



In May 2021, IMI International Research-Public Reach conducted a survey on behalf of Friends of Muskoka and the Muskoka Lakes Association to capture Muskoka area residents’ thoughts, priorities and concerns about development at the Cleavelands House property in Minett.

To date, more than 1,600 respondents replied from across the area, and representing the Big Three Lakes, the Township of Muskoka Lakes and townships of Lake of Bays, Georgian Bay and Seguin, the towns of Gravenhurst, Bracebridge and Huntsville, and many more lakes and rivers.

In addition, our respondents also support their continuing investments in Muskoka through memberships in one or more community groups, including: Friends of Muskoka, the Muskoka Lakes Association, Safe and Quiet Lakes, the Muskoka Steamships and Discovery Centre, Muskoka Ratepayers Association, Friends of Muskoka Watershed, the Muskoka Conservancy, and 44 more lake, island, road and other associations.

We asked 32 questions, many of which provided space for comment. In all we received more than 4,000 comments – far too many to share in an email, or even a book. Instead, we have provided the comments received to our last question: “Do you have any final comments about the Draft Policies or development in Minett that you would like to share?”

These are the comments we received from the first 1,500-plus responses processed, largely the way we received them; they have been edited only to remove names and potentially libelous statements or objectionable language.

1. You’re going to ruin Minett with this development. Taking something special and commercializing it for tourists is sad for the residents who live/ vacation here. In the process you’ll further pollute the lakes and demolish the homes of many species that live here.
2. You have only one chance to do it right. Once the development criteria is driven by financial considerations there will be no recall. from my years of observation there are plenty of jobs available based on the present population in the lakes region. As more trades people are required the inevitable will happen and that is traffic will be deplorable and a good example if Aspen Colorado where the development has created daily traffic jams, lack of housing and parking in the area resulting in a commuter condition that is intolerable.
3. Yes - PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE do not allow over development. There needs to be thoughtful, well managed builds that do not irrevocably damage our beautiful and unique destination
4. You are doing a great job monitoring this project. Keep it up
5. Yes. Good Luck preventing all of this !! I sincerely would not want to see this much development. Also keep the developers off Fairy Lake !!
6. You have let us all down. This is a disgrace. This should not be allowed at all. Wish there was an election before this decision is made!

7.	Would like to see the environmental impact study. Also what about the Ministry of Natural Resources and demand on the lake??
8.	would like to see 100% redirect no restrictions too much rentals means Kaos on roads, water, district. Concern for water boating safety. Would like to see more speciality shops for locals yearroind instead of summer only.
9.	With this development future growth should be prohibited. Whatever gets allowed here should be the maximum allowed EVER. This development should never be allowed to become predominantly residential and owners should not have exclusive use of commona areas and amenities. We do not want "Lake Simcoe" to come to Muskoka. A residential subdivision in Minett should not be permitted.
10.	With the boating habits of today I am fearful of all the added traffic on our lake system.
11.	Why wreck a beautiful part of Muskoka with high density properties . Don't make it into a Club Med .. leave it quaint and vibrant .
12.	Why is this project necessary?
13.	Why is this happening? The concept of coming here is for peace and living in the moment of nature. Do not want the city culture up here The city still where a city should be not here in Muskoka and everfywhere else up north
14.	Why is it even being considered??? A remote area does not need a monster resort. The road and the area cannot handle the extra people This looks like a travesty unfolding. Ps: I cycle on that road so even though I live in Huntsville, this does affect me.
15.	Why have policies and guidelines if developers are allowed to exceed them? Allowing this as proposed will set ever increasing demands to build similar developments. The "common good" and concerns of existing area residents should outweigh the demands of developers that will build and leave the area.
16.	Why do we have to have city like resort development in a Muskoka.
17.	Why are we dictated by commercial developers? Why is not the community who votes changes in Muskoka? Is it money talks versus what do we want to preserve.
18.	Why are we developing Minett when Rosseau, Port Carling and Bala are underpopulated and under utilized? This does not seem like a good idea, looking towards the future. It looks like. Make work project that is not sustainable.
19.	While it would be nice for more people to enjoy Muskoka , they won't enjoy what is special about it if the urban problems follow them - too many people in a small area, can't find parking, too much noise etc Thank you for the work that is being done to get it right.
20.	While I don't access my property or boat by Peninsula Road, I do travel it regularly to reach other recreational activities and for shopping. I am already concerned that with teh current volume of traffic, some drivers are not able to drive across the Port Sandfield Bridge safely. Those of us who have the opportunity to live in the Township are stewards of long-term resources and the environment that we want to pass on to our children and grandchildren and share with other Ontarians, as well as travellers.
21.	While I believe that everyone has the right to enjoy the area, the people who live here have a right to be heard of their concerns. Were they? I think not! Just the way they were not heard in Bala, when the outside forces, who had no interest in the community, other than to rip it off for the almighty dollar, came to my town, ran roughshod over it, altered it forever and diminished it forever!
22.	Where is the support buildings. Where is the WASTE TREATMENT PLANT. Where is the water coming from?

23. When the current owner/developer purchased the property, he should have known that significantly altering/changing what was there would NOT BE ALLOWED.
24. What is the end game here? This precedent will affect everywhere else in Muskoka. The developers won't stop once this is approved.
25. What has been the consultation process with indigenous communities about this development?
26. What happens when it's built out in high density, and the resort ends up being not financially viable? The units will end up being sold, and used year round as a residence. That is my fear. And I believe the developers are hoping that is what will happen.
27. What happens to Port Sandfield when a minimum 2 lane road needs to go through there? I dont see how it is possible to deal with the sheer volume of people and cars. The Cleves site and into the bay could be a beautiful vacation spot but I'm afraid the setting will be destroyed and the water will be heavily polluted. Red Leaves dumped raw sewage into Lk. Rosseau for a few years with virtually NO repercussions. Imagine if proposed development goes forward?
28. What ever goes down on site it will be a future president to future unnecessary developments (example) Bangor lodge Gravenhust Fire collage site ect. These projects need tobe on larger bodies of water.
29. what else can we do to help stop this overdevelopment?
30. What are the provisions for water supply and waste water treatment and release for this development? How will council ensure water quality going forward?
31. What a mess!This sort of development screams greed and exploitation of the environment and Muskoka as a whole.
32. We're on a slippery slope here. My biggest concern is the precedent that these decisions will set. If development (such as this proposal) is allowed, there will be a domino effect and the Muskoka aesthetic will be lost...forever.
33. Well not opposed to new developments, and agree with new projects that will encourage tourism and create waterfront destinations the overall size, scale, height and density of this project is simply far too much on all accounts. I am extremely concerned about the environmental and visual impact this will have on the quality of our lakeside environment. I am also equally concerned about the precedent this will set on other proposed developments. On all accounts this project must be reduced in size, scale, height, density and developed in a character suitable for waterfront site in such a way that it becomes a good neighbor, valuable contributor to the economy and positive impact on the future of the lakeside environment
34. we support the MLA and Friends of Muskoka
35. We really hope that this beautiful part of the area is not destroyed through over development. We understand the need for employment especially for young people but that has to be in balance with preservation of this area.
36. We owned three cottages in Muskoka over the years, and now have a fourth...two fractional cottages. I do believe it is important to have this model available to people, especially with record breaking cottage prices. I don't think there should be more units available than before at Clevelands, but maybe they could be bigger. I don't see how building a very dense, suburban landscape could have any benefits for the community. People come to Muskoka for Muskoka. No one wants high traffic, ugly views, and hordes of people. We need a balance. People like the model of full ownership in a smaller denser footprint. I wish this would be allowed. Just don't overdo it. The idea that we can't have this because we have to keep it for tourists, doesn't make sense to me. When we had our cottages, we had one very large cottage in a very exclusive area. The cottages there were rarely used. Our last cottage was much more affordable in an

<p>older denser area. People in that area really used their cottages. They were all getting their money's worth. If people owned their own place in Cleavelands for full use, they would be there all the time contributing to the local economy. Why is that so bad?</p>
<p>37. We need to stop with the greed and desire to mess with the natural environment.</p>
<p>38. we need to reduce the number of units 2000 is way too many</p>
<p>39. We need to be mindful of the level density in Muskoka. More is not better.</p>
<p>40. We must protect the environment.</p>
<p>41. We must act now to preserve the quality of the lake and so restraints on both land and water are of utmost importance . Let's get it right by a restraining "big business"</p>
<p>42. We have to stop Resorts from expanding rental units as far as this development goes, to make the developments more spread out and not destroy the Muskoka people come to to enjoy!</p>
<p>43. We have to be careful that we don't over use the properties and negatively affect the environment, noise and light pollution.</p>
<p>44. We formed a committee to look at this, they have recommendations we should follow and we are grateful that the current Township of Muskoka Lakes council is brave enough to address the issues with overdevelopment and impacts to Mukoka as we know it</p>
<p>45. We find all of this really scary. These plans change the look and feel of our Muskoka into a commercialized environment.</p>
<p>46. we don't need more density on the lake with expanded resorts.</p>
<p>47. We cannot stop people from wanting to enjoy our area. We do have the right to maintain its character and the obligation to do so without destroying the environment.</p>
<p>48. We are worried about waste water capture, as well as densification, heights and development at the water's edge. How this resort will be serviced is critically important regardless of what the architectural features of the development are.</p>
<p>49. We are ok with having some modest commercial hotel/resort accommodations in addition to the Marriott in Minett but do not favour high density "resort village" development that completely changes the natural look and feel of Minett as a hamlet.</p>
<p>50. We are located relatively close to the bridges just south of Minette. The increased tourism traffic could significantly impact our property from a visual as well as noise perspective. Additional tree planting along the road adjacent to the bridges as well as shrubbery planter boxes affixed to both sides of the bridges would assist in minimizing this impact. I hope this concept would be considered and thus added to the initial and ongoing cost of the proposed resort budget.</p>
<p>51. We are delighted to see this survey! The combination of the FOM concerns and requests and the survey results should result in an acceptable compromise!</p>
<p>52. We appreciate the efforts of the Friends of Muskoka and Minett Steering Group. It would be a shame for this beautiful location to be high density, high rise and over populated. We come to Muskoka to get away from the overly populated locations like Toronto. Let's protect this gem.</p>
<p>53. We all know the smaller municipalities (the Muskokas) want the tourism dollars. We all know the political parties want their cities to grow and be more popular. But is it a good idea? Is it necessary? Do we really need to over crowd our lakes and forests? Until everyone learns how to respect nature (and that will take a lot longer than it does to cover the land with buildings), I don't think it is a good idea to expand in such a large degree. Large construction companies and developers should start looking at ways to make large</p>

<p>cities more 'green' and promote more natural constructions (roof top parks, gardenpark high rises - where entire floors are gardens inside high rise buildings, etc) in cities instead of encouraging urban sprawl. It's easy to blow up rocks, cut down trees, pollute waterways, basically destroy the environment - it's not easy to put it back or fix it. Think before you destroy it all.</p>
<p>54. Water quality is the biggest concern. Without clean water and wildlife there is no Muskoka.</p>
<p>55. Wasn't one of the campaign promises of the newly elected Mayer to eliminate this type of development??????????????</p>
<p>56. very much appreciate this survey and the work of Friends of Muskoka and other groups to keep us informed and protect the long term interests of Muskoka seasonal residents</p>
<p>57. Very much against the density of multi-storey buildings. Feel it would be negative for Minett, traffic culture and environment.</p>
<p>58. Very important to protect our lakes and water quality. We did not buy in Muskoka because we wanted urban sprawl and all amenities. We have a home where we go when want that. Being in Muskoka is time to enjoy clean air and water without a lot of boat noise and wall to wall people.</p>
<p>59. very important to be kept in formed of plans and upcoming changes. Be honest with the people .</p>
<p>60. Very glad to know that there are still groups who want policies and plans to be reviewed and refined for the betterment of Muskoka and in this specific case, Minett!</p>
<p>61. Very disappointed in policy makers of Muskoka, particularly in Minett. We thought the owners and residents as well as politicians had more respect for the Muskoka Lakes. This looks like it is all about making money without respect to traditions.</p>
<p>62. Very concerned about this specific development and a precedent being set for other similar development on all the 3 Lakes.</p>
<p>63. Very concerned about the water quality, shore appearance, too many boats without experience on the lake</p>
<p>64. Very concerned about safety for boating, swimming and vehicle traffic on Peninsula road.</p>
<p>65. Very concerned about how the services can handle this. Hospitals, doctors, dentists, fire and police services , the ability of the roads and bridges to handle the traffic, grocery and pharmacies The area is already overloaded in the summer</p>
<p>66. Use your brains</p>
<p>67. unfortunately developers get what they want and I have little faith in our government protecting our sacred Lake Rosseau once developers get their hands on waterfront property. they do what they want</p>
<p>68. Ultimately, I hope the environment and existing residents concerns are considered foremost.</p>
<p>69. Try to keep the environment, as well as the density in mind! This development, if approved as is would alter Muskoka's current landscape and appeal. In my opinion, this will drive down property values.</p>
<p>70. Traffic congestion, long waiting time coming and going through the area</p>
<p>71. tough love pls</p>
<p>72. Too much, too big, too many people. Dangerous for the environment, roads and waterways.</p>
<p>73. too much strain on waterfront. If you are going to build a new town, would you develop it that way? It is a narrow bay that is already a hazard to boat in, it would only get worse.</p>
<p>74. Too much development. Density is unsustainable.</p>
<p>75. Too much development when the existing resorts struggle to survive!</p>
<p>76. Too much development in one small part of the lake. Don't let greed ruin Muskoka :(</p>
<p>77. Too large a concept for such a small area.</p>

78. To much development
79. to me it looks like you could have the population of a small town during the busy summer months 2000 units with 4 people in each plus 500 units at the Marriott with 4 people in each plus the 43 Legacy cottages with 4 people in each would be approximately 10,000 people plus what we already have this could be in the 12,000 to 15,000 range that's the population of Bracebridge all using the Lake and driving on the same two lane road, you can only widen it so much this will destroy property values anywhere near this development and blemish our reputation as a world class destination the whole thing is a bad idea for Muskoka but if it is coming no matter what then make it as small as possible and enforce the restrictions, I have little faith that either will happen, shame on us for letting this happen all in the name of progress.....it's all in the name of money.....shame shame shame.
80. TML is at a critical juncture to balance the interests of developers vs the interests of environmentalists. As a 50-year Muskoka resident, I have sadly watched the trend go from stewardship of the land to monetization of the land. But further urbanization of Muskoka will destroy what created Muskoka's original appeal. The Minett Steering Committee has done expert work on an appropriate balance. When deliberating final Minett development policies, please err on the side of protecting the environmental fragility. Without it, there is no local economy!
81. time to get this right and get this under control
82. Thoughtful environmentally sensitive development is probably needed. A well laid out townsite with a beautiful waterfront park and opportunities for year round employment would be a better idea
83. this will set the precedent for development on every corner of the muskoka's
84. This will open the door to a devastating over development of what all the promoters toot as "the natural beauty" of Muskoka and turn us into Wasaga Beach for those with more money than brains and a penchant for a "Muskoka" address.
85. This will become another Wasaga beach! What we have that makes Muskoka special and exclusive- to enjoy nature and sports activities within a lessor density, that is safe for all, calm and quiet, will be threatened. The Muskoka we know and cherish will be gone forever, so a few can benefit monetarily.
86. This whole thing hinges on properties being zoned for resort use, but allowing residents to use the property more frequently. The 26-week regulation is a massive improvement. Congratulations, and thank you! Suggest having a plan in place to ensure enforcement. That's where this whole thing falls apart, potentially.
87. This whole proposal is so bad, I do not understand why it is even being considered. New development in the old Clevelands house area should be limited to something no more than twice the size of the old Clevelands house. Adding thousands of units to this bay would be a disaster for Muskoka.
88. This survey was excellent. Very impressed with the structure of questions and the detail provided. I am supportive of development in the area and increased densities. I am especially supportive of increasing employment in the area. I would not support a high density residential development, but I think a resort is great for the area. However, the development needs to be considerate of the environment and preserving the character of the Muskoka Lakes. I think the steering committee has done an excellent job of balancing this. I hope that net new boats on the lake, as a result of this development, can be minimized.
89. This size of development should have never passed. It was done so without cottages input and should be dialed back as much as possible . It's so bad and is ruining Miskoka
90. This should be minimally invasive and work off of the structures already existing at Cleveland's house. Minett is a special little town and it is a natural area we have had the privilege to enjoy for years. Consider that once it's gone we can't undo it.

91. This provide an oppportunity to create a welcoming engaging environment of lakefront amenities for cottagers and guests to enjoy Muskoka. The land is huge and can sustain the density. Allow the condo units along the full frontage except pull them further back around the marina area for more public space and commercial amenities for the enjoyment of all. Create a destination for families.
92. This proposed development far exceeds the retail and commercial access to support such a massive, densely populated area. Peninsula Rd. Will become overused and in conjunction with the increased capacity, so will the frequency of serious accidents increase. There are far too many negative issues to list here and don't ge t me wrong, I understand the developers need for new construction and PROFITS but, our roads, and lakes can barely handle the summer influx of visitors as it stands now. Long established family cottages have a right be concerned when their future safe, quiet Muskoka opens its gates without the infrastructure in place BEFOREHAND. i urge and support the Minet committee to listen to their hearts and those of their constituents .
93. This project will cost more than it makes in my opinion. The next generation can't afford it and golf course are finding this out yet expansion plans continue. Too bad this experiment will cost the near-by residents anxiety.
94. This project seems to benefit the developers and their friends. It is an abuse of the environment.
95. This project is terrible. It makes me so sad a developer wants to ruin this part of Muskoka and is putting financial gain ahead of Muskoka community.
96. This plan ruins Muskoka. You have to ensure that the plan is in keeping with the spirit of Muskoka, respects the environment, doesn't create too much density and still allows tourism.
97. This overwhelming development is very troubling. It is sure to negatively impact the environment and the increased number of people will be detrimental to the health of the lake.
98. This overdevelopment will have many negative impacts on Minett and Lake Rosseau for the rest of time. It appears that developers continue to push Muskoka Lakes to over build rather than protecting and preserving the beauty of Lake Rosseau. Unfortunately it appears that we didn't learn anything from the overdevelopment of the Red Leaves property.
99. This needs to be stopped. I have seen what happens At a Freed Muskoka development. Short term renters descend on the property and care only about themselves and justify Their excessive noise, waste pollution and disrespect of neighbours because of " I paid for this and will do what I want"
100.This is way too much devlopment Stop the sprawl and lets leave muskoka alone to keep its charm and history This will ruin the lake and ruin cottaging!!
101.This is the beginning of the end for the exclusive natural feel of Muskoka. Tourists and massive boat traffic will ruin the lake and all of the renters will make for an extremely unsafe boating environment.
102.This is still far too much redevelopment and I strongly oppose it.
103.This is so wrong - we can't allow for this level of development near the lake or away from it in an area that wasn't developed or intended to have the level of density proposed.
104.This is scary. Thank you for all the good work you are doing and fighting the good fight. God speed...
105.This is ruing why people want to be in Muskoka.
106.This is not the beautiful Muskoka we love. Way too commercial and intrusive.
107.This is an important decision as it could affect what happens at other resorts in Muskoka. The lakes are already much more busy with boat traffic than even a few years ago.
108.This is an extremely important area of the lake. If there is not an extreme measure of scrutiny given to this project you would not be doing your job. Please be considerate of all the owners who have respected this

<p>area for the last 100 years. This extreme development will have irreversible damages to this area from here forward. It is crucial you get this right.</p>
<p>109.this is an example of how Muskoka will be spoiled through over development as will set the precedent</p>
<p>110.This is a very important development in an environmentally damaged fragile location.....it must be thought through and viewed from the perspective of the next century</p>
<p>111.This is a unique, maybe once in our lifetime opportunity to show real leadership to protect Muskoka's enviroment. I am confident you have a significant majority to do so. If you don't, it is a potentially fatal turning point.</p>
<p>112.this is a precedent setting decision that will define the muskoka lakes for 100 years to come. Get it right now, and the lakes will be preserved for posterity. get it wrong now and the quick bucks will soon disappear from the ruin of the entire lake system.</p>
<p>113.This is a disaster for the Muskoka region. This will only destroy the shore line - with pollution and traffic. Crime will increase as well. This very disappointing and concerning that this plan is even being considered.</p>
<p>114.This has always been a commercial property. The history of hotels surviving in Muskoka due to the short season is terrible. The resort should be supported in its redevelopment in an environmentally conscious way as that will resonate with customers. But don't put up roadblocks that make redevelopment uneconomic. The region needs thriving businesses. IT IS NOT A NEW HOTEL! Don't treat it as one.</p>
<p>115.This development should be phased in with 100-200 units over each 2 year period. Then a proper assessment can be made with input from all stakeholders.</p>
<p>116.This development is terrifying. The kind of growth is entirely unsustainable by any economic, social, or environmental measure.</p>
<p>117.This development is poorly conceived and will only serve to make the developers rich and degrade the natural Muskoka environment. How is this possible, who is allowing the developers to influence our elected officials. As usual the seasonal taxpayers are being taken advantage of.</p>
<p>118.This development is completely in conflict with residential development restrictions and bylaws. The rationale of promoting jobs is not a viable justification to adversely impact the environment and safety for cottagers.</p>
<p>119.Think that Cleves surely needs a redevelopment but people to not come to Muskoka for a condo on the water experience so one has to be very careful what is being built here. Many of the resorts are not fully subscribed all year round so getting the feel right really does impact the success. Cleves has had a long and successful history so one should keep that in mind when planning. If it's not broke don't fix. Did I mention the condos are super tacky!!</p>
<p>120.They need to protect the current scale of Cleveland House and should not start building larger resorts - that has massive implications on safety and environment of the Muskoka Lakes</p>
<p>121.These plans are absolutely disturbing - Muskoka is about nature and disconnecting. This commercialized proposition is not welcomed. The JW Marriott is already too much for that space. The exploitation of Muskoka's resources needs to stop</p>
<p>122.These lakes have seen and sustained steady moderate development since the 1880's, but nothing so drastic nor potentially damaging to environment and character as this development. Imagine a Muskoka with dozens of developments like this one. It would not be the same place we know and love. There are other places to go if people want the high end resort life. What happens when the booming economy slows and tourism drops again as has happened in the past? Empty units and struggling businesses. You cannot</p>

<p>plan for the peaks. Just because there may be demand now, doesn't guarantee it 10 years from now. We need to protect the beauty and pristine waters we have now, for the future.</p>
<p>123. These draft policies represent a significant improvement over the previous 2008 proposals.</p>
<p>124. These draft policies are rooted in the protection of the Historical Resort operations in Minett. These draft policies achieve that protection by redefining "Resort Operations" as "Residential Development". The new "unit owners" are provided all the benefits of seasonal ownership in Muskoka without any of the responsibilities current seasonal owners in Muskoka have, or any of the regulations they endure.</p>
<p>125. These development policies seem to be very dense for a relatively small area both on the land and water.</p>
<p>126. These crass plans seem like the beginning of the end. But it really began with the Marriott -- that gross building that can be seen for miles.</p>
<p>127. There was mention of pedestrians on Peninsula Road. There should be concerned of resort visitors who walk/bike/run along Juddhaven road as well with no thought to the cars that travel along there. It is incredibly dangerous and one than one time I have come over a a rise in the road only to have a jogger running right in the middle of my lane. There would need to be some sort of consideration for the increase of people and how it would affect the safety along that road.</p>
<p>128. There needs to be a balance between growth and enabling more people to enjoy the beauties of Muskoka versus uncontrolled development. This should not be a NIMBY position. If one doesn't like the development in your area, move. We need to create jobs, create small businesses, generate tax revenue in an environmentally and sustainable manner. Polarizing positions is not the cure. Limit the bureaucracy, limit the debate, make informed decisions and move on. There is lots of space in Muskoka to share, especially more so now where the area is priced so far out of the market, the only way for most people to enjoy it is to have hotels or rental properties.</p>
<p>129. there must be a limit to commercial and dense residential development in Muskoka lakes without limits and protection we will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs.. let's get more creative about economic development beside the destruction of the waterfront and the forest.</p>
<p>130. There is tremendous support for this concept of growth.</p>
<p>131. There is only one Muskoka please don't ruin it by over developing.</p>
<p>132. There is no mention of sewage treatment from the new community. Hopefully it will all be self-contained, but eventually it will end up in the lake. Where and how????</p>
<p>133. There is no mention in all of this of water and sewage processing. None of this should be permitted if there is no a full processing facility being built, the cost to be borne by the developer. Sewage in the lake, and pollution (noise and water) from the increase in boating due to density are both unacceptable to me.</p>
<p>134. There is a reason why people are drawn to the area, don't blow it!!</p>
<p>135. There is a real problem with density and pollution in Muskoka that needs to be stopped. More resorts are not the answer.</p>
<p>136. There is a huge amount of chemicals/ fertilizers used for landscaping at large developments. How can that be mitigated as it all ends up in the lake</p>
<p>137. There are many of us that are worried about car traffic on Peninsula Road, esp between Port Sandfield and Minett. We love the quaintness of Port Sandfield and want to keep the bridge single lane. Perhaps an alternate highway going northbound out to Hwy 400 could be considered? Also, currently it is very difficult to pull out of our driveways to get onto Peninsula Road due to the current traffic level and speeding cars. If</p>

<p>traffic increases, someone will be killed, whether they be drivers exiting their cottage driveway, cyclists, or those who simply go for a walk. This is cottage country, not a city!</p>
<p>138. There are enough examples in the world of successful resort villages and my hope is that Minett will eventually be one of them. If TML uses the Steering committee recommendations and for once thinks of the Environment first, maybe this can happen.</p>
<p>139. The whole thing is a disaster. The ecosystem is a very fragile thing and we are well on our way to degrading and even destroying the Muskoka experience so a few greedy fatcats can line their pockets. I repeat. It is a disaster in waiting.</p>
<p>140. The whole thing is a BAD IDEA.</p>
<p>141. The whole development is most unfortunate as it will eventually degrade the experience and value of Muskoka</p>
<p>142. The water quality and the preservation and protection of the natural environment of this area is critical to protect. This is what attracts people to Muskoka. To mar the beautiful shorelines with massive hotels etc. takes away the special quality of these lakes, and threatens our water quality and the natural habitat.</p>
<p>143. The water quality and boat safety must be of a huge concern. The area should provide an enjoyable seasonal visit for all</p>
<p>144. The township needs to take over public boat parking for Islanders to ensure that they have a spot in the future. The developers are not interested in accommodating islanders parking. We've used that landing for over 60 years. It's definitely in jeopardy!</p>
<p>145. the tighter the guidelines are the better</p>
<p>146. The Rosseau is an eyesore that is disproportional to the tree heights and is the result of the removal of far too many trees. I am concerned that the Township of Muskoka Lakes has not learned a lesson from this terrible decision.</p>
<p>147. The road from Minett onwards is already dangerous due to volume in the summer and drivers, cyclists and pedestrians unfamiliar with the road.</p>
<p>148. The raison d'être for this development is financial gain for a very few! Environmental concerns are basically not understood by those who have drafted these plans and are irrelevant to their thinking. They are only interested in making money, not in preserving the truly unique environment that Muskoka is famous for.</p>
<p>149. The proposed development is excessive. It will be detrimental to Muskoka on many levels.</p>
<p>150. The proposal is just crazy. Stop.</p>
<p>151. The path of this development indicates that we are still stuck in a "business as usual" approach, i.e. we try to limit damage to the environment to some arbitrary level, then accept the rest as the cost of doing business. We still have not gotten an objective assessment of what the environment can sustain. What we know however is that we are losing environmental integrity on many fronts, but not enough to change direction.</p>
<p>152. The owner has little or no respect for rules and laws. Leaving a legacy means nothing, making more money he doesn't need does. Perhaps taxing the units at a higher rate in the same way Town of Blue Mountains has been able to do. If the unit is on a rental program the taxes should be higher. No employee housing, no development, very simple.</p>
<p>153. The outcome of these decisions will have a significant future impact on every small/medium/large resort that is sold over the next several years. Muskoka is rare because of its natural beauty. Growth and change is inevitable and it's great that more people can enjoy it. However, the development needs to be carefully managed and requires residents input. We risk losing everything that Muskoka has offered. Beautiful</p>

nature, clean water, open spaces, canoes, kayaks, motor boats that are sized for these lakes. NOT the huge "cigarette" boats that should be on Georgian Bay or the great lakes!! Can you tell I'm a traditionalist!!
154. The Muskoka environment needs to be preserved and taken care of. I haven't seen anything about how they are going to manage the water supply and sewage treatment.
155. The Municipality should listen to the concerned citizens who have devoted much time and effort to evaluate options and have come up with a draft policies. These are aimed at helping sustain what we love.
156. The MLA must remain diligent in pursuing adverse planning policies, amendments to exiting policies, the discretion permitted in these policies, and - most importantly - matters of good governance: the selection of elected officials, any conflict of interest rules that apply, together with the active verification of compliance with such policies. If the current membership fees do not allow this important oversight function on behalf of property tax paying owners, please increase them accordingly.
157. The long term cottage/resident owners (view, privacy. water use etc) that will be directly impacted by invasion of this development should be offered (will decrease there privacy and quality of life in there bay) a high buy out or compete station. The bay is too small for this !
158. The less development and less changes to Muskoka's natural beauty must be a priority. Muskoka is a world renown area with its unique beauty. Don't cater to developers whose sole purpose is to make money, regardless of the impact their development may have on the area's natural beauty. We are in the drivers seat here. We can say NO or dictate to the developer how we want the development to look like or how extensive it is. Don't give in!
159. The land is zoned for a resort and should be managed as such. It should be built/developed with minimal impact to the environment. Less is more so we can continue to enjoy the natural beauty of Muskoka.
160. The group that is able to bring life back to Cleveland's House will do so with trying to keep to the charm of the past mixed with the freshness of new. It is an iconic waterfront and should be preserved because nostalgia is part of the charm of cottage country.
161. The environment and safety of the area is imperative. We need some development but do not need a city in the middle of Muskoka
162. The Draft Policies are the right way to go to achieve sensible development that does not destroy the nature of our Muskoka Lakes
163. The draft policies are a good start, but not enough regard for existing cottagers. This is not a win win scenario.
164. The draft plan is step in the right direction but it still seems too much.
165. The development should be discontinued.
166. The development proposed is horrifying. Please work hard to maintain the water quality and quality of life in Muskoka. Please use all recommendations from the Minett Steering Committee.
167. the development is much too aggressive for the current resources of the muskoka lakes. The roads are already packed on peninsula and you are not providing any options to fixing road density. Concerns about the environmental impact having this many residents in one area of the lake.
168. The development is a terrible idea and should not be built. The resort as it stands is terrible for Muskoka and enlarging it takes away the appeal.
169. The developers will push as far as they can to maximise profitability. Firm policies need to be in place and NO element of trust is to be accepted. We saw this exact scenario play out in Naples Florida, whereby the

<p>developer informally committed to lesser development upon purchase of the property, only to renege upon submitting plans.</p>
<p>170. The developers in the Minett area (Clevelands House and Wallace Marina) must be limited to either existing or more restrictive building codes. Further, the developers must satisfy all environmental impact assessments. Owner of units should only be allowed to occupy their units for a maximum of 4 weeks between June 1 and September 30th.</p>
<p>171. The developer should perhaps be requested to pay for a traffic bypass around the resort area to provide a safer area for users of the resort as well as have less of an impact on the local users. The developer should also pay for any increase in required policing and bylaw enforcement</p>
<p>172. The designation of Minett as a 'resort village' is already problematic, given that the only access is the single-lane Peninsula Road, which has already had several fatal accidents. The density proposed by the Cleves developer is dismaying. In addition, the possibility that units will morph into year-round residences, a la Friday Harbor, is a real one—a terrible precedent, and a development that could lead in the future to increasing demand for services (fire, ambulances, school buses).</p>
<p>173. The design of the buildings should have a more cottage/cabin design to respect the tradition of Minett and Clevelands House. Black and white buildings do not look natural to the land. We want to attract people that love and respect nature and the outdoors and are not looking for a modern condo outside the city.</p>
<p>174. The density of this draft plan is very high, but better than the original proposal.</p>
<p>175. The Council has a huge responsibility to do the right thing as far as development of this site goes. Do the environmentally responsible thing as far as development, density goes and respect the Minett Draft Plan as they have tried to balance a development they know is coming with continued quality of life at the cottage and home</p>
<p>176. The committee is on the right track - we need to halt this overdevelopment in Muskoka and maintain the lower density that exists today.</p>
<p>177. The climate impact of this massive development cannot be understated. The land use, removal of trees, loss of habitat and diminishing biodiversity will be unsustainable. The use of building materials with untenable carbon footprints and the likely choice of Fossil Fuel heating and cooling will significantly increase the Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the community and make the required reductions in these GHG's unattainable. This accommodation will be beyond the reach of nearly all year round residents. There will be nothing affordable to the "general" public looking for a family holiday in an "eco tourist" destination and the jobs created will mostly be minimum wage service jobs and will not contribute to workers earning a living wage in Muskoka. The income gap will be further widened. This concept fails on so many levels. It could be instead an opportunity to develop a sustainable, state of the art world class eco tourist destination in a pristine Muskoka wilderness with a totally different design vision. That vision and the values of living within our planetary means are nowhere to be seen in this project. It is one more nail in the coffin of our children's future. Big development making a few very wealthy to cater to the very wealthy at the expense of all the rest. This is an atrocity.</p>
<p>178. the clear cutting of trees as they did in the first development at Legacy was xxx this should be stopped on future plans also the boat docking and waterfront density is a significant problem</p>
<p>179. The bay is too small to support so many swimmers and boaters for these developments. Too much congestion. Needs considerable restriction to maintain the character of Muskoka.</p>
<p>180. The Bay an Lake Rosseau cannot support the density proposed</p>

181. The area is busy enough during the summer months without adding to an already overburdened infrastructure.
182. The approval of this application its policies will set the precedent for future redevelopment applications, therefore every effort should be made to set the standard for the density and type of development, to control the nature and type of future developments on the Muskoka Lakes
183. The airbnb / short term cottage rental experiment has failed. You cannot find a middle ground. Follow the lead of other jurisdictions and ban it outright. If its a resort - then a maximum of 4 weeks per year per person (not based on the name on the reservation). If its a cottage, apply the same rules everyone else abides by.
184. The aim has to be to minimize the density of the development and to ensure that the environment can support it . No mention of sewage treatment in your survey which is I think a critical issue.
185. The Rosseau (and other facilites) is/are in existence ,, with limited all year round usage..... W H Y do we we need another limited facility - during a few summer months....
186. Thanks to the Minett Steering Committee for their work.
187. Thanks to the committee for their efforts.
188. Thanks for the hard work on everyone's behalf.
189. Thanks for seeking public input.
190. Thanks for putting in the effort on this!
191. Thanks for keeping us informed.
192. Thanks for asking for opinions, and good luck with the process
193. Thanks for asking and seeking public input.
194. Thanks for all the hard work and commitment to ensuring this development is done right. This work is integral to protecting the Muskoka Lakes from over zealous development.
195. Thank you to the volunteers who have brought these issues forward to the general public like me.
196. Thank you to the Friends of Muskoka and the MLA for your efforts and the volunteer hours being spent on this important matter
197. Thank you for your work.
198. Thank you for your work on our behalf Survey was very well presented I am very sceptical of township listening to your recommendations
199. Thank you for your involvement and presentation - please do all possible to ensure there is suitable consensus for whatever is ultimately decided.
200. Thank you for your efforts on all our behalf
201. Thank you for your efforts in collaboration and representation of Muskoka residents.
202. Thank you for your advocacy.
203. Thank you for working on this issue.
204. Thank you for this opportunity.
205. thank you for the work you are doing to protect Muskoka from over-development, destruction of nature, noise and light pollution, over-density and unwanted changes to the beautiful landscape.
206. Thank you for the work you are doing on our behalf. We have ONE chance to do this right. Once blasting of the virgin landscape and tree felling begins there is no going back. We have a treasure, and it is encumbant upon us to protect the area for the generations who come after us. As such, all parties involved

<p>in the approval process and the development itself should take this work extremely seriously. Decisions should NOT be made based on leveraging the highest ROI for a developer. I have said this before, and I will repeat: Tuscany remains a beautiful, natural jewel on this earth because the decisions were made and continue to be maintained to protect the area from development. For this reason it remains a top destination in the world. We can do this for Muskoka if we have the will and the environmental conscience to do so.</p>
<p>207. Thank you for the opportunity and the amazing role you are playing in this important and critical discussion for the future of our lakes!!!</p>
<p>208. Thank you for taking this on. The Bracebridge Official Plan is also in serious need of amendment to raise the environmental standards. Very unfriendly to species at risk.</p>
<p>209. Thank you for sharing and let's hope we can take some time to pause in these difficult times. This is no time to introduce undo stress for the sake of money. Resorts are awesome but small is best....for everyone, not just a select few. Cheers!</p>
<p>210. Thank you for reaching out for input.</p>
<p>211. Thank you for giving those of us on other lakes the chance to review this material and express our views. You will set the precedents for continued cottage living in coming decades.</p>
<p>212. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to offer my opinions. I appreciate it.</p>
<p>213. Thank you for caring about our environment. When I was a teenager, we could boat in the area and have uncluttered shoreline views on all three lakes. Let's no continue to turn this into downtown Toronto.</p>
<p>214. Thank you for asking!</p>
<p>215. Thank you for asking for my feedback.</p>
<p>216. Thank you for all your work on this. I feel it is very important for us to protect Muskoka for future generations</p>
<p>217. Thank you for all you do to preserve Muskoka</p>
<p>218. Thank you for advocating for balance. The Steering Committee got it right. Adhere to their recommendations.</p>
<p>219. thank u for keeping me in the loop, please keep the info coming!! your work is much appreciated.</p>
<p>220. Tell the politicians to quit allowing the greed for profit to over-ride the qualities of Muskoka that it what it is.</p>
<p>221. Stories have emerged about how the Marriott dumps raw sewage into Lake Rosseau. This is a relatively new development and I'm surprised that preventing this would not have been built into the original plans and approved by the Township. A concern then might be how effective municipal/provincial oversight would be for a project of this scope.</p>
<p>222. Stop the madness.</p>
<p>223. Stop everything Have some guts , and say no. Think of our children's children what will they see.</p>
<p>224. Stop all development</p>
<p>225. stick with The Minett steering committee recomendations</p>
<p>226. stay strong! It's important to get this right, it sets a precident.</p>
<p>227. Staff housing MUST be on site or next door. It is the responsibility of the developers to provide accommodation for staff!</p>
<p>228. Some of the questions are difficult to read due to the language used. The development should not happen on the scale proposed. The people that will use the proposed development are not full time owners and will not care about the environment "the lake" and its surrounding area.</p>

229. So sad to see the loss of Cleavelands House, an icon in our beloved Muskoka. Any development should preserve the beauty of our region so all can enjoy it...travelers and residents alike.
230. So sad to see the changes happening in Muskoka. I guess that is what progress is called now a days.
231. So much development in Muskoka, seems like it will loose its charm ! More people, more pollution etc
232. so important to prevent over development on the lake
233. Small area to have that much buildings
234. Slippery slope started when JW Marriott first allowed, nothing will stop the greed in the once beautiful corner of the lake if anything of this scale is allowed.
235. Six Mile is sympathetic. We do not have any commercial resorts that are going to flip. Good luck!
236. Should be promoting more naturalist view point and less on development.
237. Should be operated as a resort not condos or time sharing.
238. Shame on these developers! They are ruining the environment for the sake of money. These people don't care about the environment. This is what leads to global warming - one footprint at a time.
239. Set the bar very high for environment, noise, light, traffic. Close all loopholes.
240. seems overbuild....very concerned about noise "pollution" and SAFE traffic level on Peninsula Road.....also want residential units rather than traveling public units.
241. Save Minnett
242. SAD!. Having spent over 75 years vacationing at our cottage on Lake Jo, I am saddened by many of the changes in Muskoka but I know I am blessed to have been able to enjoy the area for so long and understand others desire to be able to enjoy it too!
243. Sad!
244. Sad to see such proposed development. It will detrimental to the desired Muskoka experience.
245. Sad to say, the development will go ahead. Tax dollars speak louder. Those of us who have been here for numerous years pine for the peace & quiet of what once was our natural beautiful setting.
246. Sad to overbuild this resort
247. Rosseau is at an inflection point. If this is allowed to proceed it will damage the lake forever and have far reaching consequences.
248. Rock and roll
249. responsible development. we all lose if the appeal of the lake is destroyed (natural environment, overcrowding etc)
250. Remembrance that almost everyone values the environment of Muskoka.
251. Remember why people come to Muskoka- beautiful scenery, good swimming, canoeing, sailing. I love the birds and wildlife. I would not come to a Muskoka that looked like the draft plan.
252. Quit approving these huge resorts which only spoil our lakes and environment.
253. Put a stop to this desecration . A xx of xxx was xxxx neither of them still around . These embedded zoning permissions were never intended to make Minnett into Miami Beach !
254. Progress is one thing but building a small city is what it looks like the plan is. This will take away all reason people want to come to Lake Rosseau. Keep the city buildings in the city. Don't let Lake Rosseau be destroyed.
255. Progress is OK if done correctly but this entire expansion is too much all at once, max 1,000 units would provide a way to do measured growth over time.

256. Progress and urbanization is unfortunately inevitable. That being said, building the resort in a respectful way to minimize environmental and human issues is the right way to go. Obviously we'd rather not see it there at all, but if we have to have it built, do it in a way that doesn't conflict with the values and beauty of Muskoka
257. Preserving the natural beauty and environment of Muskoka should come first before commercial reward. Safety is also a concern.
258. Preserve Muskoka's "one with nature" character and stop greed and overdevelopment. Resorts should be built like resorts and NOT like crowded residential streets on a waterfront. Keep heavy density residential away from the waterfront. Otherwise, we will destroy our lakes, the habitat, and the natural beauty of our landscape. No one wants to vacation amidst a densely crowded area that looks like a city with a waterfront.
259. Pollution-Environmental Concerns 1. Run off into Bruce Lake 2. Major changes to landscape - trees, rocks and the environment 3. Increase traffic and noise and light
260. Please, Town Council, don't mess this up. Overdevelopment may kill water quality for generations!
261. Please stop this! Sets terrible precedent for the rest of Muskoka. Greed and financial motivation is not okay. This area needs to be preserved.
262. Please stop Cleveland's house from this big development!
263. Please safeguard Muskoka. Let my grandchildren enjoy what I have enjoyed
264. Please remember that we cannot undo development but can always add to it. And please be mindful that we're all going to be gone in the next 30-50 years but the land will still be here ...
265. Please remember that the lake is shared and owned by many. Just because you can make a huge profit for over development, it doesn't mean you should. Treat the land and the neighbours with respect please
266. Please put in place policies that prevent a lot of future growth in Minett, particularly residential growth. The bay is small, already overcrowded and we want to prevent lots and lots of more boats on the lakes. Residential owners will want boats. Please keep any future growth commercial.
267. Please provide Staff Housing. And please allow access to the lake for the public, period.
268. Please provide a plan from any owner who intends to build a resort in Muskoka that they have the finances in place to develop and construct such a resort and they have the same finances in place for many years forward. Muskoka does not need another abandoned or partially constructed development.
269. Please protect our shoreline!!! Thank you
270. Please protect our paradise.
271. Please protect our diminishing waterfront and protect the health of the environment. Over development is a great concern all across Muskoka. We are losing the pristine beauty that we have. Once it is gone, we will never get it back!! Tread lightly!!!
272. Please protect Muskoka from this awful big city expansion. Think of the legacy for generations to come...we need to protect our shorelines and environment.
273. Please preserve the natural beauty of Lake Rosseau, and don't bend to the commercial and financial pressure of unfit development. My family has owned property on this lake for over 100 years and it will be a tragedy if this is allowed to proceed.
274. Please please do not proceed without truly understanding what you are doing and the cascading changes this proposed development would have on the residents already there. If it is permitted to proceed, the Township will not be able to undo what results.

275. Please make an effort to preserve the beauty of Muskoka. It will be criminal if development of the land/ buildings added to this waterfront do not reflect the environment. A sad day when developer's cash profits outstrip the need for a community that honours the natural beauty here.
276. PLEASE LISTEN TO THE RESIDENTS BOTH FULL TIME AND SEASONAL TO THE FUTURE PRESERVATION OF THE NATURAL ASPECT OF OUR LAKES.
277. Please limit development to preserve the lakes. Minnet should not look like Gravenhurst and should not destroy Port Sandfield and Port Carling communities
278. Please keep to maximum 1,000 units with low buildings set back far from shore and large vegetation buffers.
279. Please keep this development low density, keeping trees and looking natural
280. Please keep it under control.
281. Please keep in mind what drew us all to Muskoka in the first place. The tranquility and peacefulness that it represented. We need to keep that! Thanks.
282. Please keep in mind that we are in a climate emergency. Will these buildings be passive, using the best quality of materials? Think about building for ECO tourism. Get rid of the big power boats.
283. please just keep it the way it is....
284. Please hold firm...as there is not turning back. Legacy development should never have been permitted.
285. Please don't let these greedy developers ruin Muskoka
286. Please don't let development greed destroy Muskoka's appeal.
287. Please don't let commercial interests ruin the natural beauty of Muskoka.
288. Please don't let a big, massive hotel style building go up, the JW already looks terribly out of place and brings so many people to a small area it is unsafe when boating. forget about swimming.
289. Please do not make Clevelands House an overpopulated resort. J.W. Marriott has changed that whole area - its not the relaxing Muskoka we know...its become a very elitist spot. It doesn't fit in Muskoka. Do we really have to take over animal habitat and risk our environment so that half of Toronto elites can come up and spend all their money? Sure, upgrade Clevelands House but don't turn it into a money-grabbing snotty place like J.W. Marriott.
290. Please do not allow this. For the love of god. Please.
291. Please discuss the limits on Helicopter traffic. This is becoming a real nuisance and a development like this looks like it would attract helicopter visits for golf and meals. Muskoka is not an airport. It has an airport and air traffic should be limited to that (Bracebridge) or once a week visits at smaller pads not multi visits per day or multi days per week.
292. Please control this development for now and for the future of our lakes and the impacted environment.
293. Please consider that Lake Rosseau is already at its carrying capacity in terms of peak summer boat traffic and also in terms of environmental issues related to sewage and wastewater, as well as the pollution from motorboats.
294. Please be mindful and respectful of the natural setting. Large and dense developments need to be subtle, blend into the environment and not have a detrimental impact to the people already there.
295. Please balance habitat and humane needs to coexist.
296. People really need to think about this before they do this. It will ruin what Muskoka is all about, it's history and its beauty. Our family has come up for 125 years and people do not care about the environment.

297. Peninsula Rd is too busy now during the high season and they all drive far too fast! For those of us that live on Peninsula Rd the traffic can be overwhelming and sometimes very difficult to get out of our driveways as is 
298. Pay attention to the Monet committee.
299. pay attention the Minett steering committee recommendations.
300. Owners need to make money is irrelevant. They knew the rules when they bought the resort. If we want to truly make this open to everyone make the area a park- not a spa and restaurant
301. Overdevelopment will ruin the entire area.
302. Overall no matter what gets done it will be too much development/density there. It is already far too busy and unsafe on the water. Units should not be for sale and should be strictly hotel type operations eliminating the owner usage.
303. Over population and too dense development will destroy the flavor and appeal of Muskoka.
304. Only time will tell . The environment will be the one that suffers.
305. Only that the proposed resort makes me sick to my stomach and that many of us will have to drive past it regularly. Greed is rampant in Muskoka!
306. Only that the over-commercialization of the area will have unintended long-term adverse impacts that will urbanize the cottage experience. Is that what we really want?
307. once built, it will be a permanent scar on that area and create negative impact on a much larger area than property boundaries e.g. traffic on Peninsula Rd and impact on water quality
308. On site accommodation for staff is IMPERATIVE On site management of the staff accommodation is also a MUST. Trust me.....I know of what I speak
309. not restrictive enough
310. Not convinced that this will be beneficial to the community. We need way way way more public access to the lakes. Not more privatization. Shameful how little public spaces are in Muskoka.
311. Not at this time
312. Not at this time
313. Not at this time
314. Not appropriate for cottage country
315. None. Good luck.
316. No.
317. No questions on your survey are asked about sewage or septic systems. I find that very disheartening. Considering that E-coli is a concern for water quality (and very human generated in most cases unless ducks explode), you should have discussions for the public or at least questions on your survey that make the public consider where all the poop and pee will go for all these new resort residents. Not glamorous topics, but ESSENTIAL.
318. No one forced the successive developers to acquire the properties and there was no guarantee their best case plans would be approved without changes being imposed by the respective authorities charged with this responsibility. I find the argument of greater employment to be unconvincing.
319. no matter which way the plan goes it won't please everyone so let's work to find a middle solution suitable to all. Also I personally think that any development of this sort should give some thought to the needs of other seasonal or full-time residence when planning out recreational facilities. There should be some thought given to partnering with the Township, service groups and outside organizations to build facilities

<p>which will benefit the entire community. Restaurants are a given but don't forget a swimming pool that can be used of lessons or fitness facilities that the surrounding community can join and use. Or tennis courts or more importantly pickleball courts. People coming to use these facilities will also dine there ... win/win. The Township won't or can't afford to build them so why not have the Resort do it for them??</p>
<p>320.No matter what the final decision - how can we ensure that the development will follow the rules for both safety and environmental concerns? This is just as big an issue as the development itself. Thank you for all the work you are doing. Much appreciate.</p>
<p>321.No emphasis on the site's heritage character</p>
<p>322.No but original plan is excessive and should be reduced inline with the proposal. Too much density will ruin boating , swimming and driving the roads.</p>
<p>323.No</p>
<p>324.No</p>
<p>325.No</p>
<p>326.no</p>
<p>327.no</p>
<p>328.No</p>
<p>329.No</p>
<p>330.No</p>
<p>331.no</p>
<p>332.No</p>
<p>333.no</p>
<p>334.No</p>
<p>335.No</p>
<p>336.No</p>
<p>337.No</p>
<p>338.No</p>
<p>339.Need to follow recommendations of steering committee</p>
<p>340.Need to balance use and growth. But have to be fair.</p>
<p>341.n/a</p>
<p>342.My main concern is for what this development would mean for future developments. Water quality is key, yet there appears to little or no discussion about what infrastructure would be put in place to manage sewage. Marriott had a spill in 2020. The spill should have been considered a crisis, yet it was barely news. As cottagers, we are required to adhere to extremely strict regulations for septic infrastructure. The development in question must meet or exceed similar requirements. I am against such a development including day boat access to the lake via a public boat launch (if the marina were to provide such a for-fee service, I would like to see a substantial portion of the fee be allocated to the township for infrastructure support). Water quality must be a priority.</p>
<p>343.My great-grandparents were born in this area... and though much has changed since, it's been such rapid development that I am concerned that my grandchildren will not enjoy much of the wildness and peace of Muskoka as it won't exist anymore.</p>

344. My fear is this Minett development will set a precedent that will spread throughout Muskoka and have a very damaging effect on the environment, water pollution, and noise pollution. The lakes are already busy and noisy impacting the beauty of Muskoka. Developers want to make Muskoka just like Toronto with high-rise living, restaurants, retail and wellness centres. I thought a Muskoka vacation was to get away from all that.
345. My father came to Lake Joseph in 1929 and loved what was here. He died in 2003 and did not like the development that was happening at that point in time. He would be HORRIFIED at what Muskoka is TODAY. He would say that "development" has already ruined Muskoka. And so any further "development" should not be allowed. Our development mentality is not leading us toward a "sustainable" future.
346. My family started coming to Muskoka over 100 years ago for the solitude and escape to nature it provided. Now Muskoka is loud and busy. We are damaging a beautiful resource so developers and the rich can get richer. If we lose the environment we have nothing. Stop catering to those who only want to profit off of Muskoka and find sustainable ways to build an economy.
347. My biggest concern is about overcrowding in Muskoka; water quality; environmental damage; and traffic.
348. Muskoka will fast lose its appeal if a city of large buildings grows around its shores.
349. Muskoka needs to progress with the times and having new development is key for the local economy however it is paramount that the precedent that is set is thoughtful and mindful for future generations to enjoy this beautiful place on all big 3 lakes.
350. Muskoka is very unique and we should protect our environment for clean drinking water, safe boating, safe driving, cycling, walking on our roads. Reduction of noise both in cars and boats and proper licensing of boat drivers who must have practical tests not just written.
351. Muskoka is popular for its natural beauty. Covering the earth and waterfront with commercial developments is shortsighted.
352. Muskoka is not conducive to massive development projects like this one. Council should create incentives to provide an increased number of lower impact projects. If commercial projects like this go ahead, they should offset the existing and astronomical property taxes for private landowners.
353. Muskoka is and has been an escape place from city life. These proposals bring city life to Muskoka and all the problems associated with it such noise not tranquility and will ultimately change the area forever in a bad way. The environment will be changed and damaged by development and the lakes will see increased pollution as the ecosystem will be disrupted. Muskoka has survived and will continue to survive without this type of large scale development. Please move slowly and cautiously as these proposals are dangerous from many many standpoints.
354. Muskoka is a treasure to be developed with care to preserve it for future generations of Ontarians .Preserving its environment yet allowing growth and responsible development where warranted
355. Muskoka is a place that invites tourists to visit and enjoy the natural beauty or the lakes and nature. Any and all development needs to keep that at the forefront of their plans. Over densification chases away the animals, pollutes our lakes , washes out the night sky and ruined the quiet of Muskoka. Developers should find a way to develop the land without ruining the thing they are trying to make money off of.
356. Muskoka is a destination because it is not over used/crowded - it is magical because you can travel back in time and experience a bit of the history of the north- this development could turn it into the water front in Toronto
357. Muskoka has experienced too many grand development plans where the developer goes bankrupt and leaves a site mess. Ensure significant deposits etc are part of the development plan and policies.

358.	Mr. Goldhar has done MUSKOKA a big favour and should be treated properly in the context of allowing him not to lose on his investment
359.	Mr Goldhar is being too greedy with his plans. He was brought in to help solve the overdevelopment issue, not just to dull it down from a tsunami to an earthquake. Please minimize these plans as MUCH as possible.
360.	Most of what is being proposed is too many people in too small a space. Environmental impact will be huge. Loss of trees significant,. Cycling, pedestrian and motor safety will be reduced. Why create a small town in such s pristine environment.
361.	Most important thing is to preserve the views and the water quality. We can live with whatever promotes those two things. That is what we come here for, after all.
362.	More staff on-site 24/7 and less condo or time share theme. Encourage full resort activites, similar to Cleveland's House, Aston Villa, typically experienced in the 1970's. More employment & more infrastructure to benefit entire community before approvals granted.
363.	More restaurants! Will encourage people from Lake Muskoka to boat up more often!
364.	more development should not happen. The density photos are appalling.
365.	More building restriction on the entire project.
366.	Minimize building height. Protect the waterfront and the environment (trees, water quality, pollution). Boater safety is very critical. Peninsula Road and Minnett can not handle this level of development. Protect and limit development in Muskoka —the beauty and serene environment is what makes Muskoka beautiful. Don't ruin it please!
367.	Minnett will change forever from the quaint small village that it has been for over a century. All the reasons people come to Muskoka to enjoy it will drastically change in a very negative way. Remember, once in place a bad decision like this, cannot be reversed.
368.	Minnett should continue to be a Hamlet not become a Resort Village with hundreds of homes.
369.	Minnett must move forward but perhaps in stages so we can assess how well the changes can be absorbed and tolerated by the residents and the environment in this fragile area.
370.	Minnett Joint Policy Steering Committee recommendations should be adopted
371.	Minnett is part of Muskoka and Muskoka is a gorgeous prime area in Ontario which needs protecting. High density resorts/multilevel buildings are an impediment to Muskoka's beauty and health and safety. We need to act as stewards for this gorgeous part of Ontario to ensure our lakes continue to be healthy for future generations and current owners. We get our water from the lake for our homes - it's a valuable resource that needs protecting. Keeping habitats natural and protecting our environment is integral to the continued enjoyment of Muskoka. Why would we ever want to harm it? I'm not opposed to growth but why such a huge project/undertaking - what about a phased in approach to ensure it's workable for our future?
372.	Minnett cannot stay they way it is. It is currently in a dilapidated state with sewage smell coming from Cleveland's house. However, I think the density needs to be controlled for environmental purposes, boat traffic purposes and road traffic purposes.
373.	Mega resorts are common throughout the world. There is only one unique area in the world known as Muskoka. Please save this area for future generations to see & enjoy.
374.	make it look like old Muskoka ,ie like Cleveland's house used to look like in its great days
375.	Maintaining water quality in Muskoka is of key importance. These large scale developments put way too much strain on our irreplaceable natural resources.

376.looks too dense. Is it feasible? Remember the prime season is basically 2 months and you will lose money in winter if you stay open.
377.LOOKS LIKE TORONTO IN MUSKOKA
378.Looks like a huge undertaking with significant implications to the area - need to proceed very carefully as once it's underway, there is no turning back.
379.Local opinion matters most. Under-development better than over-development. Push for year-round use of property and amenities to encourage local business infrastructure development.
380.Living very close to Cleaven House, We would like the property to be Developed, but only if it's done as a boutique resort, more so for the travelling public. Not for speculators. The property needs a responsible development. We would also recommend 9 km speed limit, in the area , with no boat rentals and especially seadoos rentals in the area.
381.Limit development as much as possible. Muskoka is already being spoiled and however this turns out it will only get worse, not better.
382.Like the public beach, restaurants and retail.
383.Let's try to make sure that there are enough activities that people come and stay on the property rather than use it as a launching place to explore all over.
384.Let's be precise on WHO benefits - who wins, who loses?? Watch out for presumptions and assumptions!
385.Let's all be honest here. The best we can do is win a few reasonable restrictions on density, boat dockage etc. But Minett is going from village to resort town [think Grand Bend] with ONE road access, it's a tradgedy.
386.Let's keep Muskoka environmental beauty not large developments.
387.let it happen, but happen right
388.Less is more.
389.Less is more for future generations - less density, commercial enterprise more emphasis on nature. As an example, more safe bike trails and less retail stores. I don't want this to be the first project in a line of future projects that continues to erode the natural beauty, uniqueness of this place, a place to get away from what you normally do. Yes, things will change, there is always change but let's make it positive change for the better of all the community not just a few.
390.Less is better initially. You can always build more later, of course that's more expensive but you shouldn't worry about the developers costs.
391.Leave Muskoka to be the gem it is ... go put your condos in the GTA
392.Kudos to SQL, FOM and the MLA for representing cottagers's interests relating to development in Minett.
393.Keeping the charm and beauty of Cleveland's house - would work by putting some love and investment into the existing framework versus what is a blatant money grab and will destroy the lake. A suburb of Toronto is not a reasonable development in such a beautiful part of the world.
394.Keeping fingers crossed that sanity not greed will prevail.
395.Keep up the good work! We live here after developers maximize their dollars and leave for others to clean up. I'm ok with you original controls. I am a surveyor and land economist with 50 years experience !!!
396.Keep up the good work! Only one chance to get this right. I agree that there should be no loose ends on interpretation! There are many good examples of environmental sensitive development in the world. The outcome in this regard will only be as good as the expertise of the team who are charged with realizing this project and by those whose responsibility it is maintain and protect what is essentially our unique Muskoka.

There are lots of developers who don't know the difference of good development and outstanding development, Remember what must be protected and can be shared effectively if done right. One chance only!
397.Keep up the good work
398.Keep up the excellent work in keeping us informed ~up to date.
399.Keep the density low, set the bar very high for safety, wetland preservation, wildlife preservation and water quality. Concentrate on cleaning up the Wallace bay area including trails, it is all quite a disgrace to muskoka at the moment.
400.Keep redevelopment to a minimum to preserve quality of environment Is a huge hotel really necessary?
401.Keep Muskoka natural and beautiful. That's why we love it here and why people visit.
402.Keep Muskoka Muskoka. The Red Leaves resort started all this development. Too much in that corner is a mistake
403.Keep Muskoka beautiful and safe.
404.Keep Muskoka as is. Shift intense use to areas already so designated in Ontario. A good start on reaching an agreement. Thanks to everyone who has worked so hard for Muskoka as is!
405.keep it a resort only, no permanent residency or seasonal residency.
406.Keep Heritage character of Cleveland's House.
407.Keep density to the lowest level!
408.Keep density and boat traffic down.
409.Just way way way too much for the environment, and surrounding community. Why so large?
410.Just too big
411.Just to be careful. You can't go back and regret over allowing these developers too much will haunt you for the rest of your life. Just consider that you could be responsible for the end of something you love.
412.Just thank you to all who have worked so hard on these proposals.
413.Just as when the Marriott was built, we are very opposed to more multi unit buildings. The increase in traffic, the decline in the beauty of the drive, and the additional numbers of people affect all of us who have raised our families here over the spring and summer and fall months.
414.Just an overall bad development. It will ironically lead to the deterioration of all aspects of what for generations has made the area special and an attractive place to live and cottage. It makes a mockery of what we treasure in the area.
415.Its too much for a small area and will decrease the value of the cottages there already. Its not right
416.It's important to get this right as it will set a new precedent.
417.It's yet again obvious that the developers have their own pockets as their only concern. Community enhancement be damned.
418.It's sad that this development is even being considered. It will ruin the area.
419.It's not too late to do the right thing. Follow the advice of the Minnett Steering Committee .
420.It's critical that from the water there are no high rise or midrise building seen. In addition the history of the site must be respected ie the main building must be saved and restored as well as the boathouse and dock. All building should complement the original architecture of the main building. If ther is going to be stores and restaurants they should be close together in a village setting to create a pedestrian hub, rather

<p>than spread out amongst parking lots. Appreciate developers must hit financial thresholds to meet costs, but the precedence of this site must ensure the environment and lake health are the top priority.</p>
<p>421. It would be nice to understand the long term costs to local tax payers. The developers will argue that this will bring taxes to the community, but I don't see how the tax base will be able to pay for ongoing sewage issues and road development costs that will inevitably be a part of this development.</p>
<p>422. It would be nice to see the entire development package the new owners of Cleavelands have put together</p>
<p>423. It would be great to ensure that the public has adequate access to the waterfront.</p>
<p>424. It will happen, you know it. Pathetic.</p>
<p>425. It still needs so much more work before approval in order to protect natural surroundings, water and boating safety and 'Muskoka' aesthetic.</p>
<p>426. It should be no different than for the rest of Muskoka. I am glad I rarely go up Peninsula road. I will be using it even less if this goes through.</p>
<p>427. It should be an absolute requirement that no policies get pushed beyond the current recommended limit for this project. Once we make height/density allowances for this beyond what's in place now, Muskoka's future is doomed. There are tons of friendly, respectful people living around here in Minett (including my own family). Our opinion wasn't taken seriously in preventing this development and I fear for the future of our little Hamlet of Minett. Muskoka was meant to stay Muskoka, and nobody around here asked for this.</p>
<p>428. It seems this proposal is an extension of the Marriott development that will negatively impact the character of Minett as we know it.</p>
<p>429. It seems the die was cast in 2007 when the area was rezoned urban. Only thing we can do is negotiate with owner to reduce size and scope of project. The strain on roads and water treatment facilities will be huge. For those of us who use Peninsula Road, conditions and access to our landing will be very different in 10 years.</p>
<p>430. It seems like the regulations for private cottages are increasing each year. In one decision the impact of this development is likely larger than the impact of all of the cottages currently on Lake Rosseau!</p>
<p>431. It looks like the government is only looking to collect taxes rather than thinking about the area itself and its well being.</p>
<p>432. It just makes one realize the critical importance of getting the next official plan correct with the overall environmental impact being critical</p>
<p>433. It is very important that there be required adequate tree planting to reduce the visual effects of so much building.</p>
<p>434. It is very important that the uniqueness of what Muskoka represents can be preserved. The region does need to be shared, but it needs to be done in a thoughtful way that does not undermine the future and respects the environment.</p>
<p>435. It is sad to see this type of development further erode the beauty of Lake Rosseau. Thanks for your efforts to try to protect this area...</p>
<p>436. It is quite concerning that our property at 2060 Peninsula Rd located in between Cleveland's House and Legacy cottages is listed on the legend as "Potential Future Growth Area".</p>
<p>437. It is important to maintain the shoreline and views from the water. Buildings should not be higher than the treeline and should seriously be limited. The lakes can't handle another 100 inexperienced boaters.</p>
<p>438. It is important to maintain the qualities that make Muskoka unique: trees, fresh clear water, and a chance to walk or swim without being afraid of being run over.</p>

439. It is important that this be done right and with mitigation for environmental impact but it is equally important that pictures are properly represented when you are trying to get rationale and appropriate feedback.
440. It is a developer "cheat" method to convert old resorts into residential units
441. Is the demand there for a big resort such as this? Thanks for trying to preserve Muskoka
442. Inspections and enforcement are essential for the future of Muskoka. We need to invest in these areas to have any impact on the huge monetary pressures
443. Incredibly sad that this development was allowed to get this far so we have no good options. The short term thinking on this is beyond understanding.
444. Important to maintain look and feel of Muskoka green space, trees. Lower density and building height are critical. Do not want to hold back development but constraints are key so it is not overbuilt.
445. Important to have proper staff housing. I'd like the township/provincial government to work on affordable housing in Minett to support expansion of the community. Water quality is an issue.
446. I'm sorry to see this sudden and significant change coming to old Muskoka
447. I'm really concerned about the density in the Minett area, especially on the lake. I used to boat to the Clevelands House but rarely go there now. The amount of boat traffic is very concerning. I'm just glad Lake Joe doesn't have the amount of commercial resorts like Rosseau has. If they did, I would be more inclined to sell my property.
448. If you want these lakes to stay the way they are you need to consider turning these commercial sites to residential sites that meet the current standards.
449. If you are putting limits on number of units then mandate that at least 20% of the units be "affordable" at the lower end of market conditions.
450. If you allow such development to proceed you might as well just abandon the whole lake. Lake Rosseau will no longer be special in any way and just a dumping ground for people and their filth.
451. If this isn't controlled, where will it breakout again in Muskoka. Once lost, never regained.
452. If this is the future of Muskoka you can say goodbye to what made Muskoka attractive in the first place; nature, clean water and serenity. Instead this will create high density time-share resorts which stress the environment and reduce boater and swimmer safety. Cottage property values will collapse. Tourism is fickle; most people only visit resorts once then move on to another area. It's not a sustainable model. Local trades people who own their own business working on cottages will end up working in service jobs at these resorts. It will spiral downward. We saw this same resort model back in pre-WWII and look what happened...most resorts burnt down or went bankrupt from lack of customers. Why is this failed model being done again? It's a blight on our environment. I was a Muskoka cottage owner for 35 plus years. I am glad I am out of it if this is the future.
453. If this development goes ahead it would be horrible. Over crowding and lack of personal investment in this area brings carelessness and zero respect for the area. Lakes will become dangerous, which we're already seeing now. Pollution in all forms. This is all about making the all mighty buck. Unemployment is so high in this area already and no locals want to work. Who and how will they get people to work at this new resort. The people north of Minett will certainly be turned off by sitting in traffic jams just to get to the grocery store. I guess they'll have to head NORTH. This would be a travesty to this area. Commercialization will destroy the area. Will Minett turn into a second Port Carling where all the storefronts practically are real estate offices. Maybe work on Port Carling first to bring shops and restaurants, sidewalks before taking on a project like Minett.

454. If large development is allowed, other resorts will follow, over crowd the lakes and ruin it for everyone, especially long time cottages like is whose families have been coming here since the 1890's.
455. If even a modified version of this is approved, it's the BEGINNING OF THE END for the Muskoka Lakes as we know and love
456. If allowed to stand, the draft policies would destroy our community/neighborhood we have taken over a century to nurture. No community and its voters in the GTA or similar well managed communities across North America would allow a few people to so drastically change the nature of their communities visually, environmentally, or safety wise. It would be very difficult to change momentum if this is allowed to pass as is. The results I believe are difficult to visualize at this point in time, they would be so great over the next 25 years.
457. If a resort could replace Cleve's but still offer boaters and visitors a safe beach area and quality restaurants, great. Little rental cottages and green space would be wonderful.
458. I've been cottaging one MUSKOKA Lakes since birth and have lived full time in Bracebridge for twenty years. While we can not stop progress we can hopefully temper it with preservation (cultural, safety and ecology) as much as possible.
459. I'm very happy to be in Seguin Twp and truly saddened to see the scale of the proposed development. The Muskoka Lakes are a world class gem, best wishes to all for your efforts to preserve the natural beauty.
460. I would prefer that the traveling public have more access to all of the accommodations, but understand that off season it is difficult to fill a resort and keep it viable. It must be sized in order to fulfill the needs of high season yet kept viable during the off season. Environmental, cultural and safety concerns MUST be the guiding force in ALL future development. I believe the public is finally beginning to understand that. Muskoka is unique and we must not sell it out. We must fight to keep, it the gem that it is.
461. I would like to thank the Muskoka Steering Committee and other interested groups for all the hard work they have done and hope that we can move forward with realistic results that maintain the character, integrity and Natural beauty of Muskoka.
462. I would like to see the development to be reduced to preserve the beauty of the area !!!!
463. I would like to see development along the lines of resort communities such as Whistler
464. I would like to know what the sewer/sanitation plan and restrictions are for the re-built resort. The potential for water pollution is huge!! JW Marriott has already polluted the lake and gotten away with it.
465. I would be very excited about a redeveloped Cleveland's House that offers recreation facilities that are accessible for the use of the local community for a fee. I would support a small increase in floor space for the resort and a small number (around 20) of incremental condo units.
466. I would be curious to know the opinions of the Minett local and surrounding residents. They would be the most affected.
467. I wish it wasn't happening At all
468. I wasn't going to complete the survey because I feel that the views of cottagers and people who want quiet in Muskoka are being overlooked and dismissed in favour of developers under the guise of providing employment. I understand that some development will happen but if we don't get it right there isn't a chance to correct it. Future enjoyment is impacted forever. 2000 units is far too many. I don't understand how the environmental impact from this number of units will be kept to a safe level. We have seen the inability of the Marriott resort to handle sewage treatment and now a much larger development is being slated on and surrounding environmentally sensitive wetlands.

469.	I was shocked to see the currently development in Minett. all natural habitat has been essentially removed from this area of development...terrible...the land has been denuded. the visual from the lake onto this property now and what it looked like a year ago, is very upsetting. we are destroying the natural beauty of this part of coutry.
470.	I was hoping that Mitch Goldhar would be the saviour of Minett. Evidently not. But if it HAS to be developed, please ensure that the absolute minimum proposed is what is accepted.
471.	I urge the decision making bodies to respect the environment and allow the lowest density possible. This end of the lake is already overbuilt and the shore view ruined by Red Leaves which towers over the landscape.
472.	I urge the decision makers to consider the long term impact of this development on Muskoka and how it could possibly ruin Muskoka's appeal - the harm to the environment, to traffic to safe boating. I understand the need for jobs and the appeal of the potential prosperity but I would suggest if this is not done responsibly it will turn Muskoka into a form of Scarborough.
473.	I understand the developers want to maximize profit, but I think the social and environmental impacts of this proposal would tarnish the luster of Muskoka.
474.	I understand that there must be redevelopment in Minett but let's all work together to try and come up with a viable concept that does not destroy the ecological factors and creates an attractive classic muskoka vision not one of lake simcoe or hamptons ! For these plans are far too dense for the current restrictions and shall be hugely bothersome road , environmental, boating , personal safety ! This will also create huge opportunity for increase theft and crime !
475.	I understand that Muskoka is evolving and will continue to do so. I have a hard time understanding the constant push for development. We're developing ourselves right out of the sweet spot the keeps people coming back for generations. Keep it small ('ish) and simple.
476.	I understand that it is a commercial venture but having looked at the city subdivision look of Legacy which should never have happened and the number of boat slips that have been allowed .when individual cottages are so tightly controlled it is very important to our cottage families that we be heard by the town and the developers . Plus the inconvenience of having to drive through the disruption caused by the trucks , machinery, not to mention the traffic,dust, delays and the fact that peninsula Road will be severely damaged just so someone can build what they want. It's too much.
477.	I understand development is inevitable. Just want to keep the balance between, density-population and structures, nature, environment, night light pollution, boat traffic and noise level amongst others. Thanks for sending out the survey and good luck.
478.	I think this is tremendously important not just to the Minett area, but to all of Muskoka. The resort as proposed would ruin this precious area. And if allowed, it would be a precedent that other developers could leverage to do the same thing elsewhere on these magnificent lakes. We should not even consider more than 1000 low-rise units, limited to no new docking. Even 1000 units strikes me as way, way too many.
479.	I think this is a dangerous precedent. The developers will be back with proposals to build more high density communities. This will end up destroying Muskoka.
480.	I think the recommendations of the Minnett Steering Committee are all very valid and should be adhered to.
481.	I think it's safer for boating traffic if there are fewer boat slips in and around Wallace Bay Marina and more boat slip development in front of the proposed hotel site
482.	I think it's great that a resort community is planned, but the large scale of it is quite tragic. I loved vacationIng in Minett and this makes me sad. Plan seems totally out of touch, superficial and shallow but I

guess some visitors will be drawn to this.. I would not want to look out from my dock and see this view. I also hope some of the historic buildings from Cleveland's house are saved.
483.I think it is absolutely imperative that there be staff housing on this site. Staff should not be accommodated in nearby towns such as Bala. Throughout the document there are too many qualifying words such as 'where appropriate',if possible'. This lays the groundwork for many future challenges from this resort and others that may use this as a model. I think the policies need to be tightened and not open to interpretation.
484.I think environmental protection and water quality are very important. The Lakeside Lodge area redevelopment - clearcutting etc. was unfortunate and should not have happened.
485.I support the Minnet Steering committees recommendations. We need to minimize the amount of density in this development as well as reduce heights and proximity to lakeshore. This large resort will have very negative long term effects on or beautiful lake Rousseau.
486.I strongly suggest any future development on resort/commercial that has residential aspects be converted into what was done at Bangor Lodge July 30, 2018 on Coote,Hiley,Gemmett Ltd. Surveyors. 4 Waterfront residential lots with frontages 302.ft.
487.I sincerely hope that the planning councils and governing bodies seriously consider how the environment in Muskoka is being severely impacted by so much development, and the legacy we are leaving future generations. Who is to look after these massive infrastructure projects in years/decades to come after we have scarred the environment and landscape with them?
488.I should like to know how many "units" currently exist - do they include Red Leaves. If the expansion is limited to max 2000, how many new units does that permit. Also, what does "non Red Leaves" mean. Is Red Leaves exempt from this policy document?
489.I repeat that the decisions should be relatively easy to make. Photos of the Lake of the Ozarks should be a reminder of how this whole thing can get out of control. Muskoka risks the same, sad future. As a society, we should know better.
490.I realize that the desire for country property is growing. But we must protect what attracts us here isn the first place. We need more TREES, CLEAN WATER, access to trails etc. NOT luxury, expensive condos/cottages. We need modest cabins, small hotels etc. I think you know where I stand.
491.I love Cleveland's House and the old feel of a Muskoka resort. Don't ruin it with a Marriott style hotel. That's not cottaging! That's not Muskoka
492.I loathe development of Natural Resources to commercialize and make money. Tell Toronto people to stay in Toronto with their asphalt & density. Once destroyed, never returned and Muskoka will cease to be the breath of fresh air and relaxation that it is treasured for. I get on the 400 extension and tension drains away - with this kind of development - it is substituting one urban sprawl for another. Keep it in Collingwood.....
493.I joined FOM for exactly this reason-good survey Now- I did not rejoin MLA and will no longer support FOM due to your influence on individual property restrictions and rights You're out of your lane! Get back on this track
494.I hope those in charge take future generations into consideration. Muskoka has already failed to protect its fragile environment and should be doing everything to encourage responsible and state of the art environmentally conscious construction. Will the dollar or doing the right thing win this debate?
495.I hope this keeps a friendly village feel which would be nice to visit. Thanks for the opportunity to give input. My cottage is further up the lake but my friends are right beside this.
496.I hope that those in power will take this very seriously and do what is right for the lake, the land, and those who need them.

497. I hope that people today have come to realize that when they live in close contact to a large number of people it results in health, social and emotional problems. People in Minett do not want their lifestyle disrupted by developers who are only interested in making money and have no regard for local people.
498. I hope that a long term view, with consideration of the health of the lake is taken seriously. How does Port Sandfield continue to exist? The bridge and road will have to be expanded to a minimum of 2 lanes which totally destroys the character
499. I hope Council will stay true to the policy of environment first and develop stringent guidelines i.e. shoreline/treeline preservation, capacity limits and height restrictions that realizes that objective. It is only through preserving what makes Muskoka beautiful that it will retain its long term value.
500. I hope (for a change), that our Planet takes presidents over money.
501. I have have a strong belief that we need to keep the Muskoka Landscape as natural as possible. What is the benefit of a Muskoka Getaway when you leave your condo in the big city of Toronto and come and vacation in a similar setting of condos in the Muskokas.
502. I guess all all good thing must come to an end. I have had 50 years of enjoyment in the Muskokas and almost 80 years old I can move to another area that the developers haven't ruined or attempting to do so. I wish I could finish my days here so sad for my wife and I
503. I fully support your recommendations
504. I found the survey weighted towards a negative position on the redevelopment of Cleveland house. Not a fair survey.
505. i foresee many unintended consequences if this development proceeds as currently planned. it is far too big. development needs to be considered and thoughtful if we are going to keep our precious resource. the reason people want to be in Muskoka is the environment - lets not pave paradise.
506. I find the whole thing utterly depressing. It would take so little to add the real Muskoka look and feel here. I am fully in favour of opening up Muskoka to a more diverse cross section of people to enjoy. But the people coming here would not be having a Muskoka experience. They would feel like the 'have nots' or the 'new people'. it is not at all welcoming or introducing people to what is really special about the region. It feels like commercial short term interests have won.
507. I find it interesting that as a cottage owner I am limited by what I can do on my own property. I have a smaller cottage I would like to expand slightly. But due to the current zoning laws I would have to jump through hoops and would still probably get denied. Yet these guys can completely destroy Out community by over developing their property. And make huge amounts of money at the same time.
508. I feel strongly that multi unit, over development in the Muskoka region must be curtailed with stricter regulations on density and water usage.
509. I feel for the families that own cottages in the immediate area. It's unfortunate and disturbing that developers can force change because they have the money to influence and make changes that will forever diminish the beauty and traditions Muskoka Muskoka
510. I don't understand this whole drive for density. This is NOT why people have cottages in Muskoka. If the plan is to destroy the feel and heritage of Muskoka, then these development plans will have succeeded. Who wins from this drive for development? Certainly not those who have invested their lives in creating a beautiful, quiet and enjoyable area. It's very sad.
511. I don't agree that this will improve the quality of the Muskoka experience at all. The only reason the township approved the density for Red Leaves 20 years ago was because the Cleavelands house site was going to be a village and golf course. Now it changes hands and a crazy amount of density is being

<p>proposed right next door. It's too much in one area. The re-development of the Lakeside Lodge site has been painful enough to watch and there is a huge amount of new density there that the community hasn't even digested. I can't believe the township approved that developer to clear cut the entire site of trees and allowed that many units. It's gone too far already, this next stage needs to be done slowly or the whole charm of the area will be compromised.</p>
<p>512. I don't want to see the charm of Muskoka lost due to the desire to generate revenue- this will impact the future of the prissiness of Muskoka</p>
<p>513. I don't support this at all. Access through Port Sandfield will be hugely impacted, and the road will become impassable.</p>
<p>514. I do not want this to happen, I want the land and lakes to be preserved</p>
<p>515. I do not think you can stop development, but it should be controlled as much as possible so it doesn't change Muskoka for the reasons cottage owners came there.</p>
<p>516. I cannot believe the plans are even being considered. What about preserving our beautiful land and lakes????</p>
<p>517. I can only have a small boathouse on 1600' of shoreline. And resorts seem to have almost unlimited ability to develop Your proposed restrictions are welcome</p>
<p>518. I believe we need to prolong these decisions until we can call elections so that the citizens of the district can have their voice heard at the polls. The 2007 decisions on Minett were not taken very seriously back then. The current drafts are simply appalling. Give us all a vote!!!!</p>
<p>519. I believe this was an excellent survey, well organized and thought out.</p>
<p>520. I believe the Minett Steering committee researched and investigated all concerns and developed plan with community feedback in mind and their recommendations should be respected and supported. Not enough done to ensure road safety concerns with increased traffic. Too many people have died on this road and not enough has been done to ensure road safety is a priority. Speed and volume of cars is a huge issue!</p>
<p>521. I believe that resort village should be allowed in Muskoka and that the Minett site is a good location for one. However, it must be done in a manner consistent with Muskoka's character and maintaining the environment and water quality and tranquility. The biggest dangers I see are too much boat traffic and high buildings and buildings too near the waterfront.</p>
<p>522. I believe biking should be banned on Peninsula Road as it is too dangerous. Drivers attempt to pass cyclists on bends - it happens all the time and cannot be prevented by "share the road" signs. It is human nature when driving in a car, and stuck behind a bike, to try to pass. Fully separated/barricaded cycling lanes would be the only way to make cycling on a road with so many bends.</p>
<p>523. I appreciate your efforts on this resort development. However, someone should open their eyes on the current situation on the lakes. Dangerous high speed boating, wake board boats and light population over the top. Not pleasant on the waters anymore.</p>
<p>524. I appreciate the work and recommendations of the Minett Steering Committee.</p>
<p>525. I am very concerned about traffic on Judhaven road.</p>
<p>526. I am very concerned about the increase in traffic and safety on Peninsula rd. Specifically between Halls rd and Hemlock . The speeding and the geometry of the road</p>
<p>527. I am trying to understand the "why". I am trying to understand another huge commercial effort when the JW Marriot and The Rock are largely unsustainable? Not to mention - where they could cover off business all year - both places do not celebrate their local cottagers - they churn and burn tourists without realizing their neighbours could help sustain them.</p>

528.I am totally against it for the ale of the environment , the density and ruining our beautiful Muskoka.
529.I am totally against any widening of Peninsula Road and the bridge at Port Sandfied!
530.I am surprised that She Quiet Lakes has become involved. Please stick to your mandate.
531.I am supportive of a reasonable development of the lands as long as they take into consideration the landscape and intention of the surrounding area. Development and environment can co-exist (Whistler / Banff other areas) along with a commercial area.
532.I am stunned at the level of increased density. It is a sad day for Muskoka, have we learned nothing from the Red Leaves fiasco. Very disappointing.
533.I am opposed to this development from the standpoint of boater / swimmer safety and the adverse affect on the water quality / landscape. Again, we already have our fill of ugly - Red Leaves !!!
534.I am not supportive of increasing any density beyond what it is today. Don't think the bay can handle the environmental or safety issues that increased development present.
535.I am not anti development. However, if the density is too high it will negatively impact on Lake Rosseau, and lead to potential issues with sewage treatment and discharge (eg Red Leaves). Boat traffic will also be a critical issue.
536.I am not against all development but this proposal is far too big . The density of the units is outrageous. Reasonable development needs to be achieved!
537.I am not a NIMBY but all development should be done environmentally responsibly.
538.I am most concerned about sewage and water quality. I feel this is the weak link and they should only be able to develop what a commercial sewage facility should allow and they should be required to pay for third party testing and heavy fines if they dont meet standards or there is a failure.
539.I am in support of what I said in this report. Although I live in Guelph and formerly Oakville, I have been a Muskoka kid since the early 1050's. I strongly support a natural Muskoka that Canada's National Geographic cited as one of the favoured region to vacation in 2011. Some things never change - and that is a good thing in this case. But then there are those who prioritize lining their pockets instead of their hearts and memories. Abandon the plan with courage, tenacity and heart-warming care for the region.
540.I am in complete disagree with this development in its scope and density. Having said that I understand that it will proceed. It's just a matter of size. 100 to 200 units max in my opinion especially considering what is currently there. Do we really want Muskoka to become another Collingwood. Beautiful natural space turned into condo city. It is very disheartening to see this happening. I am fearful for what Muskoka will look like in the time frame for the generation to come.
541.I am concerned for the pollution that will come from having another big resort.
542.I am against the "big bucks" takeover of the beautiful natural shorelines of nature.
543.I am a capitalist through and through... but I strongly feel it is the role of government to moderate capitalism and protect our environment. This oversight is why I don't mind paying the very high taxes.
544.I added them to the last box. I think that we are taking this treasure for granted - but also acknowledge the privilege that afforded me the opportunity to have a place that we can use in the area. I'm not sure how to balance that but it needs desperately to be done, because often we as humans seem not aware of the ways we work against ourselves until it is too late.
545.How much money does a man need? Stop it
546.How do you stop it
547.HOW DO WE STOP THIS? Let me know how to help

548.How did we get to this!?!
549.Hotel and resort for travelling public is fine and should remain...thousands of residential condo units for "alleged" owners rental is a disaster for Muskoka...far to big a development for a small area and setting precedent for other commercially zoned properties in Muskoka.
550.Horrible impact to the area.
551.Highly concerned about the density and the implications that it brings!!! Muskoka is meant to be low density and an escape from the city. We don't need to replicate something from a high density city.
552.High density should not be allowed and that is the reason the old council was removed.
553.Hi
554.Healthy lakes are a key priority. A lakefront resort shouldn't resemble a city lakefront.
555.Have a look at the way they designed Friday Harbor
556.Great that the public is being asked their opinion. This is a much better way to develop properties. Legacy is a total sham. Clear cutting of all the trees, hi density along the waterfront etc. PS we are particularly interested in being able to access nice scenic hiking trails. Thanks for all the hard work and collaboration being put into this. BB
557.grandview redeveloped the waterfront on fairy lake and it is too dense, not in keeping with the natural look or sustainability of nature and the lake front. Truly sad for nature, and the noise/light/sight pollution. The beauty of Muskoka is that it has retained the natural habitat with gentle development. It is not intended to look or feel like big resorts in the US.
558.good work
559.Good luck!
560.God help us!
561.Glad that you are reaching out to the community to gather feedback about these proposals. Want to ensure the Muskoka we know and love doesn't get lost by over-development.
562.Given the fact the previous government should not have approved the density and rental usage I think the current council and planning have made a reasonable recovery.
563.Get it right or this will be a prototype for many more resorts to follow. Thanks
564.Generally, We don't like the whole concept Thank you for going to the trouble of drawing up and sending the survey
565.Generally, I don't like NIMBYism. I'm not opposed to some development in the Minett area, as it's only right that more people have more access to Muskoka. BUT that 4,000-unit abomination removes Muskoka from Muskoka, so we've all lost out.
566.Generally this represents too much densification.
567.Further development a double edged sword. Create jobs and growth for the region but environmental impacts need to be considered as well.
568.From what I've observed over the past 30 years, Muskoka Lakes district must be nearing it's maximum density. The governing bodies must strive to ensure an equitable density considering the area has become an upscale resort area. Balance must be maintained between the permanent population, preservation of the natural environment and tourism. Tourism has become the main economic driving force. Tourism is a good clean industry and if managed properly will bring more prosperity to Muskoka.

569.From what I have just witnessed filling our this survey, the re-development of Cleveland's house will be a disaster unless significant changes are made to all current plans. Without such adjustment, another Muskoka and Canadian Icon will be gone for good.
570.Follow Minett Steering Committee guidelines.
571.First and foremost the ecology of the area and the environmental impact of this development must be the first priority. In addition, the proper infrastructure must be in place to support this development (roads/traffic, bridge in Port Stanfield, staff housing etc). Boat safety and traffic is critical as well.
572.Fight any development in Minett
573.favour Minett Steering Committee approach. How many large developments in Muskoka have gone into receivership ?
574.Everything about this development is about the profit motive for development. It's not about the environment of Muskoka Lakes. It is about building a city type waterfront development for the sake of developers.
575.Everyone was opposed to the Legacy Cottages, but someone the developer was granted all approvals. Hopefully, Cleavelands House will not end up being another nightmare.
576.Environmental protection is most important!
577.Environmental impact is key to everything. This includes water, air, noise, light and sheer density of humanity in and around these resorts.
578.Environmental impact and safety is most important
579.environmental concerns should be prime
580.Environmental concerns are paramount! It seems all things promised can change. Developers dont go away they just keep up the pressure until they get what they want. Then they leave town! They dont have to live the impacts to such a beautiful area! Legacy is a prime example. of this! A complete and utter eye sore! How many hundred trees were cut down for that project?
581.Environment and current ownership is already at max capacity in this area of the lake
582.Ensure there is both boat and car parking for people that live in Muskoka to plan day trips to the shopping and restaurants in Minett. Wouldn't mind walking to and from parking as long as the walk is scenic i.e. landscaped. All car parking should be away from the waterfront but maybe have some drop off areas for those less mobile.
583.Each non cottage owning development, ie tourist and or rental brings a much greater environmental toll to the area. The risks that come with large amounts of weekend warriors to the environment and what tax payers appreciate in muskoka will be forever damaged by overdevelopment.
584.Draft policies seem to be an improvement but still have a long way to go
585.Dont like the one on the right, as it looks too much like the city. we must preserve the country look.
586.Don't let developers ruin our beautiful Muskoka....if it gets overdeveloped we will loose the beauty of why we all love it up there
587.Don't do it! Keep Muskoka beautiful - not commercial!
588.Don't allow over development of the area. Don't allow a "white elephant" to be built. Most developments projects of this nature have proved not to be viable and have failed.
589.Don't make the mistake of past councils! Think of environmental protection over money from excessive development. There needs to be a time to just say STOP!!!! As a long time Muskoka resident I am

disgusted by the trend to lean to money and profits over the pristine beauty that was once found everywhere in Muskoka. Don't make the same mistake of the past council who focused on greed.
590.Don't make it bigger then it is now !!
591.Don't let it happen. Our beautiful areas environment is already irrevocably damaged. My family has been on Lake Joseph for 120 years and my great-great-grandparents would weep if they saw Muskoka today.
592.Don't let conservative government get involved. The environment is key
593.DON'T DO IT. The Bala Falls is causing havoc to the environment and this will be way worse.
594.Does it ever matter what we think? We have been fighting this for decades.
595.Does anyone not have their head up their ass?
596.Do you really want to build an enclave for the wealthy and heedless that will then feel entitled to do as they like all over the rest of the lake?
597.Do not overbuild and ruin our lakes forever. The pollution both water and air that will occur from overbuilding will ruin Muskoka for everyone. It will be a tragedy for Ontario.
598.Do not build this atrocity
599.Do not allow these projects to take over our lakes. Who is benefiting from this if we let it get away on us? - Muskoka or greedy developers who want \$\$ and are NIMBY - you can be sure none of this is anywhere near their cottage.
600.Do no increase from existing density
601.Do keep the pressure on to reduce the scope of this project in all ways possible
602.Do it professionally. Get outside help. Please don't rely on local peeps. They just don't know what to do. It's new to them. It's no longer the 60's. Get the pros in. (Not the private commercial pros. We all know what they want. It has to work for everyone or it will be unsuccessful. If unsuccessful it will be a blight on the lake for a long long time. There will be more.....get it right now.
603.Development there is a huge issue that is fundamental to Maintaining the character and environmental of Muskoka today. Development likely a serious hazard for anyone who cares about Muskoka.
604.Development of water front, excluding commercial should be single family residence with 200' ft frontage
605.Development must not remove public access to Lake from the current road allowance at Cleveland's House This time lets make certain Policies REQUIRE Sewage plants to be built BEFORE any buildings!! Not like the Marriott fiasco.
606.Development must consider environmental sustainability. The proposals would appear to have a negative impact on water quality, terrestrial wildlife habitat, road traffic, pedestrian and cyclist safety, the safety of other cottagers on the lake (due to visitor boat/PWC use). It is unclear to me how the waste water will be handled in a safe way. This level of density would create an issue. Lake Rosseau has had reduced water quality due to poor waste water handling by the Marriott hotel.
607.Development is permanent...and onl encourages more of it
608.Development is good for the local economy. Many people would be surprised by how much poverty there is In Muskoka. Particularly among females. Muskoka has a feast of famine economy which is dominated by Construction, marina services and landscaping. All dominated by men. We need more jobs in which women can make a living wage and live in dignity.
609.Development is a reality...however it should not come at the total cost of the current residents enjoyment of their properties. This is muskoka NOT Toronto!

610. Developers do not respect buffer zones. Square footage is maxed out by blasting out the building envelope and using flat roofs to accommodate height bylaws. Once final building inspections are concluded, additional sq footage is added. Unless the TML is prepared to police its policies, with sever repercussions for violations, the results will look like Stevens Pt, Foots Bay, Lake Joseph, - Rossi/Wouters developers/owner-Hasnain & Clarke developer/owner McDonald. Two football fields of 100+yr old trees were removed from this point and blasting 25-30 feet below grade now supports lake houses in excess of 10,000 sq ft each. And the development continues. The TML does not have the policies and or political will to redefine and control development in Muskoka.
611. Developers and past and current council members seem to be intent on overdevelopment to make money and increase tax revenue while having no concern to the environment and the beauty of Muskoka which must be preserved.
612. Density is too great but I understand it is too late to reduce it. Residential building heights must be limited to the tree line. Developer should pay for any improvements to the Peninsula Rd and the bridge.
613. Density and setbacks are important. But also is the colour of buildings. Dark Brown or Black buildings are much less visible than white ones. Also, beware the removal of trees and blasting beyond the setbacks, which can be visually destructive
614. Density and number of boats are huge issues. If a resident is required to have 200 feet of frontage to build a cottage, there has to be some correlation to what a resort/condo/time share development can do. It has to be equitable in some way to all.
615. Demand for the development does not warrant the density proposed in the plan. If municipal services are required it will likely be felt in everyone's property tax therefore only allow effective well monitored private servicing. Need to have good control over residential commercial to ensure the travelling public has access during the period June thru September above all any development must be planned and monitored to ensure the least amount of damage to the environment as the effects of climate change must be mitigated. Clean energy alternatives must be a requirement
616. Current zoning policies throughout Muskoka are not enforced and almost all requests for adjustment to current policy are rubber stamped. Zoning policy in Muskoka is a joke.
617. Critical to me is staff housing. The resort must have appropriate housing for staff. We can not have them sleeping in a container in Bala!!
618. Council needs to think generations ahead, especially when it comes to the health of the lakes. Can they do that?
619. Council has an opportunity to control the trajectory of Muskoka, while growth is unavoidable, the type of growth is in their hands.
620. Cottage country is desirable because of nature. Space. Trees quiet. I understand that others want to access this for these very reasons but over development ruins cottage country the environment and and the rural nature of the area. If you want a shopping experience go downtown Toronto.
621. Construction should be completed with minimal impact June through September
622. congrats t the very hard working Minett Committee
623. Concern re density and changing to a cosmopolitan area with pollution and careless people damaging the area. We
624. Concern is about destroying the natural beauty of the lake by introducing many many more boats so it would become dangerous to boat. Houton Lake in Michigan had that happen.

625. Committee is doing a good job. Thanks for making such an effort to keep Muskoka Muskoka.. and encouraging free enterprise to create more opportunities for our growing population to enjoy what we currently share.
626. commercial properties in Muskoka have been serial failures for at least 30 years. Touchstone has been bankrupt more than once I believe. Red Leaves condos did not sell well, and that was after the initial investment had been written off. I believe they are still using cesspools for sewage after promising to install septic systems as part of their initial approval. These projects are dreams of builders that become white elephants. Why are we approving any of them?
627. comments in the various questions
628. Cleveland House should be rebuilt to reflect the Muskoka experience and offer similar amenities to what it has been known for. That will create a truly unique experience. Don't need another JW Marriott. Go back to Basics....isn't that what this pandemic has taught us? Create good clean living & great outdoor experiences. Differentiate yourself...don't be a "me too" resort. Those are everywhere! .
629. Change is inevitable, set backs and green space are really important. With the growing awareness of climate change greenscape to encourage pollinators could help.
630. Change is inevitable but managing this resource to insure that the land and the lakes are protected is critical.
631. Change is good yet not at the expense of the tranquility of Muskoka. People want to be in Muskoka because they don't like how busy and noisy the city is. Please don't let them bring the city to Muskoka. Once it is done it is hard to undo. I hear of people already saying Muskoka is busy. Thank you for all your hard work.
632. Change can be good if the environment and the neighbourhood aspects can be preserved.
633. Certainly not against the improvement of the Cleverlands house and surrounds, but needs to be mindful of the character of the area, the local environment. This cannot be another legacy cottages/subdivision, please.
634. Bylaws should not be violated.
635. Building heights must be restricted!! Also consider that most large resort developments in Muskoka fail financially. What happens when this one inevitably fails and we are left with an eyesore?
636. Build in provision for charging stations for electric boats as well as electric cars.
637. BRING BACK WATERSKI SHOWS !!!!!
638. Bring back "Old Muskoka".... I am going to miss what was there..... good fun for all and a wonderful place to visit..... the way it was when my grandfather and/or father would take us for a boat ride some 65 years ago.
639. Boat traffic in and out of the marina is already too heavy. Please take this into consideration. Also noise and light pollution are huge concerns of mine. As a cottage on an island across from Cleverlands House both of these have a big impact. I am looking for neighbours that are respectful of the quiet, peaceful Muskoka lifestyle, not party animals.
640. Boat and car traffic as well as the impact on the environment need to be carefully considered. Boaters and drivers alike are an issue during the summer months.
641. Bike lanes need to be included in any road widening. Altho more car traffic will reduce the appeal of riding on Penn road in the first place.
642. Beyond a functioning resort on the waterfront, I can support estate properties built on private services around the golf Course with no restrictions for available to travelling public - Minett is not Whistler, Blue

Mountain or Mount Tremblant and DOM should not build a water / sewage treatment facility for something that will never be realized
643. Between Minett, Bracebridge boarding school, and all the other questionable things our officials are pushing through different areas of Muskoka you can't help but wonder about motivation. They certainly don't care about the environment.
644. Before anything is final, get firm commitments with financing in place that the sewage will be adequately dealt with.
645. Be very careful. This sets a precedent you will not be able to reverse. There is a very real risk of destroying the magic that is so special about the area. The whole reason people come here is to get away from the city. DON'T turn it into one. Once the beauty disappears, so will the tourism.
646. Be very careful with the legal words as developers have clever people looking at word loopholes
647. Be sure to think ahead in preserving the natural environment. It is the reason people want to visit here, not shops, boats, restaurants, spas, noise and unnatural environments. They/we can get those things in bigger towns and cities. Make the lake areas special for perpetuity. Please. It is not about money if there is nothing left to show off...
648. Be careful. Don't get pushed around by dreams of more revenues and tax base. You have a beautiful area. Don't make it into a commercial area which loses the charms of the area as we know for.
649. Be careful. Muskoka is only Muskoka because it is NOT overdeveloped...
650. Be careful on what we allow as it may determine the long term fate of the Muskoka Lakes
651. Be careful and don't over build! too much risk on future of our beautiful Muskoka!
652. At the present stage Peninsula Road is not equipped for high volume of traffic and uncontrolled speed limits. Two years ago a trucker speeding lost control and ploughed into our property, thank God no one was killed or hurt. This is of great concern to us because we live on Peninsula Road and strongly object emphasizing strongly object to the proposed development. I was under the impression that our current mayor was a friend of the Muskoka.
653. At the end of the day my criteria for success or failure is how much this endeavor mirrors or differs from the debacle of the Lakeside development. We do need to have Cleveland's house reconstituted in some capacity what's concerning is that the rules that apply to homeowners on the lake in proximity of this property are so dramatically different than The rules that apply to commercial owners. I am also very concerned about the timeshare concept. We saw at the lake Joe club what started out as timeshare evolved into basically people not putting their properties into the pool and using them full-time.
654. At most a marina. At best a park with bike trails.
655. As written in the last comment. We have been cottagers on Bruce Lake for 30 years and residents for over 20 years. We support rebuilding Cleveland's House to be similar to how it has been for the last 100 plus years and not affect others in this neighborhood for the worse.
656. As this is only the start of huge developments in Muskoka I feel it is important to get it right and strictly limit the number of units allowed. Let the developers know they are not in charge and we will stand up to them. I have invested a lot of money in Muskoka and I want to protect that investment and enjoy my home.
657. As I stated earlier...I fear we are living Muskoka to death.
658. As I said before, I worry that the biggest risk to Muskoka from an economic, environmental and health perspective is preserving the health of the lakes. I hope any retail here will be developed rationally. Port carling is a mess — it seems that anyone can build a new building and move their business into it, in spite of the fact that there is existing vacant space.

659. As has been indicated, this decision is critical not only in terms of the subject property and the proposed improvements which I support. Clevelands House is a neglected blight and certainly represents an opportunity for improvement. As also articulated, this decision will be precedent setting for future proposed developments in the area. Without having first hand knowledge of the thinking and many hours of work that have occurred by both the policy makers and the local stakeholders, I support the local residents and the Steering Committee. I know Mr. Goldhar and I also applaud his efforts and investment to improve upon the Clevelands House Resort and contribute to the municipal tax base as a result of his company's investment. On the other hand, Mr. Goldhar however well intended, is a developer of Wal-Mart anchored retail properties and not an experienced residential developer. In addition, he has not have any past connection to the area and therefore no legacy to either Minett or Muskoka Lakes. I imagine he won't be a resident at the proposed resort either on a permanent or part-time basis so he may enjoy or not the result of his initiative. I imagine like a typical developer, he will build and leave. Notwithstanding, I support the refurbishment and modernization of the property. I do not however, support the size and scale being proposed, the development creep out to and beyond Pennisula Rd. #7 and the amount of increased traffic, light and sound noise, etc. that this type of development will permanently create.
660. As cottage owners face more and more restrictions on enhancing their properties in a comparatively modest way, commercial developers (here today, gone tomorrow) seem to have an open door with respect to the exploitation of their properties.
661. As a cottage owner on Tobin Island, I am concerned about the future water quality in Lake Rosseau.
662. As a 60 + year seasonal resident this development ruins my love of what Muskoka should be
663. Are we forgetting how hard we fought to keep port Sandfield as single lane bridge. It was to keep history and the feel of the area. Turning that into a two lane bridge erases that for ever. Also without that almost mandatory stop what kind of speeds will we see through there? The reason this is getting so much attention is the Mariott was built and stands out to this day like a sore thumb. Yet a cottager is scared to cut a tree at their cottage shoreline they were allowed to leave the shore portion of their property wide open and barren. Clevelands house should have to stay below the tree line and not stand out at the shoreline anymore than the private cottages on the shoreline in that area.
664. architecture should feel like Muskoka. Limit the # of boat slips / boats available to Minett residents.
665. anything that can be done to limit the proposed development is very important, both for the site itself and as a precedent for the region. It is a very unfortunate situation for all of Muskoka..
666. Any road or bridge improvements should be paid for by the developers not tax payers The sewage issue and water quality is of paramount importance
667. Any of the development plans will mean more people, boats, noise, light, etc. I appreciate that "progress" re: development is necessary, but look well into the future and envision what it will look like or what you want it to look like 25 or 50 years from now.
668. Any increase in density should be cautious and measured. Getting the development wrong could change Muskoka permanently, and there will be no way to go back.
669. Am horrified by the proposed density.
670. Always be aware that all developers have little or no concern about what they leave behind when they're finished, as long as they make money. The one exception to this attitude would be Mitch Goldhar.
671. Although I know this development is inevitable, I am concerned with how it will effect the lake environment
672. all these need to block as it is ruining the natural elements of the lake

673. All recommendations need to be mandatory with significant and meaningful sanctions if not followed. There is no compelling reason for the densification of what are essentially residential units on the waterfront. If they are essentially residential units they should be required to meet the same restrictions as other property owners.
674. All in all seems about 5x bigger than it should be. I
675. All developments of this scale require significant capital improvement to municipal services & must be solely at the expense of the developer.
676. All decisions should be based on factual knowledge to support the safety of public and environmental sustainability. No rule bending to support growth for the sake of growth. Consideration needs to be given to Global Warming and carbon sequestering.
677. All architecture/design should be in keeping with Muskoka Lakes current "sense of place". Ensure there is enough public space for people to congregate when not in their condos- ie- prevent overcrowding on development.
678. Again we have let this project go too far..
679. Adhere to the Minett Joint Policy Review Steering Committee's recommendations as closely as possible. There's a reason you commissioned them to look into all of this. Respect the process and accept their recommendations.
680. Adequate sewage treatment for this number of units requires a major investment in a reliable, municipal regulated system. The proposals seem to gloss over the importance of getting this right.
681. A very concerned resident, who moved and purchased a cottage in Muskoka for what it has always been known for. Now with high density concepts the overall beauty in the area is changed, and was why people came to Muskoka. Boating safety in PARAMOUNT!!! This needs to be controlled and I believe is even more important than the development.
682. a terrible development should never happen. can't believe the district voted to allow this kind of development in Muskoka.
683. A shout out to those who care.
684. A development of this size and scale is inappropriate for this town, and sets a bad precedent. The open space, dark skies, and noise levels all need to be protected for future generations. Seasonal and permanent residents choose to come to Lake Rosseau to see the stars, experience the outdoors, and swim and boat safely in the lake. All of this is being negatively impacted by this large development proposal.
685. 300' setback. Dense tree planting. Focus on septic treatment. Private commerce, restaurants,
686. 1-The water quality, in all aspects, is prime and must be retained or all else is just a waste of effort. 2- Climate change is coming. Unstoppable and must be considered and allowed for. Since we don't and can't know exactly what this might entail over time I think we should maintain the maximum natural buffer between development and the natural shoreline. 3- I would install a helipad somewhere toward the back of the development, mainly for safety. With this many people in the development area, medical emergency access should be considered and in the overall scheme of the development a helipad would be one way to enhance this capability with little impact on the environment. It would also be useful for VIP access in the case of meetings held at the resort. Think mini G-8 type events.
687. "Pave paradise, put up a parking lot" Joni Mitchell. "Call a place of paradise, kiss it goodbye" The Eagles. Don't say I didn't warn you

688.one realizes looking at these proposals, how quickly the Muskoka's as we know them, can be changed for the worst. please be nimple and respectful developers, this approach will ultimately make everybody happier and pay off larger, than the big quick pay out.
689.Is it time to consider only residential zoning for waterfront? This is radical, worth discussing. Density would be greatly reduced. Example Legacey property. 2 residents rather than 43.
690.Im praying for the steering committee !! And that our Beautiful Muskoka will be cared for with, respect for the environment and the cottagers.
691.I live at the south end of Lake Muskoka near Taboo. I feel that we will have the same problem that Minett has. When this is resolved I am hoping that Gravenhurst will follow the same restrictions that the MLA & FOM impose on Minett on Taboo
692.Halting overdevelopment is critical to maintaining Muskoka's unique ambience.
693.it is what it is , regretfully , due to govt and planners , stupidity and ill action on there part s to protect Muskoka //
694.Do not allow this, it is setting a dangerous precedent.
695.I think it is irresponsible to allow a development of this hugh scale. why?? hospitals too small for a development of this size. Road to resort too narrow and will need costly upgrades. Bridge at Port Stanfield outdated. where would kids go to school? where would all the staff needed come from?? where would all these people go food shopping? I am also concerned about water quality. a lot of people for such a small Bay!! bay. I also fel for the residents o Minnette . their small quaint village and country way of life will never be the same. a small group have made a lot of money and may continue to do so at the expense of others. way of life.