinion: I believe that the Municipality should require all STR to hold and maintain a valid Fire Permit for the duration of the STR's operating period, regardless of the term adopted by the Municipality. This would be a minimum \$60.00 permit fee. I understand we offer weekly permit options, but why not offer \$100 yearly option for properties within East Ferris?

No matter what resolution The Municipality comes up with I believe that the enforcement of the rules/by-laws is the biggest issue we face and that needs to be addresses within the Municipality and not just specific to the STR by-laws at hand.

Melissa	mmaltais1229	I wanted to submit some feedback with regards to the Short Term Rental By-Law that was
Marie	@gmail.com	distributed for review recently.
Maltais		As a business counsellor with a passion for the tourism/recreation industry, I wanted to submit my feedback on the following points:
		1) 4.4 Within the calendar year that the Licence is issued for, a Short Term Rental may only operate for 3 calendar months within that year.
		Investing in a licence for one year, but limited to only actively renting a unit for 3 months of that calendar year is prohibitive and limiting what is considered as an income source;
		An alternative option: Offer quarterly licences; If a Licensee only wants to operate May to October they could then invest in 2 quarterly licences; If a Licensee has a unit that is 4 season accessible, they should have the option to purchase 4 quarterly Licences; The benefit to this option is that it could increase the revenue earned by the Municipality and provide more flexibility for Licensees who need the consistent income stream.
		Recreational Short Term Rentals is a growing tourism trend, limiting Licensee's to only 3 months of a calendar year to rent their unit is limiting not only the licensee, but also our community's potential for economic growth.
		2) 5.0:
		5.1 Tourist or Travel Trailers or Recreational Vehicles are not permitted to be located on properties being used for Short Term Rentals /
		Recreational experiences such as this, is greatly limiting our communities opportunity to grow our tourism/recreation sector. There is high demand for these experiences, especially within the agricultural industry, which could benefit greatly from offering these types of "Farmstead" experiences. Furthermore, these experiences provide a great deal of health benefits for those

who are seeking a more rustic/off-grid experience that connects them with nature and can further provide nature-based learning experiences.

These experiences also offer families a more cost-effective alternative to weekend get-aways than traditional rentals.

This restriction further limits income opportunities for property owners of East Ferris and reduces opportunities for our communities economic growth.

5.8 Tents or other temporary accommodations are not permitted on the site of a Short Term Rental.

Offering Tent based accommodations is also an increasing recreational trend; you only need to take a quick browse on sites like AirBnb, HipCamp, Explore Ontario to discover a variety of unique accommodations that provide guests with opportunities to disconnect with our busy day to day lives and to reconnect with nature. These types of experiences also limit our communities' opportunity for economic growth.

5.9 Events are not permitted at the location of a Short Rental including weddings or other organized events

This is incredibly restrictive. Post-COVID, many individuals are seeking a space to have intimate nature-based weddings. With so few available options for people to find a space to host such a wedding, this is limiting not only to the Licensee, but to our local North Bay/Nipissing/Parry Sound residents who are seeking spaces to host such a wedding.

An alternative solution: Offer a Licensee the opportunity to invest in an ADDITIONAL Licence based upon the Municipality's approval; subject to each individual property. To be fair to all property owners, such a licence would be required for ANY resident of East Ferris who would

want to host an event/wedding on their property. In Summary: Upon reviewing the Short Term Rental By-Laws of Muskoka (attached for your review), there are no such restrictions to Licencee's. While I understand that these By-Laws have been proposed with the interest of our residents in mind, it is also our residents who own these properties, and if said property owner would like to provide a recreational opportunity as a business and source of income, such restrictions as the one's listed above present GREAT barriers and challenges. Our government is investing in our Tourism and Recreation industry, and there are many funding opportunities for those with accommodation/experience based businesses. However, these eligibility for these grants is typically only for businesses who are in operation all year round. Thus, the 3 month restriction would automatically deem our local property owners as ineligible to obtain these grants. Tourism and Recreation is founded on the availability of short-term rentals, whether that is a building unit, camper/trailer or event tent. Now, more than ever, people are looking for LOCAL travel opportunities. East Ferris could greatly benefit from even our local Nipissing/Parry Sound travelers who cannot afford to travel greater distances, but would still like to have the same recreational experiences as found in (over-priced/saturated) markets found in the Muskoka's and beyond. Perhaps it would be more prudent to have licence applications reviewed on a per-application basis. It seems unfair that a property owner with no neighbours be restricted the same as a property that perhaps is smaller in size and closer in proximity to its neighbours. This would then ensure that ALL property owners in East Ferris are considered with each application for a Short Term Rental Licence. Thank you so kindly for your time and your consideration of my above mentioned concerns regarding the proposed Short Term Rental By-Laws.

I would like to start this email by explaining our business model as while we are providing a

Stephany

stephany.st.lou

St.Louis &	is@rlb.ca	short-term rental service, it is not your typical service.
Yves Labonté	Stone Oaks Farm 720 South Shore Rd	We have a travel trailer on our 125 acres farm. We own the travel trailer. We provide short getaways for families where they can come and have a life on the farm experience. They stay in our trailer (or bring their own), they help with farm chores, they hike our trails, they visit our area, they play with our animals, they learn about the environment and animals. They help in the garden and collect eggs. They learn how to build a campfire and how to respect nature. We offered it to a few families last year and it was extremely well received. We had hoped to expand our agri-tourism experience this year. We are quite happy to pay for a license and to have our facility inspected. We do however feel that as the by-law is currently drafted it would prohibit us from running our business. Our situation is mildly different than what most short-term rentals are offering in that we live on the property where the short-term rentals are happening so do not have issues with noise or being disrespectful as we are here the whole time to supervise visitors.
		Here are the points we are concerned about:
		 4.4 – At a fee of \$750 for a license and only being able to operate for 3 months out of the year even though the license is for a full year this is very cost prohibitive. We are trying to make our experiences family friendly and economical for a getaway for lower income families as well. By the time we pay the licensing fee and our commercial insurance (which is \$500/month for reference sake) that leaves us with no profit). We would like to be able to use our license for a minimum of 6 months of the year but would prefer the opportunity for 12 months. 5.1 – Our business model is run out of our travel trailer. As this point reads currently we would no longer be able to use our trailer. We also have people who rent our trailer and then have a sibling or friend or family member vacation with them and they use their own trailer. We have backups an our property for two trailers. We would like to amend this to
		trailer. We have hookups on our property for two trailers. We would like to amend this to allow for the use of travel trailers on our property. We are happy to put a max on the number of trailers however. We also run a horse boarding stable and people come and use our trail system on the property and stay overnight in their horse trailers. It would be nice if we could amend this point to allow for that type of experience to continue happening on our property. • 5.4 – By only permitting short term rentals to happen with single detached dwellings this

is prohibiting our entire business model. Could we please include travel trailers in this point. • 5.8 – Some people come to our property and camp out in our forest near our large pond in the back. This point prohibits this as well. We only allow one tent at a time in the back. We realise we are not a campground but we have a beautiful property rich in wildlife that we would like to share with our visitors. 5.9 – We have been repeatedly asked to host birthday parties for kids where they can enjoy the animals and the family/birthday child can stay overnight in our trailer. Prohibiting the use of our facility from hosting events when we have more than enough space and buildings is unfair. I can understand wanting to implement the above points for cottages situated on the lake or near other homes or cottages but I feel like our business is an outlier to the issues the municipality is trying to solve. I would respectfully ask that council consider the different types of businesses that this new by-law would affect and take into consideration that there are many types of shortterm rentals to consider when creating this new by-law. Anna and anna rivet@ya Our first choice continues to be that the township not allow short term rentals. If that is not an Jim Braund option, then we whole heartedly support the brilliant strategy to limit rentals to a three month hoo.ca rental period. This option was truly a thinking out the box idea. Kudo's to who ever thought of it. We support the draft but bi-law in the event the township chooses to not to ban short term rental which would be our first choice. If short term rental are allowed then we support the draft by-law. We also whole heartedly support the brilliant strategy to limit rentals to a three month rental period. This option was truly a thinking out the box idea. Kudo's to who ever thought of it. We just have two amendments to suggest. 1) Section 5.7 states, "Any additional garbage disposal that is required beyond what is picked up by the municipality is the responsibility of the Licensee. The Licensee shall arrange for disposal at the landfill." We submit that there be a time period attached to this. For example the Licensee must dispose

		of the garbage on the first available date the dump is open.
		2) The fine for operating a short term rental without a license is \$500. Yet the cost of a license is \$750. The fine should be increased to at least \$1000. The fine should be greater than the actual cost of the license.
		We thank you for your work and consideration of our comments.
Fabian Hogan	fabian@hogan roy.com	Firstly, I appreciate the effort that has been put in to drafting this by-law, secondly, I think it is a worthwhile endeavor.
		I can appreciate both sides of this issue having been a nightly rental owner and current resident.
		Many of the ideas dealing with safety and septic issues are warranted. In my experience with Ontario Cottage Rentals Inc. our guests were first vetted by OCR and OCR added a second level of insurance. Over the years I had only two complaints and one of those was from a guest who was disturbed by a party at a neighboring owner. My point is that guests were very respectful of my space and my neighbors. It is important that we understand that not everyone can have the privilege of owning a cottage on beautiful Lake Nosbonsing so many visitors are very grateful that we can share.
		Affordability of cottage property, especially in the last couple of years has become out of reach for many so a week at a cottage is great for their mental health and therefore for the good of all.
		It should also be considered that the income from nightly rental can help young people pursue their dreams of cottage ownership.
		Also, please let us keep in mind that our good neighbor, The City of North Bay is a tourist town and relies on the income form the hospitality industry. Tourists come from all the neighboring towns to spend their dollars at north Bay shops and restaurants, it may be short-sighted to enact laws that inhibits tourism.

		The timing of this process is also bothersome. Many cottage owners, who as a collective pay a very significant share of our property tax base will not have a say in this process as many will only visit after this by-law has already been passed, I believe they deserve a say in the matter and that we should not hurry this important process of consultation.
		The restriction of three months is also prohibitive and should be extended to five months perhaps again to allow guests opportunity to stay and enjoy our lake and visit the Gateway to the North. I would also like to address the issue of cottage use for charity as this should be excluded. I have had the pleasure of working with organizations like Cottage Dreams to have cancer survivors have a week a cottage to relax and convalesce.
		In closing I believe this issue warrants more consideration and input from organizations like the
		respective Chambers of Commerce and Tourism Ontario.
Tyler Ross	deeken99@ho	Please see attached letter.
	tmail.com	
Joyce	effingerjoyce@	Attached is a document containing my thoughts about the proposed bylaw. I have taken the
Effinger	gmail.com	time to read quite a few by laws from other communities, as well as interact with people in our community who are both pro and con the bylaw.
East Ferris		Notes from Short Term Rental Septic Chat NBMCA:
Staff		 No septic inspection programs that currently exist for general application or for STR stuff Not willing to take that project on due to workload and program complications Recommended that we modify the wording in our by-law to require a copy of the septic permit for a STR application and ensure that it matches the number of bedrooms that they're intending to rent. If it doesn't then we can just ask that they get a new septic permit which would then fall under one of their programs that already runs. Should be a simpler solution for both parties That would also satisfy concerns about a septic system being current because the permit would be up to date.