

From: Mike Baum [mailto:mikebaum@xplornet.ca]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2010 1:01 PM
To: Undisclosed-Recipient;;
Subject: Dangerous Precedent on Kawagama Lake
Importance: High

I rarely take a position on "for or against issues" for fear of alienating myself from potential clients and loosing business. But, I feel I'd be a hypocrite to myself and my daughter, who I have encouraged to face matters by taking responsibility & ownership of thoughts and feelings about something she believes in, and not be afraid to make her opinions known...especially when in disagreement and one's values or principles are at stake. I've often told Sabrina that the world is made up of different people with equally unique personalities and viewpoints. I explained that none of us can always share the same perspective and sometimes we just have to *agree to disagree*, but that should not make us enemies of each other. I also told her that Canada is a land where one can express an opinion and still be respected for this freedom.

For the record, I like Rob & Jennifer and their family. Our family used to own the Old Mill Marina in the early 1970's. I know how hard they work and what is involved. I realize that increasing one's profits is simply part of our right as citizens of this wonderfully free country.

I have been a cottager, resident and Realtor on and around Kawagama Lake since the Spring of 1959 - a mere 6 months after my birth in Nov. '58. I think it is fairly common knowledge that we are all attracted to this area because of the serenity it helps us experience through its beauty to all of our senses, including silence and wooded forests. This is further ensured through the zoning of lands in the area, which are typically shoreline residential, residential or rural. We all made a choice to buy various parcels of land based on this perceived "status quo" that is "protected" by the underlying zoning. In fact, there are a bundle of legal rights that are part of land ownership involving the concept of "enjoyment" and appraisal theory contemplates this concept in determining value on property. If this is violated, then it follows that enjoyment and value are diminished.

As a Realtor for 25 years, working primarily on and around Kawagama Lake, I had distinct challenges trying to help people sell property between the two marinas....mainly due to traffic and added noise, dust & activity. There is a fairly long stretch of undisturbed, rural/residential zoned property between the 2 marinas, as we all know - see attached aerial photo... which I took in the prime of autumn, about two years ago. In fact, this wooded plateau is further "isolated" from the lake activity by being up high and out of sight of both marinas. People bought properties here, **in the same way that others buy elsewhere around the lake**, thinking it will stay that way.

(As a temporary digression, I want it to be known that when a person buys land beside the likes of an airport, land fill site, sewage lagoon, township road yard, public access point to a lake or even a marina, I take the position that they had prior knowledge of this fact and that these **existing** locations were already established and zoned to permit such activity. It stands to reason that attempts to object and close down such activities will fail, as they often do. Further, in the example of ongoing commercial activity, such as on the main street in Dorset, it is not uncommon to see various parcels of land near the video store or gas station or school, etc. be zoned or re-zoned commercial, simply because it is part of regular town planning and is an extension of similarly zoned activity that is ongoing on a regular basis. There are many examples of this throughout the Province of Ontario. Properties are valued in these settings accordingly. People make choices to locate there and generally accept the consequences of ongoing activity, resulting from these commercially zoned locations.)

I feel that I must make my position known that the proposed re-zoning of a 12 acre parcel of wooded land, located between the two marinas, is wrong for the following reasons:

- there is a peaceful, wooded status with underlying rural/residential type zoning that attracted cottagers/residents who reside beside, near or across from this subject lot.
- the precedent of any decision by Council could be devastating as it may be used by other business persons to apply for re-zoning elsewhere around the lake, who would expect to be treated in the same manner and be allowed to build boat storage facilities.
- Old Mill Marina has about 100 water/boat access customers who have cottages on Kawagama Lake and, ironically, there seems to be a reported 140 units of storage available to service that group. Old Mill is trying to increase its storage units to allow for owners from **other** lakes in the area, **incl. Lake of Bays in Muskoka**, to bring their boats to Old Mill's storage facilities. **NOTE: Nowhere on the Old Mill website or KLCA email notice is this FACT stated. In fact, there is a distinct avoidance(?)/absence of thisthat naturally causes empathy and support to the Old Mill proposal.... as the impression is a Kawagama Lk Community will be the ones who suffer as a result of not utilizing this extra storage that Old Mill is seeking. Another fact is that there are several acres of land on the Old Mill property that are not fully developed. Incidentally, I believe Mountain Trout House has over 30 acres, much of which has not been developed. (I spent a few weeks in Florida this winter and noticed many 3-storey boat sheds on considerably smaller areas of land, than either of the 2 marinas presently occupy, who cope quite adequately with the boat storage demand by building higher.**
- The subject lot is actually owned by an entity other than and quite distinctly different than Old Mill or Rob & his family. In fact, a corporate

- search apparently revealed that a cottager by the name of Dave Harvey is named as a principal of that company - the same person who successfully changed the school-only type of zoning of the former school in town to a commercial type of zoning, based on plans and architectural drawings laid before council...which was **NOT** carried through with *on which and after the change in zoning was granted*, despite eluded intentions that were expressed to Council. In fact, the former school site was later put back on the market for sale.
- It is common knowledge that Old Mill has been for sale off and on in the last few years. The KLCA email sent out by Bob Campbell states that this storage facility is being done in an effort to service the "Old Mill customers"but no mention is made of the many "new customers" that Old Mill aggressively seeks elsewhere. Old Mill's website makes reference to some "uncooperative neighbours" standing in the way of providing better service to their customers. Again, it is not stated that Old Mill has dockage and signage on LAKE OF BAYS, in downtown Dorset, on property owned by Dave Harvey, where the Century 21 office used to be...on the south side of the bridge...beside the former Clayton's General Store, where the Old Mill makes it clearly evident that they want their storage business to grow by welcoming new customers. (If the township makes an agreement with the Mayor of Toronto to take their garbage and store it here at our land fill site, in Dorset, does that mean it's okay to expand our dump...simply because it is not large enough!?) It was the choice of the Old Mill to increase their storage business by marketing other lakes. They created their own problem by not having enough storage and, quite frankly, took on more than they can chew. Does it make it right that the neighbours of this proposed storage-zoned site should suffer less enjoyment and peace & quiet because Old Mill wants to increase their profits...and claim to not have enough space?) If OMM wants to expand and grow services outside of Kawagama, search out a site near Dorset or Minden or Haliburton on a major highway where existing commercial zoning is in place and municipalities are promoting employment and business expansion. What happens if Old Mill does sell? This lot is owned by an entity completely unrelated to the Old Mill...and to my knowledge it has no obligation to be part of an Old Mill sale. It is a different owner! The applicant is NOT Old Mill nor Rob, to my knowledge. Initially, the application to re-zone named Rob at Old Mill but has been since changed to the numbered company that owns it. It is completely detached and geographically separated from the Old Mill. It does NOT front on the lake. What really frightens me is that no wooded property is safe, **IF** this subject lot is re-zoned to a commercial, storage type of use.
 - I don't want to have stakes driven through my wrists and ankles, to be anchored in the ground, on the wooded lot beside my house...as bulldozers come in to remove the trees so that storage sheds are built. Imagine sitting out on the sundeck, sipping on a choice of your beverage by the bbq....hearing a fork lift and boat trailers clang and bang while

moving things around, not to mention seeing it though the leaf-less trees for nearly half of the year!!? The character of the entire area can be effected, **including island cottagers!**

- Further to items above, there is added traffic....by the enormous number of new customers.... and increased risk of liability of accidents and maintenance (e.g. need to grade wash board effect on gravel hill) to the twp (and tax-payers) and those who walk/jog & bike the road. When we stored boats at the Old Mill during our ownership, in the 1970's, I have yet to not see an outboard motor or heavy machinery (such as fork lifts) drip oil and hydraulic fluid. Also, gas/oil spillage in boats typically goes into the lower depth of the haul and gets drained with water when the plug is removed. This all goes onto the ground and either drains to the lake or leaks into the ground toward well waters enjoyed by surrounding residents. Unsightly removal of trees and the presence of huge storage shed/s, when leaves are off the trees between November and May, is also a concern - not to mention the extra noise, as trailers and machinery and staff move these items around. Would you want this beside, across or near your cottage or residence!? Not me!

The time I have on this planet is relatively short. I am making this effort less for myself, as I don't have a boat storage facility beside my house (yet). I am speaking out for the sake of my daughter and the many others, present and future, who are potentially subject to this brazen disregard for the essence of what cottage country is made of. This is NOT a "little problem" at the west end of the lake. There are certainly real people, owners and families who will suffer as a result of the poor management of the Old Mill storage plan. There is an extraordinarily dangerous precedent that is quietly unravelling that could effect **all of us**, as fleets of recreation toys grow and storage is needed...as larger cottages replace smaller ones and families spend more time here, compared to the past. Storage is extremely profitable and this is just the beginning of many more applications to re-zone that, I believe, are inevitable. IF we do not stand up for our rights of peaceful enjoyment now, I think, it will be too late when the lands near you are applied for re-zoning! New applicants will argue that re-zoning was allowed at the west end...and why not elsewhere!!!!!!? This is a collective problem for the entire lake community, including boat/water access owners, as I fervently believe land values & enjoyment will diminish over time, as these types of zoning changes increasingly change the landscape.

IF you oppose such re-zoning efforts, it is in your interest (and those generations after you) to be present at the upcoming May 6th Council Meeting (at 9 a.m.) or at least send a letter - see email address...by scrolling down.

Good luck to us all!