

# Memorandum to the Council of Corporation of the Municipality of Temagami

---

**Subject:** Public Engagement Report – Draft Municipal Land Use By-law No. 24-1727

**Memo No:** 2025-M-111

**Date:** May 8, 2025

**Attachment:** None

**Prepared By:** Laala Jahanshahloo – CAO/ Treasurer

## Recommendation

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council receives Memo 2025-M-111 as presented.

## Contents

1. Executive Summary .....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Summary of Survey and Public Consultation Results .....	3
4. Question-by-Question Analysis.....	5
5. Conclusion .....	9

## 1. Executive Summary

This report provides Council with a comprehensive summary and analysis of the public consultation process conducted regarding Draft Municipal Land Use By-law No. 24-1727. Consultation activities included a public information and consultation session, and a public survey made available both online and in hard copy.

While there was strong support for regulating municipal land use, the public expressed overwhelming opposition to the current draft By-law, citing significant concerns regarding fairness, effectiveness, enforcement clarity, impacts on local businesses, and potential negative effects on tourism. Only 2.08% of respondents believe the by-law effectively manages land use. Over 97% of respondents recommended substantial improvements or replacement, and concerns were raised that taxpayers were unfairly subsidizing private storage on public lands.

## 2. Background

In accordance with Council Resolution R#25-023 and Memo 2025-M-020, a public consultation process was initiated to gather feedback on Draft Municipal Land Use By-law No. 24-1727, which proposes a permit system regulating the placement of personal property on municipally owned or controlled land.

The consultation process included the following activities:

- A public information and consultation session held on April 17, 2025, in Council Chambers and via Zoom.
- A public survey conducted between March 26 and April 20, 2025, available online and in hard copy.
- Public notices issued through Municipal social media channels and the municipal website.

## 3. Summary of Survey and Public Consultation Results

### 3.1. Public Participation Overview

- Total Survey Responses: 96
- Temagami Ratepayers: 90.63%
- Non-ratepayer Stakeholders: 9.38%
- Indigenous Representation: 1.05%
- Awareness of Draft By-law: 89.58% were aware prior to the survey.

### 3.2. Key Survey Results and Feedback Themes

#### 3.2.1. Regulation Support vs. Effectiveness

- ▶ Support: **78% support regulating municipal land use.**
- ▶ Effectiveness: **Only 2.08% believe the draft by-law effectively manages land use.**
- ▶ Key Concerns:
  - Lack of clarity between parking management and ice hut regulation.
  - Insufficient focus on removing derelict vehicles and abandoned property.
  - Issues at specific sites such as Mine Landing and Strathcona Landing.

#### 3.2.2. Fee Structure and Cost Recovery

- ▶ Fairness: 73.91% find the \$25 fee unfair and insufficient.
- ▶ Support for Cost Recovery: 56.52% support full cost recovery.
- ▶ Suggested Fee Adjustments:
  - Annual fees between \$90–\$200 per item.
  - Optional transient use rates: \$5/day or \$15/week.

### 3.2.3. Enforcement Provisions

- ▶ Clarity: Only 13.33% found enforcement provisions clear.
- ▶ Stronger Enforcement Needed:
  - Clear removal timelines (e.g., 30-day notices).
  - Fines of \$250–\$500 for non-compliance.
  - Use of seasonal enforcement officers and electronic monitoring systems.

### 3.2.4. Impact on Local Businesses

- ▶ Concern: 57.45% believe the by-law negatively impacts local businesses.
- ▶ Specific Issues:
  - Municipal \$25 fee undercuts private marinas and storage operators (private rates are typically \$500–\$2,000 annually).
- ▶ Suggested Solutions:
  - Collaboration with private operators.
  - Avoiding municipal competition with private businesses.

### 3.2.5. Tourism and Visitor Impact

- ▶ Concerns were raised that confusing regulations and higher costs could deter tourism.
- ▶ A tiered fee structure for residents versus visitors was recommended to balance fairness and economic sustainability.

### 3.2.6. Parking and Storage Management

- ▶ Concerns: Overcrowding at Mine Landing, Strathcona Landing, and similar access points.
- ▶ Suggestions:
  - Removing abandoned vehicles and trailers.

- Creating designated short-term parking areas with time limits (e.g., 14 days).
- Prioritizing taxpayer access.

### **3.2.7. Communication and Public Information**

- ▶ Public Requests:
  - Clear, plain-language explanations of the by-law requirements.
  - Improved signage at public sites.
  - Simplified online permit and enforcement information.

## **4. Question-by-Question Analysis**

### **Q1: Are you a Temagami Ratepayer?**

- 90.63% Yes – Majority are ratepayers.
- 9.38% No – Non-ratepayers included seasonal visitors, business owners, and stakeholders.
- (No major comments provided.)

### **Q2: Are you a member of Temagami First Nation or Teme-Augama Anishnabai?**

- 1.05% Yes – Very low Indigenous participation.
- 98.95% No – Majority of respondents were non-Indigenous.

### **Q3: Reason for Filling the Survey**

- 88.42% Taxpayers – Focused on tax burden, parking/storage concerns.
- 6.32% Non-taxpayer stakeholders – Focused on economic impacts.
- 5.26% Frequent the region – Tourists concerned about permit fees.
- Additional Comments – Highlighted issues with trailer parking logistics, seasonal storage, island resident needs.

#### **Q4: What Should the By-law Address to Avoid Limiting Local Business**

##### **Opportunities?**

- Fee Equity – Set fees closer to market rates (\$90–\$200); avoid competing with marinas.
- Collaboration – Partner with businesses for parking solutions; allow seasonal commercial uses.
- Storage Restrictions – Ban long-term trailer storage on municipal land.
- Flexible Permits – Offer daily, weekly, and annual options.
- Economic Impact Mitigation – Exempt business-owned equipment (e.g., rental trailers, ATVs).

#### **Q5: Awareness of the Bylaw**

- 89.58% Yes – General awareness, but criticized poor communication.
- 10.42% No – Requested clearer explanations/background information.

#### **Q6: Effectiveness of Bylaw in Managing Lands**

- 2.08% Yes – Very minimal support.
- 27.08% Somewhat – Mixed opinions; called for clearer language.
- 48.96% No – Focused criticism on ice huts, derelict vehicles, low fee issues.
- 21.88% Unsure – Highlighted confusion over goals and enforcement.

#### **Q7: Does the Bylaw Support Local Businesses?**

- 5.32% Yes – Some believed it could improve aesthetics for tourism.
- 57.45% No – Argued the \$25 fee undercut private businesses (e.g., marinas).
- 37.23% Not Sure – Unsure of the long-term impact on businesses.
- (Comments emphasized higher fees and collaboration with private businesses.)

### **Q8: What Should the Bylaw Address to Avoid Limiting Business? (Open Comments)**

- 47 Skipped.
- 49 Responses:
  - Ban long-term storage on municipal lands.
  - Set higher fees aligned with market (\$90–\$200).
  - Collaborate with businesses.
  - Remove abandoned trailers/vehicles.

### **Q9: Should Fees Cover True Costs (vs. Taxpayer Funds)?**

- 41.05% Strongly Agree – Users should pay full costs.
- 13.68% Agree – Supported cost recovery model.
- 11.58% Neutral/Disagree – Concerned about tourism deterrence.
- Criticisms – Current low fees seen as subsidies for non-residents.

### **Q10: Should Land Costs Be Shared Between Users and Taxpayers?**

- 56.52% Yes – Users should contribute (especially non-residents).
- 22.83% No – Taxpayers already contribute too much.
- 20.65% Not Sure – Need better equity balance.
- (Suggestions included resident/tourist tiered fee structures.)

### **Q11: Is the Fee Structure Fair?**

- 4.35% Yes – Very low support.
- 73.91% No – Fee seen as too low.
- 21.74% Not Sure – Needed cost breakdown.
- (Frequent suggestions for higher daily/weekly fees and violation penalties.)

### **Q12: Are Enforcement Provisions Clear?**

- 13.33% Yes – Limited confidence in enforcement plans.
- 56.67% No – Lack of clarity and enforcement staff.
- 30% Not Sure – Confused about how violations would be handled.
- (Ideas included kiosks, towing, and hiring seasonal staff.)

### **Q13: Should Court Orders Address Violations?**

- 69.23% Yes – Strong support for strict enforcement.
- 13.19% No – Feared excessive legal costs.
- 17.58% Unsure – Needed better information on logistics.
- (Support for fines (\$250–\$500) and towing abandoned vehicles.)

### **Q14: Does the Bylaw Balance Community Needs?**

- 10.87% Yes – Minimal support.
- 60.87% No – Criticized as favoring visitors over residents.
- 28.26% Unsure – Needed more impact data.
- (Main criticisms: lack of parking for taxpayers; “junkyard” effect.)

### **Q15: Can the Bylaw Be Improved?**

- 97.56% Yes – Overwhelming call for improvements.
- 2.44% No – Minimal opposition.
- (Focus areas: cost recovery, clearer enforcement, partnerships with businesses.)

### **Q16: Attending Public Consultation?**

- 12.77% In-person.
- 53.19% Online (Zoom).

- 34.04% No.

### **Q17: Additional Comments/Suggestions (Key Themes)**

- Parking & Storage – Remove derelict vehicles, prioritize ratepayer parking.
- Fees – Match market rates (\$90–\$200), tiered resident/tourist fees.
- Enforcement – Kiosks, strict fines, seasonal enforcement staff.
- Collaboration – Work with private businesses, don't compete with marinas.
- Communication – Provide clearer summaries and explanations for public understanding.

## **5. Conclusion**

The public consultation process confirmed strong support for regulating municipal land use but overwhelming opposition to the draft By-law No. 24-1727 in its current form.

Only 2.08% of respondents believed the by-law is effective, while 97.56% identified significant problems requiring substantial revisions. Key issues included unfair fee structures, negative impacts on businesses and tourism, inadequate enforcement mechanisms, and lack of clear communication.