POST-PUBLIC HEARING PLANNERS REPORT

SUMMER VILLAGE OF NORRIS BEACH LAND USE BYLAW | 7 JULY 2023

1. OVERVIEW

The Summer Village of Norris Beach held a Public Hearing for proposed Bylaw 180, which is a bylaw to adopt a new Land Use Bylaw (replacing the current Land Use Bylaw, Bylaw 73, as amended). The Public Hearing was held virtually via Zoom, during a special meeting of Council. The Hearing was attended by approximately 15 members of the public.

The following report provides a summary of the testimony presented at the Public Hearing. In addition to the testimony presented verbally, five written submissions were provided in advance of the hearing date. The submissions were read into the record by the Secretary and MPS.

2. PUBLIC HEARING INFORMATION

DATE AND TIME	May 25, 2023 @ 6:00 PM		
FORMAT	Virtually via Zoom		
ATTENDANCE	21 attendees, including:		
	 Council and Administration (4): Mayor Brian Keeler, Deputy Mayor Charlie Esslemont, Councillor Frank Dyck, Chief Administrative Officer, Sylvia Roy Municipal Planning Services Representatives (2): Jane Dauphinee and Brad MacDonald Members of the Public (15) 		
SUBMISSIONS	5 written submissions were received in advance of the public hearing. Verbal testimony was provided by 12 persons, with multiple persons providing more than one testimony.		

3. PROCESS

The Bylaw was introduced by the public hearing Secretary, Sylvia Roy, who is the CAO for the Summer Village of Norris Beach. Jane Dauphinee and Brad MacDonald of MPS read from their Planner's Report for Council, which provided an overview of:

- the purpose of the bylaw;
- how the proposed bylaw was prepared;
- a summary of public and referral agency engagement and feedback; and
- notification for the public hearing.

4. SUBMISSIONS/TESTIMONY FROM THE PUBLIC

The following is a summary of submissions and testimony received from community members at the public hearing by topic.

A more comprehensive summary of the comments provided by each speaker (adapted from the Public Hearing minutes) are included as **Appendix B**.

SUBMISSIONS BY TOPIC	MPS COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION
TOURIST HOMES	
Approximately 13 people objected to the Bylaw because they did not support restricting the development and use of dwellings in the Summer Village as Tourist Homes. The following comments were presented regarding Tourist	The draft LUB does not propose changes to the current regulations affecting Tourist Homes within the Summer Village.
 Tourist Homes should be allowed within the Summer Village. Tourist Homes provide an important service to both visitors and residents. 	Tourism Homes are not currently <u>allowed</u> within the Summer Village. Any existing Tourist Homes operating within the Summer Village are doing so without approval from the municipality and

- The LUB should include regulations to address and regulate potential nuisance issues associated with the use.
- Tourist Homes provide economic benefit to community members and should be supported because they provide economic benefits.
- Tourist Homes provide positive exposure to the community and may help to grow the community.
- Tourist Homes provide overflow accommodations for community members when friends and family visit the Summer Village.
- Tourist Homes support businesses in the Village and Pigeon Lake Region which provide soft services to Summer Village residents.
 Supporting these businesses supports the quality of life of all Summer Village residents.
- Tourist Homes provide exposure to pigeon lake which may help support property values by increase demand for lake properties.
- Not allowing Tourist Homes will impact the livelihood of some Summer Village property owners who are currently operating Tourism Homes within the Summer Village.
- Restricting Tourist Homes in Norris Beach when other Summer Villages do not restrict them may be harmful to property values in the Summer Village.
- Support for regulating Tourist Homes in a similar manner to how the Summer Village of Golden Days regulates Tourist Homes in their new LUB.
- Concern about how monitoring of concerns with Tourist Homes will occur and how enforcement will take place if a Tourist Home created problems.
- Tourist Homes could be regulated to limit the number of visitors in the summer when the lake is busy and allow more rentals in the winter when the lake and community are less busy to provide opportunities for revenue but minimize negative impacts on neighbours.

currently contravene the Summer Village LUB. The absence of a defined use class for "Tourist Homes" in the Summer Village LUB does not enable the development and operation of a Tourist Home within the Summer Village without permission from the Summer Village's Development Authority.

MPS has prepared proposed new regulations that would regulate and enable the development of Tourist Homes in the Summer Village of Norris Beach for Council's consideration. These regulations are based on feedback from public hearing attendees and the current regulations in the Summer Village of Golden Days' Land Use Bylaw.

See proposed amending motion included as Appendix A.

RECREATIONAL VEHICLES

Comments about the keeping of RVs on a lot in the Summer Village included:

- Confusion about how RVs are currently regulated in the Summer Village and what is proposed.
- Concerns about requiring a development permit for an RV on a lot in the Summer Village.
- Concerns about not regulating RVs on lots in the Summer Village.
- Concerns about people using RVs as temporary accommodations in the Summer Village. Supports including regulations that would restrict RV us on a lot for temporary accommodations.
- Support for allowing an RV to be stored on a lot but not used for accommodations.
- Support for allowing an RV to be used temporarily during the construction of a cottage on a lot.

Regulations pertaining to RVS in the draft LUB have been reworded to improve interpretation but have not been significantly changed. A comparison of the current RV regulation and the regulations proposed in the draft LUB are included as **Appendix C** to this report.

No changes recommended.

ENGAGEMENT

Poor dialogue and community engagement:

- Significant changes are being proposed in the LUB that should have been highlighted for community input in community newsletters;
- Many bylaw changes not discussed in community engagement meetings;
- Heard of changes through word of mouth in community only;

Information about the project and proposed changes to the LUB were provided to the community and Council in the following ways:

August 2021 - Newsletter #1 and Survey mailed to all residents, posted on the Summer Village website

- Significant bylaw that will affect many Norris Beach owner's and potentially livelihood.
- January 2022 What We Heard Report shared with Council
- April 2022 Newsletter #2 mailed to all residents with information about the Open House. Newsletter was also posted on website
- April 2022 Online Open House
- August 2022 Report for SV of Norris Beach Annual Information Meeting
- August 2022 2nd What We Heard Report shared with Council
- April 14 2023 First Reading by Council
- April 2023 Notice of Public Hearing mailed to all residents, posted on website
- May 25, 2023 Public Hearing

REMOVAL OF TREES

- Request for clarification regarding the caveat regarding spruce trees and requirements for approval from the Summer Village to remove the trees
- Question: Are all spruce trees protected in the Summer Village or just spruce tree that were planted prior to registration of the caveat?

The caveat protects all trees of the "evergreen or birch variety" and states that they cannot be cut, removed or destroyed. This provision from the caveat has been carried forward in the LUB (see 9.23.1) with the following exception:

5.2.3 "No development permit is required for the removal for invasive species, removal of dead or hazardous trees or vegetation, cutting grass, pruning and typical yard maintenance".

Including these provisions in the LUB makes it easier to undertake enforcement if required and provides greater clarity regarding how the trees are to be managed within the Summer Village.

No changes recommended.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS RE: TOURIST HOMES

MPS notes that most public hearing submissions and testimony at the public hearing concerned the proposed regulations that would prohibit Tourist Homes (i.e., Airbnb, VRBO) in the Summer Village of Norris Beach.

The Summer Village's current Land Use Bylaw (Bylaw 73) does not allow for Tourist Homes (or bed and breakfast operations); the only 'commercial' operations that can be developed are home businesses. A home business is defined in the current Land Use Bylaw as "a business carried on in a dwelling which is not normally visited by clients, customers or delivery services and does not change the external appearance or residential character of the dwelling. It may only be operated by the residents of a dwelling and does not include a bed and breakfast operations [emphasis added]."

It is important to note "bed and breakfast operations" are neither a Permitted or Discretionary Use in the Residential District. Therefore, a Tourist Home (or bed and breakfast operation) does not conform to the uses for the Residential District in the current Land Use Bylaw 73 and any development permit application for such a use under this bylaw must be refused in accordance with section 640(6)(b) of the Municipal Government Act.

In <u>Condominium Corporation No. 042 5177 v Kuzio, 2019 ABQB 814 (Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta)</u>, it is noted that an Airbnb operation is of a "commercial nature" and displays "all hallmarks of commercial enterprises" (e.g. advertising on websites to general public; having reservation systems, availability calendars, deposit and cancellation policies; accepting credit card payments; and charging service and cleaning fees.)

Municipalities throughout Alberta (particularly those near lakes and other recreational opportunities) have taken different approaches to regulating (or, not regulating) Tourist Homes within their boundaries. While some have chosen to prohibit, others have instituted permitting requirements to allow for their controlled use.

Should the Council of the Summer Village of Norris Beach wish to allow for the development of Tourist Homes in the Summer Village, MPS has prepared an amending motion (included as **Appendix A** to this Report) that would enable this use.

The following is a list of proposed amendments to proposed Bylaw No. 180, the Summer Village of Norris Beach Land Use Bylaw following the bylaw's public hearing (May 25, 2023).

1. Entire Land Use Bylaw

1. Correct minor typographical and formatting errors throughout the document.

2. That Section 2.2.2 – 'Definitions' be amended as follows:

1. Definition 178 (Tourist Home) be revised by adding the following: "Recreational vehicles shall not be used as a tourist home."

3. That Section 9.22 – 'Tourist Homes' be deleted as replaced as follows:

- 1. The development of a Tourist home in the Summer Village shall require a Development Permit.
- 2. No development permit for a tourist home may be issued for a lot that does not conform with all other provisions of this land use bylaw.
- 3. An application for a development permit for a tourist home shall include (in addition to the requirements of Section 5.4 Application Requirements for Development Permits):
 - a. the development permit fee as established in the Summer Village's Fees and Charges Bylaw;
 - b. signatures of all property owners listed on the title;
 - c. identification of what portions of the dwelling are to be utilized as a tourist home, and total number of bedrooms;
 - d. a safety and evacuation floor plan of the tourist home;
 - e. a parking plan that identifies the total area of the lot to be used for parking; and
 - f. information on where (or on what website) the tourist home will be listed for rental.
- 4. A tourist home may be developed within:
 - a. an entire principal dwelling for which a development permit has previously been issued; or
 - b. a portion of a principal dwelling for which a development permit has previously been issued;
- 5. A maximum of one rental booking may be scheduled at a time within an approved tourist home.
- 6. A tourist home with an approved development permit shall visibly display in the main entrance of the tourist home:
 - a. A copy of the development permit outlining the maximum occupancy of the tourist home and the primary contact telephone number and email of the owners; and
 - b. a home safety and evacuation floor plan of the premises.
- 7. A tourist home shall not be developed within:
 - a. a recreational vehicle;
 - b. a tent or tented structure; or
 - c. an accessory building without cooking or bathroom facilities.
- 8. A minimum of one (1) parking space per bedroom in the tourist home, plus one (1) extra shall be provided for on a lot. The parking space shall be included in the calculation of lot coverage. No offsite parking (i.e., parking within the adjacent road right of way, on municipal land, or on adjacent private land) shall be allowed.
- 9. The owner(s) may be required to facilitate periodic inspections within a 72-hour notice of the tourist home as requested by the Development Authority to ensure compliance with the regulations of this land use bylaw.
- 10. The owner(s) shall be required to cooperate with the Development Authority, emergency services providers, and Alberta Health Services during an investigation of any complaint associated with the tourist home.
- 11. No signs advertising the rental of the tourist home shall be permitted onsite.

4. That Sections 11.3 – Discretionary Uses (Small Lot Residential (R1)) be amended as follows:

1. "Tourist Homes" be added to the lists of discretionary uses.

5. That Sections 12.3 – Discretionary Uses (Large Lot Residential (R2)) be amended as follows:

1. "Tourist Homes" be added to the lists of discretionary uses.

Comments were adapted from the minutes of the Public Hearing and have been lightly edited for clarity, brevity, and relevancy to the proposed Bylaw, where necessary for the purposes of this report.

SUBMISSIONS BY SPEAKER

D. Ketsa (Written submission, Read by Mr. Ketsa)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed bylaw change that would deny the operation of short-term rentals in our community. As a homeowner and a member of this community, I believe that short-term rentals provide an important service to both visitors and residents alike.

I understand that there may be concerns about the noise, parking and other issues associated with the short-term rentals. However, I believe that these issues can be addressed through common-sense regulations and enforcement, rather than an outright ban. In fact, many cities, towns and summer villages have successfully implemented regulations that strike a balance between the needs of the residents and the benefits of the short-term rentals.

Furthermore, short-term rentals provide an important source of income for homeowners and contribute to the local economy by attracting visitors who may not otherwise visit our community. By denying the operation of short-term rentals, we risk losing out on these economic benefits.

I urge you to reconsider the prosed bylaw change and instead work to develop reasonable regulations that address the concerns of the residents while still allowing for the operation of short-term rentals.

At this time, I would like to inform the governing bodies that I will be attending the May 25 public hearing to present the above-mentioned concerns with regards to the proposed Regulations effecting the development of Tourist Homes.

Mr. Ketsa added that he has been an air BnB operator for 5 years.

T. Uffelman (Written submission, Read by Ms. Uffelman)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

I own a cabin at Norris Beach. The summers of my youth were spent fishing, boating, and biking around the lake. My parents bought empty property at Norris Beach in 1997 and have since built a cabin. Staying at a friend's cabin in the late 90's is what drew my parents to lake lot ownership. Without the opportunity to stay at the lake, we would have never bought at Pigeon. My memories of those summers are so amazing that when a small cabin, ten doors down from my parents, came onto the market, I bought it.

I am a single mom to three small children and the opportunities they have to make friendships and develop independence at the lake are endless and such a gift. This is a gift and a joy I could not give to them without the ability to rent my cabin out when I am not using it. I understand that for some of my neighbours this was worrisome at first but I have worked hard to ensure the families staying at my cabin are respectful, not only of my property, but of the community I love.

For three years I worked in tourism and economic development with Destination Stettler and the Board of Trade in the Town of Stettler. We worked with Travel Alberta to showcase our community and some of our best received advertising was unique stay options. Whether it was a cute Airbnb, an Airstream in the middle of nowhere, or a tiny house at a campground; Our visitors craved to stay someplace outside of a traditional hotel.

This is why I am writing today. I have read the amendments to Norris Beach's land use bylaws and have seen there is consideration to outlaw short term rentals. Short term rentals are a great way not only for cabin owners to earn income to pay bills, but to introduce families to the Pigeon lake we know and love. A ban on short term rentals not only impacts owners, but also families who visit the lake.

When visitor stay options are limited, it affects revenue in shopping, eating, and enjoying recreational activities in the area. Families that can't find their ideal stay options simply won't come. Creating a scenario with less economic activity in our community, that has been hit hard by the pandemic, is short sighted.

There are obvious direct impacts to the lake's economy by tourists. Many of our businesses depend on tourism to make ends meet. There are also indirect impacts of more visitors, such as hiring practices that support higher wages. Induced impacts include visitors ranting about their stays, and their friend's discovering Pigeon Lake as a result. Tourism isn't just a sector, it's an economic driver that touches so many facets of the community of Pigeon lake. There are widespread and unseen benefits to welcoming visitors with a variety of stay options that include short term rentals.

Many communities around Pigeon Lake are poised to grow. They have cabins and lots waiting to be sold. Less people who stay at Pigeon Lake can impact the number of opportunities we have to add new residents to our great communities. Staying at the lake was the first step in my parent's wanting to become owners at Pigeon Lake. I personally have many repeat guests who are looking to buy around the Crystal Springs/Norris Beach area.

Banning AirBnbs is a troubling president and frankly a regressive move that is harmful to tourism efforts and our communities. This decision will affect owners of cabins who use them as short term rentals, recreational operators, restaurants, grocery stores, and other storefronts around the lake, as well as visitors who want non-traditional stay options around the lake.

I would like to book a call with one of the elected representatives ahead of the call. I have been attending the bylaw readings and this was not on the radar last spring with the planning service met with the constituents.

I would also like to add that regulating Airbnbs like they did at Golden Days beach would be a much better way to approach this. I would support regulation and I hope that council would as well.

Ms. Uffelman added that short-term rentals are viable for families, and there are regulation options available instead of prohibiting them.

Michelle James, Kim Nielson, Inger Nielson (Read by Brad MacDonald of MPS)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

We were very surprised to get the letter the. Review the new bylaw changes as some of the changes were not part of the conversations in the last public meeting. We feel our elected leaders should be working for us residents and the community.

A major concern we have is the out lawing of Tourist Homes and here is why:

Why short term rentals matter: Short term rentals (or 'Tourist Homes') are a great way not only for cabin owners to earn income to pay bills, but to introduce families to the Pigeon lake we know and love. A ban on short term rentals not only impacts owners, but also families who visit the lake.

When visitor stay options are limited, it affects revenue in shopping, eating, and enjoying recreational activities in the area. Families that can't find their ideal stay options simply won't come. Creating a scenario with less economic activity in our community, that has been hit hard by the pandemic, is short sighted.

There are obvious direct impacts to the lake's economy by tourists. Many of our businesses depend on tourism to make ends meet. There are also indirect impacts of more visitors, such as hiring practices that support higher wages. Induced impacts include visitors ranting about their stays, and their friend's discovering Pigeon Lake as a result. Tourism isn't just a sector, it's an economic driver that touches so many facets of the community of Pigeon lake. There are widespread and unseen benefits to welcoming visitors with a variety of stay options that include short term rentals.

Banning AirBnbs is a troubling move that is harmful to tourism efforts and our communities! This decision will affect owners of cabins who use them as short term rentals, recreational operators, restaurants, grocery stores, and other storefronts around the lake, as well as visitors who want non-traditional stay options around the lake.

We would support a more regulated approach to the Tourist Homes like The summer village of Grandview has (note: author likely meant Golden Days, link to the bylaw and applicable tourist home regulations provided in email).

Thank you for listening to our concerns and recognition as elected officials that are to serve the residents of Norris Beach. Should you be unsure whether your actions are those of a self serving manner or only serving the minority of residents I would urge you to call a vote or poll by all residents to base your decisions from.

Ryan and Ashley Anderson (Read by Brad MacDonald of MPS)

Thank you for taking the time to review this email. We are writing because we have concerns regarding the potential new bylaw regarding "Tourist Homes". We have been members of the Norris Beach community for the past 4 years and own two properties within the Summer Village. We are disappointed to have only recently learned of the potential for this new bylaw and are concerned about the impacts on not only ourselves, but our friends and neighbors and community as a whole.

We are a young family of 4 with a 5-year-old, 1 year old and a dog named Dingo. We are fortunate to not only own one recreational property but two and we have loved calling Norris Beach our summer home since 2019.

Please see the below list of concerns for consideration.

Poor dialogue and community engagement:

- Significant change that should have been highlighted for community input in community newsletters;
- Many bylaw changes not discussed in community engagement meetings;
- Heard of changes through word of mouth in community only;
- Significant bylaw that will affect many Norris Beach owner's and potentially livelihood.

Additional Restrictions with Negative impact on property values/resale:

- Has an assessment been completed that can be shared to help understand the negative impact on property values with additional restrictions being passed?
- Norris Beach will be at a disadvantage when compared to other communities (i.e., Summer Village of Golden regulate rather than outlaw (additional restrictions will = less buyers, especially young families));
- Have any other communities on the lake outlawed tourism homes or will Norris Beach be the first?
- Will property values be re assessed to reflect additional restrictions to Norris Beach owners vs other lake communities?

Tourism homes are a benefit to Norris Beach residents and Pigeon Lake tourism:

- Allow for additional accommodations when family and friends are visiting;
- Introduces families to the lake and brings in potential buyers;

Supports local businesses/tourism

- Norris Beach is a recreational property for most, the potential of tourism homes should be assumed by all as is currently reflected in bylaws.
- Has there been concerns from the community?
- Can community concerns be made public for all to understands and potentially remedy?
- We have had an Airbnb adjacent to our property for 3+ years and have had no issues (we have used Airbnb on occasion for family)
- Proposed Tourist Homes bylaw feels like "not in my backyard" mentality being introduced by a select few with minimal community input;
- No regulations have been in place prior to outlawing, why not regulate prior to outlawing to address and remedy any community concerns (as other communities are doing, see Summer Village of Golden Days 282 Land Use Bylaw)

Personal Concerns

- Primary cabin purchased in 2019 knowing had the option to short term rental if poor economy or fell on hard times (never have had to);
- Secondary guest cabin purchased in 2022 knowing could short term rental to help supplement costs (never have);
- Negative impact to re-sale by minimizing potential buyers;
- Reduced options for accommodations for visiting friends and family.

Mark Hawkswell (Read by Brad MacDonald of MPS)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

I have a property at 801 Marine drive Norris Beach have read the proposal to ban short term rentals at Norris beach. I consider this to be the wrong choice. I think there should be some regulation similar to what Golden Days has implemented. I think people should have the opportunity to try out the cottage life by renting cottages at the same time allowing cottage owners to offset cost of ownership. I was able to visit my friends cottage at Pigeon Lake 25 years ago and liked it so much I bought a lot and built a cottage for my family. I have since developed another cottage on an additional lot. I would like other people to have the opportunity to do the same.

Michael Sawula (Verbal)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

When people stay, they're spending money in the Village, which is good for the economy as we need the Village at Pigeon Lake. It is vital for new people to come in and spend money. Airbnb people are friendly people, and he thinks it's awesome.

Curtis Uffelman (Verbal)

Spoke, against the proposed Bylaw and requested that the Bylaw be revised to allow Tourist Homes

Lives almost full-time at Norris Beach. Questioned why Council would ban air BnB instead of addressing concerns. He indicated his support for Air BnB and added that they need to be managed instead of removed, and owners need to abide by rules.

Richard Nielson (Verbal)

Lives in Norris Beach full-time, and he feels for the tourism people. Mr. Nielsen asked how monitoring and enforcement would take place.

T. Uffelman (Verbal)

Stated that tourism is a community builder; it helps people in purchasing and developing their properties. Tourism is just as important as roads. Tourism drives restaurants and businesses at the Village at Pigeon Lake and other places don't have these opportunities.

D. Ketsa (Verbal)

Doesn't view the Summer Village as residential, it's recreational. He has never had an issue or problem with air BnB people.

Curtis Uffelman (Verbal)

Indicated that by living almost full-time at Norris Beach he is guardian of many neighbors, he watches over friends and neighbors' cabins and air BnB is just another form of doing this.

Michael Sawula (Verbal)

Questioned if it would it be possible to limit air BnB to 30 days in summer and more often in winter when the economy needs it.

D. Ketsa (Verbal)

With winter revenue but would like to have Airbnb all year. Mr. Ketsa brought up the caveat regarding spruce trees and requiring approval from the Summer Village to remove the trees.

Shirley Meakin (Verbal)

Brought up the topic of recreational vehicles and added that the lot beside them recently sold and they are renters, no issues. She supports air BnB. She indicated that they like to park their recreational vehicles and with the new proposed land use bylaw, they will need an annual development permit.

Curtis Uffelman (Verbal)

With respect to recreational vehicles, the land use bylaw allows storage of 1 RV on a developed lot, don't need a development permit.

Reiner Buchsdrucker (Verbal)

Commented that currently no recreational vehicles unless you are developing, and the RV could then be used as your temporary home. Since covid, there are lots of recreational vehicles in the Summer Village; it contributes nothing to tax base, and he would prefer to see them gone. Sea cans during construction are another issue.

Shirley Meakin (Verbal)

Spoke again regarding recreational vehicles, requesting clarification on if she would be able to park an RV on her property or not; she has no problem with obtaining a permit if required.

Dave Rose (Verbal)

Has concerns with the proposed RV provisions; if the RV is stored and not used it should be okay.

Laurie Mansell (Verbal)

Commented regarding Airbnbs; she wasn't sure she wanted them although there were no disturbances at present.

Rob Switzer posed a question regarding the Public Hearing process.

Curtis' iPad (Verbal, no name provided)

Stated that it's important to pay attention to what's going on, Residents don't understand the power Council has to make rules.

Shelley Power (Verbal)

Indicated that she is in favor of Airbnbs and wishes to have recreational vehicles allowed.

Appendix C – Recreational Vehicles FAQs

The following chart provides a comparison of recreational vehicle regulations in the current Land Use Bylaw (Bylaw 73) and the proposed new Land Use Bylaw (Bylaw 180).

Recreational Vehicle FAQs				
	Current Land Use Bylaw (Bylaw 73)	Proposed Land Use Bylaw (Bylaw 180)		
Can an RV be located on a lot that does not have a dwelling?	No	No		
Can an RV be used as a dwelling?	No — unless there is a dwelling being constructed on the lot and a development permit for the temporary use of the RV has been approved as a dwelling during construction.	No – unless there is a dwelling being constructed on the lot and a development permit for the temporary use of the RV has been approved as a dwelling during construction for up to a maximum of 24 months.		
Can an RV be used as a Guest House or Tourist Home?	No	No		
What is the max number of RVs normally allowed on a lot?	1	1		
When do you need a Development Permit for an RV?	When it is going to be on the lot for more than 14 days OR Anytime you would like to have more than 1 RV on a lot (for a special event)	When it is going to be on the lot for more than 14 days OR Anytime you would like to have more than 1 RV on a lot (for a special event)		
How long is a development permit for the storage of up to 1 RV on a lot good for?	1 year. It must be renewed annually	1 year. It must be renewed annually		
Do you need a DP for an RV on a lot if it is the only RV on the lot and it will be on the lot for less than 14 days?	No development permit required	No development permit required		
Can extra RVs be allowed temporarily for an extraordinary event?	Yes – if you provide 2 weeks notice to the Development Officer and a temporary development permit is issued	Yes – if you provide 2 weeks notice to the Development Officer and a temporary development permit is issued		
What happens to the RV once the development permit has expired?	It must be immediately removed	It must be immediately removed		
Where should an RV be placed on a lot?	In the rear of the lot (unless it is impossible to place the RV in the rear of the lot)	In the rear of the lot (unless it is impossible to place the RV in the rear of the lot) In no instance can an RV be located in a lake front yard.		
Do RVs require onsite arrangements for the disposal of wastewater?	Yes	Yes		