



# Planning & Economic Development Committee Agenda

Tuesday, April 7, 2026 at 3:00 PM  
Council Chambers

- 1. **Call Meeting to Order**
- 2. **Approval of Agenda**
- 3. **Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest**
- 4. **Minutes** 2  
[December 17, 2025 - January 5, 2026](#)
- 5. **[Draft Zoning By-Law Planning Report](#)** 7
- 6. **Question Period**
- 7. **Next Meeting**
- 8. **Adjournment**

TOWNSHIP OF ADMASTON/BROMLEY

**Planning & Economic Development Committee**

Date: December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 – 9:00 am

Present: Committee members present were Michael Donohue, Angela Field, Brian Hamilton and Keith Gourley (Chair). Staff members present were CAO/Clerk Jennifer Charkavi, Chief Building Official Dwayne Coulas and Finance Clerk Amanda Ryan.

Guests from the County of Renfrew Planning Department were Manager of Planning Bruce Howarth and Junior Planners Nicole Moore and Benjamin Savage.

Regrets: Kevin LeGris

1. Councillor Gourley called the meeting to order at 9:05 am.
2. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest – None.
3. Approval of Agenda – 2025-12-01

**Moved by:** Brian Hamilton **Seconded by:** Angela Field

BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee approve the agenda for the December 17, 2025 Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting as presented this date.

“Carried”

4. Minutes – 2025-12-02

**Moved by:** Angela Field **Seconded by:** Brian Hamilton

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Planning and Economic Development Committee approve the minutes from the June 19, 2025 meeting.

“Carried”

5. Planners’ Draft Zoning By-Law 2025 - 2025-12-03

**Moved by:** Mayor Donohue **Seconded by:** Angela Field

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Planning & Economic Development Committee receive the County of Renfrew Planners’ Key Changes Report and the Draft 2025 Zoning By-Law with corresponding maps.

“Carried”

The County introduced themselves and dove straight into their presentation stating that the township should have a zoning by-law that is in line with the Official Plan (OP) of the County. Bruce Howarth stated that they are looking for direction of changes to make before these changes are presented to the public at the Public Meeting. As a team, the guests from the County reviewed the proposed changes to the existing zoning by-law and explained why these recommendations were included. This comprised of definitions, bunkies shipping containers, additional dwelling units, beekeeping, agricultural property, RV's, storage and boats in yards, separation distances, shoreline structures, exception zones, changes to zone labels, and li

Discussion was had about shipping containers and tarped garages. Mayor Donohue is sensitive to the location of the tarpaulin garage. Councillor Gourley was not concerned about the garages but would prefer more stipulations with the shipping containers. Councillor Field was not in favour of putting the Chief Building Official (CBO) in a situation where it would be up to his discretion but rather have the rules in place for him to have as support.

It was questioned if that "will" and "shall" have the same meaning. CAO/Clerk Charkavi explained that "will" is not mandatory, "shall" is mandatory.

Bruce Howarth explained that there were updates to Provincial Legislation wants to protect the loss of agricultural zoned land. He also stated that there is no current flood plain provision.

Councillor Gourley stated that he believes that there should be definitions around boats and storage. He feels that the wording is getting away from what the intent is.

The change provided with shoreline structures provides more flexibility stated Bruce Howarth in allowing additional limited uses opposed to the 30 meter hard cap where nothing was allowed in that area.

The County proposed a change from R1 Zone to Rural Residential (RR) which would mostly affect Osceola and Douglas. Mayor Donohue stated that this is specific to municipal services and asked what if a hamlet wanted to entertain a communal water system, would they not be permitted under the new zoning. They also proposed elimination of Extractive Industrial (EI), Extractive Industrial Reserve (EIR) zones. This would be the biggest change in all the zoning by-law. CAO/Clerk Charkavi confirmed that whatever is presently existing is permitted, but anything new would have to adhere to the setbacks.

Ms. Moore provided drafts of the new maps that will be available for the public to use and be available on the Township website. These maps will allow the public to look up the zoning themselves.

Councillor Gouley stated that the committee was out of time for this session of the review. CAO/Clerk Charkavi will book a time in the New Year for the

presenters to come back and discuss the items in further detail that the committee have highlighted in the presentation.

Recess – 2025-12-04

**Moved by:** Brian Hamilton

**Seconded by:** Angela Field

BE IT RESOLVED that the December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting recess at 12:11 p.m.

“Carried”

Date: January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2026 – 10:11 am

Present: Committee members present were Michael Donohue, Angela Field and Keith Gourley (Chair). Staff members present were CAO/Clerk Jennifer Charkavi, Chief Building Official Dwayne Coulas and Finance Clerk Amanda Ryan.

Guests from the County of Renfrew Planning Department included Manager of Planning Bruce Howarth and Junior Planners Nicole Moore and Benjamin Savage.

Regrets: Kevin LeGris and Brian Hamilton.

Councillor Gourley called the meeting to order at 10:11 am as a continuation of the December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting.

Resume – 2025-12-05

**Moved by:** Angela Field

**Seconded by:** Michael Donohue

BE IT RESOLVED that the Committee resume the meeting that started December 17, 2025 Planning & Economic Development Committee meeting to continue to review the zoning By-Law presented by the County of Renfrew.

“Carried”

Junior Planner Moore verbally provided a brief overview of what the discussions took place at the December 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 meeting.

Mayor Donohue questioned if the zoning should be changed to accommodate the tarpaulin garages. Councillor Gouley expressed that the tarpaulin garages should be fastened to the ground properly and properly maintained. The committee agreed that tarpaulin garages are permitted in all zones, but in Rural Residential (RR) zones they should have a timeframe of to November 1<sup>st</sup> to May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Shipping containers are something that was not recognized in the current by-law and there are a rise of people using them as an accessory building. It is

recommended by the County that they be mentioned specifically in the by-law. Councillor Gourley stated he would like to see the shipping containers in good condition, despite the inability to enforce in the zoning by-law. Councillor Field would like to see residents have to apply for a permit to ensure setbacks are being adhered to. There was discussion about painting the shipping containers and if advertising was permitted on them. The committee agreed that shipping containers would be permitted in all zones and a building permit is required as per the building code.

CAO/Clerk stated that bees are allowed on farms, and they are regulated by OMAFRA however a lot do not realize that and have bees. Bruce Howarth stated that there is a Bee Act and there are regulations to be followed. Under the Bee Act a license is required to have hives. He added that the current rules state that you must have a farm to have bees. Councillor Field would like to have Admaston/Bromley residents who do have bees to get their feed back before any thing is changed. Bruce Howarth is asking if changing the hectares or the rural or agricultural zone is the wish of the committee. Other animals were taken off.

Mayor Donohue questioned the section of mobile homes from an event of the past. Bruce Howarth said proposed states mobile homes are permitted in rural and agricultural for the purpose of seasonal help. Mayor Donohue questioned and Councillor Field agreed that there should only be mobile homes permitted in an area zoned agricultural. Councillor Gourley asked about secondary dwellings. Bruce Howarth confirmed that agriculture or areas zoned as mobile home park would be able to have a mobile home. A mobile home cannot be permitted as a secondary dwelling.

Councillor Gourley raised concern about having space in the yard for both a boat and the vehicles. Nicole of County confirmed that the RR zones are mostly in Osceola and Douglas. It was proposed that the season opposite the tarpaulin garages be permitted for boat storage. Councillor Gourley asked about the larger boats. It was agreed that it be specified that the definition of boats are motorized and over 5.5 meters.

Section 3.27.5 was added as persons wish to build structures such as decks, saunas and storage sheds right next to the water. Concerning protecting the quality of the water and the environment but still allowing some flexibility in the assets is what the County is trying to provide. An in-water boathouse is not permitted. 100 square feet is the maximum size that is permitted as a structure along the water. Pools or hot tubs are excluded in the shoreline area as they contain pressurized water systems.

Recommendation – 2025-02-06

**Moved by:** Mayor Donohue **Seconded by:** Angela Field

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the January 5, 2026 Planning and Economic Development Committee provide for the public to have an opportunity to review

the Draft Zoning By-Law Amendment.

“Carried”

5. Question Period

Committee asked how the process will work. Bruce Howarth reviewed the open house process, and stated that staff and council should not be present.

6. Next Meeting

At the call of the Chair.

7. Adjournment – 2025-12-07

**Moved by:** Angela Field

**Seconded by:** Michael Donohue

BE IT RESOLVED that the January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2026, Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting adjourn at 1:49 p.m.

“Carried”

---

Chair

---

CAO/Clerk



## PLANNING REPORT TO THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWNSHIP OF ADMASTON/BROMLEY NEW COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW

1. **FILE NO.:** New Comprehensive Zoning By-law
2. **APPLICANT:** Township of Admaston/Bromley
3. **MUNICIPALITY:** Township of Admaston/Bromley
4. **LANDS AFFECTED** All lands located in the Township of Admaston/Bromley
5. **COUNTY OF RENFREW OFFICIAL PLAN** The Township of Admaston/Bromley uses the County of Renfrew Official Plan as its local Official Plan. The Official Plan was updated, as required, under Section 26 of the Planning Act, and approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in August 2021.
6. **TWP OF ADMASTON/BROMLEY ZONING BY-LAW** The Township of Admaston/Bromley's current Zoning By-law 2004-13, applies to all lands within the municipality and came into effect on April 1, 2004.

### 7. PURPOSE OF PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW UPDATE:

The new Zoning By-law will replace the current Zoning By-law 2004-13, in accordance with Section 26(9) of the Planning Act, which requires municipalities to update their zoning by-laws to ensure the By-law is consistent with Provincial policy and the Official Plan.

### 8. MAIN CHANGES TO THE ZONING BY-LAW:

The following summarizes the main changes to the new proposed Zoning By-law:

- i. Replacing the Residential (One) Zone with the Rural Residential (RR) Zone to reflect rural services (well and septic) used throughout the Township. The zone provisions are effectively the same. [Section 6]
- ii. New general provisions to permit shipping containers/sea cans as accessory buildings in specific zones (not including residential), provided that a building permit is obtained and size requirements are met. [Section 3.2.9]

- 
- iii. Provisions for backyard chickens and urban agriculture have been carried over to the Zoning By-law from the Township's backyard chicken by-law. These provisions allow for the keeping of backyard chickens in zones where a farm is not a permitted use, with limitations on the number of chickens permitted based on the total lot area and subject to a permit being obtained. [Section 3.4]
  - iv. New general provisions added to allow for a shoreline activity area on waterfront properties to permitting limited structures (i.e. small storage sheds, gazebos, decks, etc.) within 30 metres of the high water mark, subject to building size limits. Does not apply to pools, hot tubs, a bunkie or any habitable building. [Section 3.27.5 g)]
  - v. New general provisions added to allow a sleep cabin on a waterfront lot with a minimum 0.4 hectare lot size, subject to the 30 metre water setback and 18 square metre maximum building size. [Section 3.2.2a]
  - vi. New general provision added to ease restrictions for locating structures designed for accessible or barrier-free access, such as ramps or lifts. The intent is to reduce/eliminate the need for minor variances or other planning approvals for construction. [Section 3.5]
  - vii. Reciprocal separation distances between sensitive development and aggregate resources, licensed pits and quarries have been updated. For sand and gravel resources and pits, the separation has been increased from 150 metres to 300 metres. For bedrock resources and quarries, the separation has been increased from 300 metres to 500 metres. This is a Provincial directive that the Township is required to implement in this zoning update. [Sections 3.25.1 c) and d) and 3.25.2 d) and e)]. The separation buffers have been added to the zoning map Schedule for clarity.
  - viii. New definitions for on-farm diversified uses and agriculture related uses have been added to the Zoning By-law, and listed as permitted uses in the Rural (RU) and Agriculture (A) zones. This will provide properties that are zoned to permit a farm more flexibility to use the property and diversify farm income, with some restrictions regarding maximum area that can be used for the diversified use. [Section 2. Definitions and permitted uses listed in Section 20 Rural (RU) and Section 21 Agriculture (A) zones]. This is a Provincial initiative.
  - ix. Parking and loading requirements have been updated with more detailed requirements. [Section 4]
  - x. New updated zoning map schedules will include required separations from aggregates, licensed pits and quarries, from waste disposal sites, and Provincially Significant Wetlands to improve clarity.
  - xi. An online interactive version of the zoning map schedule will be provided to the Township, for use by the public. This is intended to improve ease of use, will be searchable by address and roll number, and will include air photography and various tools.

## 9. NOTIFICATION AND PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Notification for the open house and public meeting, required under Section 34(10.7) of the Planning Act was provided by the Township starting on February 3, 2026, in the following manners:

- Posted on the Township of Admaston/Bromley website on February 3, 2026
- Advertised in the Eganville Leader on February 11, 2026
- Advertised on the MyFM radio station starting on February 9, 2026
- Advertised on Valley Heritage Radio on February 25, 2026

The following information was made available on the Township's website:

- Draft By-law Interactive Mapping
- Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law, dated January 12, 2026
- Document entitled Overview and Key Changes
- Draft Zoning By-law Map – Admaston
- Draft Zoning By-law Map – Bromley

The required Open House was held at Council Chambers for the Township of Admaston/Bromley, on Thursday, February 26, 2026, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. County Planning staff were present to meet with the public and discuss the proposed draft By-law text and map schedules.

The Public Meeting was held in the Council Chambers for the Township of Admaston/Bromley on Thursday, March 5, 2026, starting at 6 p.m. Approximately 18 members of the public were in attendance. County Planning staff also attended and provided a presentation explaining the process and the main changes to the proposed Zoning By-law.

The scheduling of the public sessions was completed in accordance with the Planning Act.

## 10. COMMENTS RECEIVED:

Written and oral comments were received by the Township from both public agencies and the general public.

A chart summarizing the written and oral comments received and the Planning responses is attached as Appendix A to this Report.

## 11. ADDITIONAL PLANNING COMMENTS:

### i. Minor Corrections

As a result of the public open house session, members of the public identified a handful of incorrect labels which are recommended to be corrected on the map schedule.

---

ii. Current Zoning By-law Amendments to Zoning By-law 2004-13

Since the public sessions for this project, two applications for site specific zoning by-law amendments to the current Zoning By-law 2004-13 have been submitted. The map schedules will be updated to include the related map changes, and new exception zone provisions will be added to the text, to ensure these approved changes are recognized in the new Zoning By-law. These last-minute amendment updates are standard procedure. No other action will be required.

iii. Algonquins of Ontario

The Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) have provided comments, regarding engagement on this project. Comments include:

- The draft Zoning By-law does not recognize the presence and rights of the Algonquin Peoples within the Township or broader region;
- The document does not clarify how meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities will occur where development under the by-law may impact Aboriginal or Treaty rights;
- The [draft] by-law does not confirm that archaeological assessments must be completed and accepted by the appropriate authority prior to approvals in areas of archaeological potential; and
- There is no explicit recognition of Indigenous cultural heritage, traditional land use, or cultural landscapes in land-use planning decisions, including those related to shoreline activity and aggregate resource extraction.

The last three bullet points are related to Official Plan/policy and are not relevant to a zoning by-law. The Official Plan already includes the policies related to indigenous engagement in the context of archaeological resources.

The Planning Act and the Provincial Planning Statement require planning authorities to engage with Indigenous communities and coordinate on land use planning matters. This engagement is intended to facilitate knowledge-sharing, ensure Indigenous interests are considered in decision-making, and help identify potential impacts on the exercise of Aboriginal or treaty rights.

The Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) were notified of the comprehensive zoning by-law project and have requested additional consultation. Council should provide direction to staff on undertaking further engagement and on responding to the AOO's request, including consideration of adding formal recognition of Algonquin peoples within the by-law.

iv. Section 3.4.8 – Beekeeping

Most towns and townships in Ontario—like Admaston/Bromley, only allow beekeeping on farms. This means you can only keep honeybees if the property is

zoned to permit a farm. Just like everyone is not allowed to keep a cow in their backyard, not all locations are permitted to have honeybee hives. The same principle applies with chickens, you can't keep chickens in a residential backyard unless there's a special local rule that allows it. On top of any local rules, the Province also has a law called the Bees Act that sets other requirements for beekeeping.

Representatives of the Upper Ottawa Valley Beekeepers Association proposed provisions relating to apiculture. They feel that limiting honeybee-keeping to only properties where a farm is a permitted use is too restrictive.

Over the years, beekeeping has seen a noticeable rise in hobbyist participation. Anyone visiting local farmers' markets or attending "Taste of the Valley" events across Renfrew County can see the popularity, enthusiasm, and variety of products offered by local beekeepers. However, it is estimated that roughly half of these beekeepers are not fully compliant with existing regulations.

Honeybees are often associated with the idea of "saving the bees," but this is a misconception. Honeybees are not native to North America; they were introduced from Europe and are a managed species. Supporting pollinators is a separate issue from determining where honeybee hives should be allowed. Suggesting that honeybees are necessary to protect pollinators is comparable to arguing that raising chickens helps conserve wild bird populations.

While honeybee populations remain stable, and may even be more abundant than ever, many native bee species and other pollinators are in serious decline. Expanding honeybee-keeping, particularly in non-agricultural areas, can negatively affect these wild pollinators. Honeybees tend to forage over longer distances and can outcompete native species for food resources. They may also spread parasites and diseases, adding further pressure on already vulnerable populations.

That said, honeybees play a vital role in agriculture and the broader economy, especially for crops such as apples, cherries, other stone fruits, canola, and blueberries. In agricultural settings, hives are often kept on-site or brought in temporarily during key pollination periods. The Township is not proposing any new restrictions on the use of honeybees for farming and agricultural purposes.

Zoning decisions require careful balance. They aim to support how property owners use their land while also protecting neighboring properties from potential impacts, and weighing environmental considerations against economic development. In essence, zoning is about making thoughtful trade-offs. It guides not only where development occurs, but how communities evolve and function over time. While it is impossible to satisfy every perspective, the goal is to find a reasonable balance that serves the broader public interest. Notably, even within the beekeeping community, there are differing views and ongoing tensions between hobbyists and commercial operators.

Zoning not only protects neighbors from unwanted or potentially harmful land

uses, but it also safeguards property owners who are using their land lawfully from unfounded or unreasonable complaints.

Concerns we have heard:

- Bee stings are a serious concern, especially for people with severe allergies;
- Fear of increased bee presence near homes, schools, or playgrounds can make neighbors uneasy, even though honey bees are generally docile unless provoked;
- Swarms of bees trying to find a new home;
- Swarms re-locating into houses/garages damaging property/buildings;
- Impacting enjoyment of property – especially regarding pools and around water;
- Negative impacts on the natural environment and native species;
- Liability – if someone is stung and injured or dies from an illegal bee hive (or reduced setbacks/lot area);
- From commercial beekeepers:
  - Hobbyists tend to have a lower standard of hive maintenance (sometimes out of their control) for diseases and pests;
  - Mites, foulbrood, colony collapse disorder, or nosema can spread and affect nearby commercial operations. Commercial beekeepers often invest heavily in disease prevention, and poor practices nearby can undermine their efforts
  - Some of the medications/treatments are not available to hobbyists or are so expensive given the scale of hobbyists operations that they forgo some of the standard treatments.

As part of the zoning by-law review, the Township wanted to hear from local residents. However, the Township needs to find the right balance, how many beehives should be allowed and where they should be allowed in a non-farm setting. Hopefully many of the existing “50% non-compliant beekeepers” identified by the local beekeeping association will become legal under any proposed changes. We also realize that this amendment may not capture every operation, and there can still be some beekeepers who might still have non-compliant operations. These local rules would be in addition to the rules already set by the Province under the Bees Act.

To improve the accessibility of honeybee-keeping, the Upper Ottawa Valley Beekeepers Association provided the following suggested provisions:

Current Zoning By-law	Suggested Provisions Received from UOVBA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beekeeping is only permitted as a farm use in the Rural (RU) and Agriculture (A) zones, on lots 2 hectares in size and larger.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To permit beekeeping in all zones</li> <li>• No limit on number of hives</li> <li>• That beekeepers must comply with the Ontario Bees Act</li> <li>• That hives should be situated away from public areas, including sidewalks and roads as well as neighboring properties</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the municipality should require a beekeeper to move the hives if they become hazardous</li> <li>• That hives not be located within 30 meters of a public road</li> <li>• That beekeepers should post their name and mailing address on hives</li> <li>• That the beekeeper be responsible for dealing with threats to others from aggressive bees</li> </ul>
--	--

Of these suggested provisions, the following are appropriate for a Zoning By-law: the zones in which beekeeping is permitted, and the restrictions on the number and location of hives. The other proposals, including ensuring compliance with the Ontario Bees Act, the posting of names and addresses of apiarists, and the allocation of responsibility for dealing with aggressive bees is outside the authority of zoning, and would best be dealt with through a licensing by-law or other animal control by-law under the Municipal Act.

As an example, the following are provisions from another zoning by-law:

- 1) *The keeping of Honeybees shall be permitted in all zones.*
- 2) *Minimum lot area requirements for backyard honeybee keeping are as follows:*

<b>Lot Size</b>	<b>Permissions/Requirements</b>
<i>0.4 Ha to less than 0.8 Ha</i>	<i>- Maximum of 5 hives</i>
<i>0.8 Ha to less than 2.0 Ha</i>	<i>- Maximum of 15 hives</i>
<i>2.0 Ha and greater</i>	<i>- No maximum number of hives</i>

- 3) *Hives are required to be located:*
  - a) *A minimum of 3 metres from any property line;*
  - b) *A minimum of 10 metres from a property line adjacent to a road or highway; and*
  - c) *A minimum of 30 metres to a property line separating the land on which the hives are placed or left from land occupied as a dwelling or used for a community centre, public park or other place of public assembly or recreation.*

When the Township considers this matter, it is effectively contemplating an exception to the existing regulatory framework. Honeybees are currently

restricted to properties where a farm is a permitted use. In evaluating a potential exception, Council has discretion to determine the appropriate provisions and conditions that should govern such an allowance.

When introducing a new use or policy direction, it is generally prudent to proceed cautiously and establish clear, comprehensive regulations rather than adopt a permissive approach at the outset. Should experience demonstrate that certain provisions are overly restrictive, it is more straightforward to relax those requirements over time than it is to introduce more stringent regulations after the fact through amendments to the zoning by-law.

Council has the following options to address the issue of the beekeeping provisions:

- a) Keep the provisions from the previous by-law (restrict honeybee-keeping to farms);
- b) Adopt new provisions in line with the Upper Ottawa Valley Beekeepers Association's comments;
- c) Adopt a modified version of the provisions.
- d) In addition to any provisions in the zoning by-law, whether to direct staff to propose or make amendments to a honeybee-keeping licensing by-law or by-law under the Municipal Act.

v. Section 3.2.8 – Tarpaulin Garages

Comments were received regarding the seasonal restrictions proposed for temporary tarpaulin garages. Public comments included that the removal and reinstallation of these structures every six months placed an unreasonable burden on residents and that winter months are when the structures see the most use, protecting vehicles and equipment from during periods of heavy snow.

Current Zoning By-law	Proposed Zoning By-law
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibited in all zones except for RU and A.</li> <li>• Maintained in an orderly fashion</li> <li>• No seasonal restrictions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted in all zones</li> <li>• Maintained in an orderly fashion</li> <li>• Tarpaulin garages in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone shall be prohibited from November 1 to May 1</li> </ul>

While the requirement to remove the tarpaulin garages over the winter in the Rural Residential (RR) zone may be onerous for some residents, the restriction only applies to those in built-up areas, primarily Douglas and Osceola. Furthermore, these provisions do not affect the ability of residents to build a permanent garage as an accessory structure (subject to a building permit).

Council has the following options regarding the tarpaulin garage provisions:

- a) Proceed with the current draft by-law; or
- b) Amend the draft by-law (i.e. remove seasonal use restrictions in the RR zone).

vi. Section 3.23 – Open Storage

Comments were received from multiple residents regarding the open storage provisions, particularly regarding the new provisions for boats and recreational vehicles (RVs). Comments suggested that the provisions around boats and RVs were overly restrictive and unduly focused on aesthetic considerations. It was also suggested that the seasonal restrictions and limit to the number of hours a month that an RV could be stored in a visible area were arbitrary and not appropriate for a rural environment.

Current Zoning By-law	Proposed Zoning By-law	
All	Boats and RVs	Other
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted in any zone other than EP</li> <li>• Must comply with minimum front and exterior side yard setbacks unless an agricultural use</li> <li>• Must comply with minimum rear and interior side yard setbacks if it abuts an industrial use</li> <li>• Cannot be visible from the street or from any adjacent lots unless that lot is a commercial or industrial zone</li> <li>• Visual screening and buffering required except when it is for an agricultural use</li> <li>• 3 metre open space buffer required around all open storage areas</li> <li>• Parking spaces cannot be used for open storage</li> <li>• No provisions for storage of boats or recreational vehicles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One boat and one RV may be stored on a property in a rural, agricultural or residential zone with a dwelling</li> <li>• If the property is over 1 Ha and located in a rural or agricultural zone, 2 RVs and 3 boats are allowed</li> <li>• Only allowed in the RR zone between May 1 and November 1</li> <li>• Mandated Parking spaces cannot be used for open storage, including storage of an RV</li> <li>• RVs cannot be occupied while stored</li> <li>• May only be stored in front or exterior side yard for up to 72 hours per month</li> <li>• 1.2m setback from rear and interior side yard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cannot be located in the front or exterior side yards</li> <li>• Cannot be visible from the street or from any adjacent lots unless that lot is a commercial or industrial zone</li> <li>• Visual screening and buffering required except when it is for an agricultural use</li> <li>• 3 metre open space buffer required around all open storage areas</li> <li>• Parking spaces cannot be used for open storage</li> </ul>

Council has the following options going forward for addressing concerns around the open storage provisions:

- a) Proceed with the current draft by-law; or
- b) Amend the draft by-law (i.e. seasonal usage/buffering requirements/number of boats/RVs);

vii. Section 20 – Rural (RU) Zone

The Chief Building Official for the Township of Admaston/Bromley provided comments regarding some of the changes made to the provisions and permitted uses in the Rural (RU) Zone. First, the removal of a Contractors Yard or Shop, Logging Haulers, as well as Retail uses accessory to a permitted use as permitted uses.

The proposal to limit Contractors Yards or Shops and Logging Haulers to the General Industrial (GM) zone reflects a preference for locating these uses in areas better suited to their impacts. These operations can generate significant noise and truck traffic, which has been shown to be incompatible with nearby residential uses in rural areas. The use will continue to be permitted in Rural Exception Zones where it is already explicitly allowed and existing contractor's yards can continue as legal non-conforming uses.

Home industries will remain permitted, as they represent smaller-scale operations that enable tradespeople to work from their property. A contractor's yard may still be considered within the rural zone, it would require a zoning amendment application and approval from the Township, subject to a determination that the proposed location is appropriate.

Regarding the removal of retail uses accessory to a permitted use in the rural zone, while this has been removed, On-farm diversified uses and home industries, and home occupations are permitted uses in the RU zone under the proposed by-law which would permit the same things covered by the previous accessory retail uses – the terminology has changed, but not the permitted use.

The second comment related to the change in the maximum lot coverage from 33% to 20%. This change brings the provision into alignment with the other municipalities in the County and recognizes the intended lower density of the RU zone. However, this can be altered if the Township is of the opinion that 20% is too restrictive.

Current Zoning By-law	Proposed Zoning By-law
<p>Permitted Uses:</p> <p>a) Residential Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single detached dwelling</li> <li>• Semi-detached dwelling</li> <li>• Duplex dwelling</li> <li>• A limited service dwelling on an existing lot of record</li> <li>• Group home</li> </ul> <p>b) Non-Residential Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Private airfield</li> <li>• Farm</li> <li>• Farm limited</li> <li>• Farm produce sales outlet</li> <li>• Forestry</li> <li>• Home industry</li> </ul>	<p>Permitted Uses:</p> <p>a) Residential Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group home</li> <li>• Single detached dwelling</li> </ul> <p>b) Non-Residential Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bed and breakfast</li> <li>• Cannabis production facility</li> <li>• Cemetery</li> <li>• Farm</li> <li>• Farm – Agriculture related use</li> <li>• Farm – On farm diversified use</li> <li>• Forestry</li> <li>• Home industry</li> <li>• Hunt or fish camp</li> <li>• Passive recreation</li> <li>• Private airfield</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hunting and fishing camp</li> <li>• Contractors yard or shop</li> <li>• Logging hauler</li> <li>• Mineral exploration</li> <li>• Private club</li> <li>• Public building</li> <li>• Religious education facility</li> <li>• Retail uses accessory to a permitted use</li> <li>• Bed and breakfast establishment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special event *with an approved special event permit from Township*</li> </ul>
<p>Provisions:</p> <p>a) Lot Area (minimum)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. single detached, semi-detached, limited-service dwelling, home industry or duplex dwelling 4047 square metres</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. semi-detached dwelling (each unit on a separate lot) 2024 square metres</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">iii. other permitted uses 2 hectares</p> <p>b) Lot Frontage (minimum)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. single detached, semi-detached or duplex dwelling, or other uses 45 metres</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. semi-detached dwelling (each unit on a separate lot) 23 metres</p> <p>c) Water Frontage 45 metres</p> <p>d) Front Yard Depth (minimum) 7.5 metres</p> <p>e) Exterior Side Yard (minimum) 7.5 metres</p> <p>f) Interior Side yard (minimum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- single detached dwelling; group home 3 metres</li> <li>- duplex dwelling 3 metres</li> <li>- semi-detached dwelling 3 metres</li> <li>- semi-detached dwelling (each unit on a separate lot) Requires Interior or Exterior Side Yard on One Side Only</li> </ul> <p>g) Rear Yard Depth (minimum) 7.5 metres</p>	<p>Provisions:</p> <p>a) Lot Area (minimum)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i. Residential uses, home industry, bed and breakfast, hunt or fishing camp 4047 m<sup>2</sup></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii. All other permitted uses 2 Ha</p> <p>b) Lot Frontage (minimum) 45 m</p> <p>c) Front Yard Depth (minimum) 7.5 m</p> <p>d) Side Yard Width (minimum) 3 m</p> <p>e) Exterior Side Yard Width (minimum) 7.5 m</p> <p>f) Rear Yard Depth (minimum) 7.5 m</p> <p>g) Lot Coverage 20 %</p>

h) Dwelling Unit Area (minimum) 65 square metres	
i) Gross Floor Area (maximum) for Mineral Exploration 9.3 square metres	
j) Lot Coverage (maximum) 33%	

Council has the following options going forward for addressing concerns around the RU Zone:

- c) Proceed with the current draft by-law; or
- d) Amend the draft by-law (i.e. permitted uses lot coverage requirements);

**12. RECOMMENDATIONS:**

That, Council support the proposed Zoning By-law and map Schedule as drafted, subject to the following considerations:

- 1) Council provide direction regarding including a land acknowledgement at the beginning of the by-law and direction regarding additional consultation with the AOO.
- 2) Council provide direction regarding the Beekeeping provisions in Section 3.4.8 of the Zoning By-law.
- 3) Council provide direction regarding tarpaulin garage provisions in Section 3.2.8 of the Zoning By-law.
- 4) Council provide direction regarding the open storage provisions in Section 3.23 of the Zoning By-law.
- 5) Council provide direction regarding the Rural (RU) Zone in Section 20 of the Zoning By-law.
- 6) Council provide direction regarding any changes resulting from the additional public comments submitted, as set out in Appendix A to this Report.

Date: March 31, 2026

Prepared by: Benjamin Savage  
Junior Planner

Reviewed by: Bruce Howarth, MCIP, RPP  
Manager of Planning Services

AGENCY COMMENTS			
Item	Name	Comment	County Staff Comment/Recommendation
1.	Algonquins of Ontario	<p>The AOO commented that they are rights-holders rather than ratepayers, and that the open house and public meeting do not constitute consultation. They further requested a copy of the draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law and the overview and key changes document.</p> <p>Following receipt of the documents requested, the AOO expressed concern that the presence and rights of the Algonquin people both in Admaston/Bromley and in the broader area., that the draft by-law does not speak to engagement with indigenous communities or how development would impact Treaty rights, that it does not mention archaeological assessment requirements, and that there is no explicit recognition of Indigenous cultural heritage, traditional land use, or cultural landscapes in land-use planning decisions, including those related to shoreline activity and aggregate resource extraction.</p>	<p>The process to consider this zoning by-law followed notice procedures under the requirements of the Planning Act and Official Plan. A copy of the full draft zoning by-law was provided to them. The AOO has requested further consultation.</p> <p>The majority of the changes being requested are more appropriate for an Official Plan than a Comprehensive Zoning By-law. The County Official Plan contains policies regarding consultation and triggering when an archaeological assessment is required as a result of development.</p> <p>An example introductory statement could be:</p> <p><i>The Township acknowledges that it is situated on the traditional and unceded territory of the Omàmiwinini (<b>Oh-ma-mee-WEE-nee-nee</b>) (Algonquin) People. These lands have been cared for by the Algonquin people for thousands of years. The Township expresses its gratitude to the Omàmiwinini (<b>Oh-ma-mee-WEE-nee-nee</b>) people for their stewardship of this land and honor their rich history and culture. The Township is committed to fostering respect, reconciliation, and understanding.</i></p> <p><b>Council to provide direction regarding further consultation with the AOO and inclusion of any statements in the introduction of the by-law regarding the Algonquins of Ontario.</b></p>
2.	Ministry of Energy and Mines	MEM commented the plan meets their requirements.	<b>No action required.</b>
3.	TC Energy	<p>MHBC Planning on behalf of TC Energy requested that the township incorporate the following provisions in the General Provisions Section:</p> <p><i>TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL):</i></p> <p><i>a. A minimum setback of 7.0 m shall be required from any part of a building or structure to the edge of the TCPL pipeline right-of-way.</i></p>	<p>The requested section already exists under the General Provisions Section 3.31</p> <p><b>No action required.</b></p>

		<i>b. A minimum setback of 7.0 m from the nearest portion of a TCPL pipeline right-of-way shall be required to any parking area or loading area, including any parking spaces, loading spaces, bicycle parking spaces, and any associated aisle or driveway.</i>	
4.	Ministry of Transportation	No Concerns	<b>No action required.</b>
5.	Township Chief Building Official	<p>Recommended to review the removal of the following permitted uses in the Rural (RU) zone: Contractors Yard or Shop; Logging Hauler; and Retail uses accessory to a permitted use. Furthermore, he recommended against the change in the maximum lot coverage for the RU zone from 33% to 20%.</p> <p>Noted that the minimum lot area of the agriculture zone was increased from 20 ha minimum to 40 ha.</p>	<p>The comments regarding the Rural (RU) Zone have been addressed in Section 11.vii of this report. It is not recommended that the contractors yard and Logging hauler be added as permitted uses, these higher level commercial/industrial uses are better suited in an industrial zone, or considered through a site-specific zoning amendment. Home industry contractor use that is smaller scale are still permitted in the Rural zone as-a-right. The retail uses accessory to permitted uses are already captured as permitted in the home occupation, home industry, and on-farm diversified uses section of the by-law.</p> <p>Planning staff have no concerns changing the maximum lot coverage back to 33%.</p> <p><b>Council to provide direction.</b></p> <p>The change to set the minimum lot size in the A zone to 40 Ha brings the Admaston/Bromley Zoning By-law into compliance w the County Official Plan.</p> <p><b>No change recommended.</b></p>

PUBLIC COMMENTS			
Item	Name	Comment	County Staff Comment/Recommendation
1.	Upper Ottawa Valley Beekeepers Association - Jennifer Doelman & Murray Borer	<p>Request that beekeeping be allowed on lots smaller than 5 acres. The organization feels that existing apiary operations on lots less than 5 acres in area have operated successfully without controversy in Admaston/Bromley in the past and they wish to see that reflected in the updated Zoning By-law.</p> <p>A full set of proposed provisions for beekeeping drafted by the Beekeepers Association was received by the Township at the Public Meeting. These provisions propose the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That beekeeping be permitted in all zones</li> <li>• That there should be not limit on the number of hives in any zone</li> <li>• That beekeepers must comply with the Ontario Bees Act</li> <li>• That hives should be situated away from public areas and neighboring properties</li> <li>• That hives should be placed to minimize bee flight paths coming into conflict with sidewalks and other high traffic walking areas</li> <li>• That the municipality can require a beekeeper to move the hives if they become hazardous</li> <li>• That hives not be located within 30 meters of a public road unless protected by a buffer or positioned to direct bee flight away from the road</li> <li>• That beekeepers should post their name and mailing address on at least one hive in an apiary</li> <li>• That the beekeeper is responsible for preventing aggressive behaviours of the bees and dealing with them if they become a threat to other people or animals.</li> </ul>	<p>The comments have been addressed in Section 11.iv of this report. Several of the comments or proposed provisions fall outside of the scope of a zoning by-law and would be better addressed through either a licensing by-law or animal control by-law under the Municipal Act.</p> <p>The provisions from the previous By-law are temporarily still in place in the draft awaiting decision by Council. Currently only allowed on farms, or in the rural zone with a minimum lot size of 2 Ha (5 acres) in the rural zone.</p> <p><b>Council to provide direction.</b></p>
2.	Cavanagh Construction	MHBC Planning on behalf of Cavanagh requested site specific rezonings of properties adjacent to existing Cavanagh sites to Mineral Aggregate Quarry – Reserve	The County of Renfrew Official Plan was updated and approved in 2021 by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the direction was that these distances be increased to 300 metres (from sand/gravel resources and pits) and to 500

		<p>(MQ-R), as well as information about how the land chosen to be rezoned to MQ-R and MP-R is chosen.</p> <p>Concern was also expressed regarding proposed provisions 3.25.2(d) and 3.25.2(e), MHBC do not feel that a separation distance from new aggregate operations should be applied and feel that D-6 guidelines as well as the County OP, and the Aggregate Resources Act support site-specific studies for new aggregate sites rather than a blanket separation distance.</p> <p>Furthermore, MHBC feels that the provisions for the Mineral Aggregate Pit (MP) Zone (13.2) the Mineral Aggregate Quarry (MQ) Zone (15.2) relating to minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage, landscaped buffers and setbacks should all be removed from the Zoning By-law. They feel that these provisions should also be determined through site-specific technical studies.</p>	<p>metres (from bedrock resources and quarries), reciprocally.</p> <p>The aggregate mapping of the Official Plan contains the information regarding the land chosen for MQ-R and MP-R.</p> <p>These separation distances have been in effect for many years and were implemented by the Province for assessing potential reciprocal impacts between aggregate resources/operations and sensitive development (i.e. dwellings; uses that involve gatherings of people).</p> <p>Site specific studies can be utilized to reduce, or increase, these setbacks through the zoning by-law amendment process.</p> <p><b>No change recommended.</b></p>
3.	Russell Defer	<p>Sought clarification about whether the restrictions on open storage of an RV would apply to his vehicle, and if so to speak against the level of restriction in proposed Section 3.23 Open Storage</p> <p>Opposed to section 3.2.8 regarding tarpaulin garages needing to be disassembled in the winter, expressing that it would be onerous for older residents and that the winter was the most useful time for the structures.</p>	<p>The property is zoned Rural Residential (RR) - Section 3.23.1 would apply to his property and his recreational vehicle. An RV would be allowed only between May 1 and November 1 under the proposed by-law.</p> <p>Comments regarding both recreational vehicle storage and tarpaulin garages have been addressed in the Sections 11. v and 11.vi of this report.</p> <p><b>Council to provide direction</b></p>
4.	Salina Aubrey	<p>Requested that the Township consider the following impacts of the bylaw changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Section 3.2 could limit the ability of residents to live on their lots while building or rebuilding a house.</li> <li>• That 3.13 Home Industry may be overly restrictive in terms of number of persons that can be employed in a home industry (3.13.1), the parking requirements (3.13.4), the percentage of floor space that can be dedicated to a home industry</li> </ul>	<p>Section 3.29 allows for residents to live in a temporary accommodation, including an RV or trailer, on a site where a dwelling is being constructed as long as the temporary accommodation has been removed within 30 days of occupancy of the primary building.</p> <p>Regarding Sections 3.13 and 3.14, the restrictions listed are intended to ensure that residential uses remain the primary use where these are allowed, and as such the size of a home industry or occupation is more limited than businesses in other zones.</p>

		<p>(3.13.6), and the prohibition on the storage associated with a home industry (3.13.7).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the restrictions on Home Occupations (3.14) may also be overly restrictive: the limit on staff (3.14.1), the restrictions on storage of vehicles (3.14.5), and the limit on number of pupils at a home occupation where instruction is involved (3.14.9).</li> <li>• That 3.23.1 may place undue concern for aesthetic considerations involving storage of boats and RVs (3.23.1).</li> <li>• Section 3.23.2 Open Storage and 3.24 Public Uses of Land was insufficiently clearly defined.</li> <li>• Sought clarification about 4.2 Parking requirements and whether this section also applied to home businesses.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments regarding Section 3.23.1 have been addressed above in Sections 11.v and 11.vi of this report.</p> <p>Regarding Section 3.23.2, Open Storage is the storage of goods, merchandise or equipment in the open air and in unenclosed portions of buildings which are open to air on the side. The intention of this policy is again to ensure that the primary use of a property remains as intended whether residential, agricultural etc., which is why exceptions were made for commercial and industrial zones where storage can be considered a primary use.</p> <p>The purpose of Section 3.24 Public Uses of Land is to clarify that public buildings, owned by the Township or County, are not subject to the standard provisions of the by-law other than the provisions specified within 3.24.</p> <p>In Section 4.2, parking requirements are based on both the intended use and whether the property is located in a built-up area or in a more rural area. While these requirements would apply to a both home industries and home occupations, subject to the other requirements of those sections, the proposed requirement is only a single space for a home business in a rural area and none are required in an urban/village area.</p> <p><b>3.23 To be addressed by Council/Otherwise no changes recommended</b></p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Allan Stokes</p>	<p>Having a Zoning By-law restricted freedom, and that it gave too much power to council. Section 1.6 which allows municipal employees to enter the property of a resident to inspect Zoning By-law violations and 1.8 which states that it is the responsibility of residents to ensure compliance with the Zoning By-law.</p>	<p>The Planning Act is the legislation that empowers municipalities to create official plans, zoning by-laws, and other planning documents to manage land use within their boundaries. These documents outline the municipality's vision for development, land use policies, and zoning regulations that guide how land can be used and developed.</p> <p>While municipalities have the authority to regulate land use, they must comply with provincial policies and legislation, including the Planning Act, Environmental Protection Act, Endangered Species Act, Municipal Act, etc. The province provides a framework within which municipalities operate, and local planning decisions are to align with provincial policies and interests.</p> <p>It should be noted that Section 1.6 of the Zoning By-law does not apply to all municipal employees. Only the Chief Building Official and By-law officers may inspect private property and they may only inspect and enter private property when/where permitted by legislation. This section does not give them</p>

			<p>indiscriminate powers to enter private property.</p> <p><b>No change recommended.</b></p>
6.	Michael Kelly	<p>Concerned that portions of the property being rezoned to EP will affect his two existing lot addition applications (from 54 Dragonfly Way to 146 Dragonfly Way and to the property without a civic address in the same ownership as 146 Dragonfly Way). The resident wants the property to be zoned LSR to comply with the notices of decision that have already gone out.</p>	<p>The EP rezoning in question was an error with the mapping; it should have been zoned RU moving to LSR with the in-progress rezoning.</p> <p><b>Recommended to update the zone boundaries.</b></p>
7.	Ralph and Jeane Klietsch	<p>Wanted to confirm that their properties, at 698 Pucker Street and the abutting lots to the north and south (both without civic addresses) are still zoned Rural (RU) in the new zoning by-law and to confirm if the property would be affected by the expanded mining buffers.</p>	<p>The properties are still zoned RU and will be affected by the mining buffer. A follow-up email was sent confirming this for them.</p> <p><b>No further action required.</b></p>
8.	Edward Gilchrist	<p>The farm at Admaston Concession 2 W Part Lot 5 and Concession 3 E Part Lot 5 should be zoned Agriculture (A) not Rural (RU).</p>	<p>Both of these properties were zoned Rural (RU) in both the previous and proposed zoning by-laws. This zoning reflects the designation of both properties as Rural in the Official Plan.</p> <p><b>No change recommended.</b></p>
9.	Jim Wasmund	<p>Wished to receive an electronic copy of the Bromley Schedule A Map</p>	<p>A copy of the map was emailed to him on February 27.</p> <p><b>No further action required.</b></p>