

**Attachment 3 to Staff Report for Final Official Plan
February 13, 2025**

Comments Response Table to Public Comments on Final Official Plan (from January 23, 2025)

Lake Temagami Group (c/o William Bateman January 23, 2025)		
#	Comment	Response
1.	The LTG would like to commend the municipality for the long, and ongoing working completed on the new draft OP. While the LTG agrees with numerous revisions that have taken place, we must bring your attention to one item that the LTG submitted and was not incorporated, that being language around "Lot Creation and Development Study".	<p>Lot Creation and Development Study policies from the current Official Plan have been carried forward in the new Final Official Plan.</p> <p>These policies have been included as Section L.25 in the new Final Official Plan.</p>
2.	As stated in several previous communications, the LTG recognizes that an LC & DS is not currently required, but if the Lake Trout restrictions are ever lifted then the Municipality has committed to proceed with the LC & DS obligations. This was agreed to the municipality the LTG, and TLA in OMB PL040429-1558 dated September 28,2024. I have provided a copy of this ruling in attachments to this email. Additionally, I have also attached our previous email outlining further rationale for the continued inclusion of the LC & DS language in this new OP. The LTG would urge that the Temagami Council reconsider their position on this recommendation.	<p>Lot Creation and Development Study policies from the current Official Plan have been carried forward in the new Final Official Plan.</p> <p>These policies have been included as Section L.25 in the new Final Official Plan.</p>

Anthony Usher, Planning Consultant TLA 23 January 2025		
#	Comment	Comment Response
3.	<p>1. Section L.8.3 - Crown land consent policies</p> <p>We have continued to advocate for restoration to the Official Plan of reference to the Lot Creation and Development Study as per the 2004 decision of the Ontario Municipal Board on the original</p>	<p>Lot Creation and Development Study policies from the current Official Plan have been carried forward in the new Final Official Plan.</p> <p>These policies have been included as Section L.25 in the new Final Official Plan.</p>

	Anthony Usher, Planning Consultant TLA 23 January 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>Official Plan of that year. Our detailed proposal – and staff's response – are in Attachment 3 to the staff report, comment 303, pages 87-88.</p> <p>Staff have also flagged this item at page 4 of their report, "Lot Creation and Development Study", as requiring further consideration from Council. At the same time they indicate they do not support our proposal, noting among other things, "we do [not] see a need to proceed with a lot creation study at this time".</p> <p>However, as we clearly said in our September 29, 2024 letter, "while . . . it would not be appropriate to undertake such a study at this time, adding these policies would ensure the Municipality is better prepared if at any time the Province were to change policies such as to allow Crown island lot disposition on Lake Temagami". In other words, our proposal is to take out an insurance policy in an uncertain world.</p> <p>We therefore ask that Council further consider our proposed additions to Section L.8.3 as shown in comment 303.</p> <p>Also, we note once again that subsection L.8.3.1(h) references section G.8.1, but there is no such section in the Plan.</p>	
4.	<p>2. Section H.5 - lake trout lakes</p> <p>MHBC has made some changes in response to our earlier comments (comment 294). However, in our view the Plan remains quite confusing on this important issue.</p> <p>The Plan distinguishes between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at-capacity lake trout lakes (sections H.4.1.2, H.4.1.3) - lake trout lakes with naturally reproducing populations (section H.5.1.3) - put-grow-take lake trout lakes (section H.5.1.3). <p>So, there can theoretically be four different types of lake trout lakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - naturally reproducing at-capacity - naturally reproducing not at-capacity - PGT at-capacity 	<p>Section H.5 in the new Final Official Plan and associated schedules have been modified.</p> <p>Reference to Lake Trout Lakes have been removed from the schedules to the new Final Official Plan.</p> <p>Section H.5 of the new Final Official Plan has been modified to provide clarity, that lake trout policies apply to any lake that supports lake trout populations.</p>

	Anthony Usher, Planning Consultant TLA 23 January 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>- PGT not at-capacity, and in addition some lakes may not yet have been assessed for capacity.</p> <p>The Plan sections cited above require different policy prescriptions for development on each of the four types.</p> <p>Most official plans list and categorize all the municipality's lake trout lakes, so that it is clear which policies apply to development on which lakes. But all the proposed Plan does is say that there are at least three lake trout lakes: Temagami, Net and Cassels, the three shown on Schedule D. It does not categorize them.</p> <p>In fact, there are around 40 lake trout lakes in the Municipality, including Cross Lake (two are PGT and the rest naturally reproducing). Why are only three lakes shown on Schedule D?</p> <p>Staff's comments on page 3 of their report that Lake Temagami is not at-capacity, whereas three other lakes mentioned in section D.3.4.1 are at capacity, do not pertain to lake trout specifically. These references appear to pertain to lake capacity overall as determined using the Lakeshore Capacity Assessment Handbook (section H.4), which has several purposes, of which determining lake trout capacity is only one. (Section H.4 is misleading in suggesting that lakeshore capacity assessment is applied only to lake trout lakes and is undertaken only for lake trout capacity purposes.)</p> <p>We therefore recommend that Council revise Section H.5 and/or Schedule D to list or show all lake trout lakes including Cross Lake, and also indicate whether each lake is (a) naturally reproducing or put-grow-take and (b) is or isn't at-capacity where known. In our view this will be even more important if Council declines our request above regarding section L.8.3.</p>	
5.	3. Section D.2.3.1 - Lake Temagami Neighbourhood principles	Section D.2.3.1 of the new Final Official Plan was modified to remove the second "need".

	Anthony Usher, Planning Consultant TLA 23 January 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<p>We recommended a revised wording for section D.2.3.1 (comment 279). Much of what we advocated was done. However, we also recommended removal of the words, "a need to provide mainland opportunities for services that support the residents and business on Lake Temagami. The Municipality supports the development of an improved access point and limited opportunities for service providers to have mainland access to Lake Temagami". This was not done. As a result the section is now quite unclear.</p> <p>We don't know whether MHBC intended to delete these words but accidentally did not do so, or if they wished to retain them. If the latter, we would point out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The words we proposed be deleted include the extremely ambiguous "mainland opportunities" which is contrary to the intent of the Plan generally, outside the one existing privately owned commercial property. - Municipal support for improving this access point is already clearly stated in section J.4.5. - If the words stay as they are, they still need to be modified by, for example, removing the second "need" in the paragraph. 	<p>Mainland access is tied to the improved access point in this paragraph. This Section does not support other mainland development</p>
6.	<p>While the TLA and I hope that Council will consider these three points before adoption, overall we are very pleased with the proposed Official Plan. I would also note that we are not looking to Council to consider any further at this time our other proposal that staff had flagged for Council consideration, "Shoreline Setbacks" at page 4 of their report.</p> <p>So far as the TLA is concerned, the proposed Plan represents a fair and reasonable accommodation between the concerns we have expressed during the process, and the perspectives of your planning advisors. For the Municipality of Temagami, adopting the proposed Plan will be a major achievement that Council, its advisors, and the community as a whole should be proud of.</p> <p>Therefore, <i>the TLA and I urge Council, subject to its consideration of the points raised in this</i></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	Anthony Usher, Planning Consultant TLA 23 January 2025	
#	Comment	Comment Response
	<i>letter, to adopt the Official Plan as recommended to Council.</i>	