



The Corporation of the Township of Seguin

Addendum

Council Meeting Monday, July 20th, 2026 in the Township of Seguin Council Chambers and Electronic Participation

05. Public Meeting:

- Addition to item c) Consent Application No.'s B-2025-0031 and B-2025-0032-F (Pelkinen) of correspondence from Steve Orser.
- Addition to item d) Zoning By-law Amendment Application No. R-2026-0009-H (Madge) of correspondence from Susan Eplett & Jim Walker, John & Joy Crysdale, the Muskoka Lakes Association, the Lake Rosseau North Association and Eric Oliver & Rhondda Lymburner. Correspondence from Melissa Markham, Agent for the Applicant notifying of withdrawal of the application.



Fw: Council, Care of Craig Jeffery. New lots on Black Road B-2025-0031-F & B-2025-0032-F

From info <info@seguin.ca>

Date Mon 2026-07-20 8:30 AM

To Planning <planning@seguin.ca>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>

Cc Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>



Township of Seguin
(705) 732-4300

From: Steve Orser <orser6@gmail.com>

Sent: July 19, 2026 8:38 PM

To: info <info@seguin.ca>

Subject: Council, Care of Craig Jeffery. New lots on Black Road B-2025-0031-F & B-2025-0032-F

You don't often get email from orser6@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Craig,

We own a property directly next to the proposed new lots at 10 Haystead Bay road. We are in full support of the proposal.

We plan to build our forever home in the next few years and having more full time neighbors would definitely be a benefit to our local community. The area gets very quiet in the winter when all the seasonal cottagers go home. All the current full time neighbors on Black Road and Haystead Bay road get along great and are always willing to help each other out. So having a few more would be great.

Regards,
Steve Orser



Fw: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2006-009-H Owners Stacy Madge Agent Melissa Markham Civic Address 163 Burgess Road

From info <info@seguin.ca>

Date Mon 2026-07-20 8:33 AM

To Planning <planning@seguin.ca>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>

Cc Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>; Donna McLeod <dmcleod@seguin.ca>

 1 attachment (63 KB)

Zoning By-Law Consideration.pdf;



Township of Seguin
(705) 732-4300

From: Rhondda Lymburner <rhonddalymburner@gmail.com>

Sent: July 17, 2026 7:35 PM

To: info <info@seguin.ca>

Subject: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2006-009-H Owners Stacy Madge Agent Melissa Markham Civic Address 163 Burgess Road

You don't often get email from rhonddalymburner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Councillors,
Please find attached a letter pertaining to the above.
Thank you in advance for your careful consideration of this proposal.
Rhondda Lymburner

To: Mayor McDermott and Councillors, Township of Seguin
Re: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2006-009-H, Owners, Stacey Madge
Agent: Melissa Markham
Civic address: 163 Burgess Rd.

We are neighbours of this property and neighbours to Nancy Croitoru, Susan Eplett, John and Joy Crysdale, and Doug and Susan Gunton. Each of these residents have clearly stated their objections to the proposed development and their belief that the proposal must be rejected. We concur with their objections and believe that the proposal must be rejected.

Thank you for your careful consideration of proposal.

Eric Oliver

Rhondda Lymburner



Fw: Zoning by-law Application R-2006-009-H: comments

From info <info@seguin.ca>

Date Thu 2026-07-16 5:16 PM

To Planning <planning@seguin.ca>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>; Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>

1 attachment (18 KB)

Zoning By-Law application R-2026-009-H Comments.docx;



Township of Seguin
(705) 732-4300

From: Joy Crysdale <jcrysdale@icloud.com>

Sent: July 16, 2026 4:10 PM

To: info <info@seguin.ca>

Subject: Zoning by-law Application R-2006-009-H: comments

[You don't often get email from jcrysdale@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hello, see attached: these are our comments on the application for the property at 163 Burgess Rd.
John Crysdale, Joy Crysdale 59 Walkers Rd.
Please advise me this has been received.
Thank you.

To: Mayor MacDiarmid and Councillors, Township of Seguin
Re: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2006-009-H, Owners: Stacey Madge
Agent: Melissa Markham
Civic address: 163 Burgess Rd.

We are writing as neighbours of this property. We are also located on Bass Bay, Lake Rosseau.

The application asks for rezoning of the lands to permit two detached dwelling units on one property.
We oppose the granting of this application for the reasons below:

1. We have reviewed the sections pertaining to second dwellings in Seguin's Official Plan, and understand second dwellings may be considered on "larger lots". (Although this application is actually for a third dwelling. See below.) Given the submitted proposal says the property has 155 m frontage, which is not enough to be considered as two separate lots, and already has several buildings visible from the lake, we do not believe this application meets the standards of the OP with respect to larger lots.
2. This would not be a second dwelling - it is a third, as the application indicating one building is a garage is misleading; it actually is a building with bedrooms, bathroom and a kitchen.
3. Even if this second dwelling, erroneously listed as a garage, were somehow converted (i.e. dwelling spaces removed?), we remain concerned about the density of this waterfront property as it exists even now: buildings already dominate.

Adding another large dwelling (2600 sq ft) to the existing dwellings and boathouse, constructed on top of the cliff above the boathouse, will mean increased density and that buildings will dominate the lakefront even further. The OP states "natural features shall dominate".

Seguin's OP is intended to be Environment First, and to "protect the visual and aesthetic character of the lakes ...", as well as to protect the unique character from "inappropriate development" of shoreline areas. We consider adding another dwelling to be inappropriate development.

4. The zoning; the applicant's planner notes the two zones of the property, Rural and Resource, and Shoreline, but is saying a dwelling approved for the Rural and Resource Zone should be allowed in the Shoreline zone. If an area is zoned for permitted uses, we would expect those permitted uses would remain as they were determined for that zone and not switched to what the owner prefers. We understand this is what section 4.1.6 of the Zoning By-Law states.

Overall, to all of these points, we also raise the strong concern of the example set should this application be granted. We expect there would be many more then who would ask for second dwellings on lakefront lots that are not large enough. Or who may apply to switch the uses of their zoned lands.

In conclusion: given the current domination of buildings on this waterfront property, and the increased domination and density this new dwelling place would produce, as well as the alteration of the shoreline's character, plus the ways in which the Zoning By-law and sections of Seguin's Official Plan are not met by this proposal, we believe the application must be rejected.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Crysedale
Joy Crysedale



Re: Letter Re Madge ZBA Application

From Lake Rosseau North Association <info@lrna.ca>

Date Fri 2026-07-17 2:37 PM

To Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>

Cc Ann MacDiarmid <annmacdiarmid@seguin.ca>; Terry Fellner <terryfellner@seguin.ca>; Ted Collins <tedcollins@seguin.ca>; Gail Finnson <gailfinnson@seguin.ca>; Ken Adams <kenadams@seguin.ca>; Mario Buszynski <mariobuszynski@seguin.ca>; Greg Getty <greggetty@seguin.ca>; Steve Rohacek <steve.rohacek@gmail.com>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>

 1 attachment (145 KB)

MLA Letter Re Madge ZBA Application July 17-26 v1.pdf;

Some people who received this message don't often get email from info@lrna.ca. [Learn why this is important](#)

On behalf of the Lake Rosseau North Association (LRNA), we write to express our full support for the submission provided by the Muskoka Lakes Association (MLA) regarding the proposed planning application.

The LRNA shares the MLA's concerns about the potential impacts of this proposal on Lake Rosseau, the surrounding natural environment, and the long-term interests of our community. We believe the MLA's submission provides a thorough, well-reasoned assessment of the planning issues and clearly outlines why this application does not meet the standards necessary to protect the ecological, social, and recreational values that make this area so unique.

Rather than repeating the detailed analysis contained in the MLA's submission, the LRNA wishes to formally endorse its findings and recommendations. We respectfully ask Council to give careful consideration to the concerns raised and to refuse the application in the interest of responsible planning, environmental stewardship, and the protection of the character of our lake and community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Teri McGurk
President
Lake Rosseau North Association
www.lrna.ca



Outlook

Letter Re Madge ZBA Application

From Erla <erla@mla.on.ca>**Date** Fri 2026-07-17 10:39 AM**To** Ann MacDiarmid <annmacdiarmid@seguin.ca>; Terry Fellner <terryfellner@seguin.ca>; Ted Collins <tedcollins@seguin.ca>; Gail Finnson <gailfinnson@seguin.ca>; Ken Adams <kenadams@seguin.ca>; Mario Buszynski <mariobuszynski@seguin.ca>; Greg Getty <greggetty@seguin.ca>**Cc** Steve Rohacek <steve.rohacek@gmail.com>; Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>; Teri McGurk <terimcgurk@icloud.com> 1 attachment (145 KB)

MLA Letter Re Madge ZBA Application July 17-26 v1.pdf;

Dear Mayor MacDiarmid and Councillors,

Please see the attached letter from the Muskoka Lakes Association commenting on the Madge ZBA Application.

Sincerely,

Erla McCaig

General Manager

Muskoka Lakes Association

118 Medora Street, Box 298

Port Carling, ON, P0B 1J0

(705) 765-5723



July 17, 2026

Township of Seguin
5 Humphrey Drive
Seguin, Ontario P2A 2W8

Attention: Members of Council

Re: Zoning By-law Amendment Application R-2026-0009-H, 163 Burgess Road

Dear Mayor and Councillors:

The Muskoka Lakes Association (MLA) is submitting this letter of objection to the zoning by-law amendment application R-2026-0009-H. As a lake association that represents over 2,000 individual property owners, we note a number of concerns summarized below and do not believe this application represents good planning.

The foundation of any planning application is accurate and complete information from the applicant. We have reviewed the Planning Justification Report (PJR) submitted with the application and note the following concerns.

- **Proposed Site Plan** – While it is assumed that the site plan information presented is accurate, what is missing is the clear delineation of the shoreline and rural and resource zones. Where each of these zones is located on the subject property relative to the request for permission to build a second dwelling is material to the application. The omission of this information is significant.
- **Site Description** – The description of the site and current structures and dwelling does match the site plan. What we have subsequently heard via Township planning staff is that the garage pavilion has been illegally converted to a second dwelling with bedrooms, kitchen and other amenities. Given the PJR does not reflect the change of use of the garage pavilion, it raises questions about other information in the PJR and if the planner visited the site prior to drafting the PJR.
- **General Planning Analysis** – The premise of the analysis is that a second dwelling is permitted, effectively as-of-right, within shoreline zoned area. It states in a number places that setbacks are in compliance with the Official Plan but does not clarify if the compliance is relative to the rural and resource area or shoreline area. Our interpretation is that setback compliance is relative to the shoreline area not the rural and resource area which should be the basis of comparison.
- **Second dwelling location** – There is essentially no justification for the proposed location of the second dwelling. The report states that location is to accommodate the existing filter bed which is at the furthest point from the lake and to allow for

drainage, septage disposal and water supply. There is no technical information or studies provided that supports that the filter bed could not be relocated or if it was relocated, any other location would be detrimental to lake water quality. In fact, the photos provided in the PJR are from the winter whereby it would be very difficult to verify any soil and/or topographical information verify drainage or septic options. In addition, there is not any information or analysis as to why the second dwelling cannot be sited on the rural and resourced zoned area.

- **Official Plan (OP) A.2.2.2 (b) Objectives** – This section states: To limit the density and intensity of development on the lakes in the Township in order to protect the visual qualities of the lakes, to protect the natural shoreline character and to ensure that the biological and recreational capacity of the lake is appropriate. Based on the site plan, the second dwelling would be located at the top of the cliff in close proximity to the edge and this have a significant impact on the density and visual qualities of the lake.
- **Official Plan – Growth and Settlement A.2.3.2 (b)** – This policy states: To limit the amount of development in the *Rural and Resource Area*, by permitting limited residential development in the form of individual lots through the process of infilling, and to direct employment uses in areas identified as Employment Lands or to areas that accommodate employment uses. The OP contemplates that residential development in the rural and resource zone may be considered through the formation of a lot. Therefore, the lot would need to meet the requirements to sever a stand alone lot from the subject property. Our analysis indicates that the overall property is not large enough to create a new lot and does not meet this requirement.
- **OP A2.5.2 – Objectives** – We disagree that the proposed second dwelling is consistent with the policy objectives of the rural and resource area. Policy A.2.5.2c discourages land uses which are incompatible with the rural character of the area. Shoreline and rural/resource areas are different and have different characteristics. This application significantly blurs the line between shoreline and rural area character, essentially making the two areas the same. We do not believe this is the intent of the policy.
- **CZBL 4.16 Multiple Zones on One Lot** – states in part: Where a lot is divided into more than one Zone under the provisions of this By-law, each such portion of the lot shall be used in accordance with the Permitted Uses and zone requirements. This clearly requires permitted uses need to conform to the zone requirements. This application in our view does not treat the SR1 and RR separately.
- **Precedent Concerns** – While we understand that each planning application is evaluated on its own merits, approval justifications from one application can be used for another. This application as submitted creates a number of concerning precedents should it be approved. As many, if not the majority of waterfront properties that are zoned SR1 and RR, regardless of their size could potentially request a second dwelling in the SR1 area. We do not believe that this is the intent of the OP or CZBL but it could be the outcome.

We have numerous concerns about this application, potential negative precedent value and inconsistencies and conflicting information presented in the PJR. We do not believe the application conforms with the Official Plan or Comprehensive Zoning By-Law and does not represent good planning.

Respectfully,



Steve Rohacek
Director, Chair-Government and Land Use Committee

cc.

Craig Jeffery – Seguin Township, Clerk
Taylor Elgie – Seguin Township, Director of Planning
Teri McGurk – Lake Rosseau North Association

[Draft] Fw: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2026-0009-H - 163 Burgess Road

From

 1 attachment (204 KB)

EplettWalker Comments on Madge Application.pdf;

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Susan Eplett <susaneplett@rogers.com>

To: Ann MacDiarmid <annmacdiarmid@seguin.ca>; Gail Finnson <gailfinnson@seguin.ca>; Terry Fellner <terryfellner@seguin.ca>; Ken Adams <kenadams@seguin.ca>; Mario Buszynski <mariobuszynski@seguin.ca>; Greg Getty <greggetty@seguin.ca>; tedcollins@seguin.ca <tedcollins@seguin.ca>; Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>

Cc: Jim Walker <jimwalkerpersonal@gmail.com>; Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>; Kara Midzain <kmidzain@seguin.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2026 at 07:58:55 PM EDT

Subject: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2026-0009-H - 163 Burgess Road

Dear Mayor MacDiarmid, Councillors and Clerk Jeffery,

We are attaching our comments on the above Zoning By-law Application for a secondary dwelling at our neighbour's property at 163 Burgess Road.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Very best,

Susan Eplett and Jim Walker
45A Walkers Road

July 15, 2026

Dear Mayor MacDiarmid and Councillors,

Re: Zoning By-Law Application: R-2026-0009-H – 163 Burgess Road

We appreciate this opportunity to provide our comments on the above Zoning By-law Application to permit a second dwelling on our neighbour's property at 163 Burgess Road. We own the property on the north side of the Applicant, on Bass Bay, Lake Rosseau.

We oppose the application for a variety of reasons:

1. If approved, **built form will dominate the shoreline and negatively impact the shoreline character, contrary to the Official Plan**. One of the Official Plan's Objectives for the Waterfront is "limiting the density and intensity of development on the lakes in order to protect the visual qualities of lakes and protect the natural shoreline character." (section A 2.2.2)

- The proposed dwelling will be visible from the lake, because it is at the top of a steep slope and set back only 60m from the lake.
- It is a large dwelling (241.25 sq m) with unspecified height.
- There are 4 existing buildings that can already be seen from the lake (ie. main cottage, garage and 1.5 storey boathouse, and a second dwelling at the top of a steep slope). The following photo shows these 4 buildings. The proposed additional dwelling is to be built at the top of the slope behind the boathouse, with a tram running up to it:



- The following photo marks the location of the 4 existing buildings and the proposed new dwelling:



1. Main cottage
2. Garage
3. 1.5 storey boathouse
4. Second dwelling
5. Proposed additional dwelling with a tram running up to it from the boathouse

2. The Official Plan provides that second dwellings may be considered on larger lots provided the development and density is in keeping with the Official Plan. **We do not believe the Applicant's lot is a larger lot within this meaning of the Official Plan, since it doesn't have enough frontage for 2 lots, and already has 4 buildings visible from the lake.**

Planning Staff stated in a 2022 application that a lot should have sufficient frontage and area to be able to be severed into 2 lots to accommodate 2 dwellings (see Staff Report DPS-PL-2022-152 to the Mayor and Council dated October 17, 2022 regarding 125 Winterberry Lane). We strongly support this approach, in order to protect the visual qualities of the lake and the shoreline character.

Council applied this policy when it approved a second dwelling on the Winterberry lot, since there was enough frontage for 2 lots and the second dwelling wasn't visible from the lake.

Although each application must be considered on its own merits, the differences between the Winterberry lot and the Applicant's lot are significant:

	Applicant's Lot	Winterberry Lot
Frontage	155 metres	230 metres
Acres	7.69	72
GFA of additional dwelling	241.45 sq m	170 sq m
Setback of additional dwelling	60 metres	120 metres
Height of additional dwelling	Not specified	Maximum 5 metres
Additional dwelling visible from lake	Yes	No

3. We are very worried that **other people will view this as a new direction in Seguin** if it is approved. It seems that development pressure is increasing across the Township's lakes, and we believe that the prospect of having two dwellings will be attractive to many others. **This would significantly increase the built form seen across the lakes**, contrary to the Official Plan's goals and objectives.

4. The **Application and Planning Justification Report were misleading to Council and neighbours**, since they did not disclose that the new building by the tennis court is actually a second dwelling. We have learned that the new building beside the Applicant's tennis court has been illegally converted into a dwelling, with a kitchen, bedrooms and bathroom.

5. Since the Applicant already has two dwellings, this is in fact an application for a third dwelling. We **strongly object to third dwellings on waterfront properties**, given the significant damage it would do to shoreline character and the environmental damage of lost trees, larger septic beds, and increased intensity of waterfront use. Even if the kitchen is removed, the building will have a bathroom and exterior glass walls to accommodate bedrooms in the future.

6. The Planning Justification Report submitted by the Applicant's Planner states that, if a lot has both Rural and Resource and Shoreline zoning, a second dwelling approved for the Rural and Resource zone should be allowed to be built on the Shoreline zone. If this is true, there are a great many lots around the lakes that have both RR and SR1 zones where a second dwelling could be located in the Shoreline zone. The negative impact on the

shoreline character would be tremendous. **We support section 4.1.6 of the Zoning By-law that requires each zone to be used according to its permitted uses, and believe that property owners should plan their development and the position of their septic beds so they comply with this section whenever possible.**

Thank you for considering our comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Two handwritten signatures in black ink. The first signature on the left is 'Susan' and the second signature on the right is 'Jim Walker'.

Susan Eplett and Jim Walker
45A Walkers Road
Rosseau ON
P0C 1J0



163 Burgess Road - request to withdraw application R-2026-0009-H

From Melissa Markham <melissa@mmpplanning.ca>

Date Mon 2026-07-20 12:48 PM

To Taylor Elgie <telgie@seguin.ca>

Cc Craig Jeffery <cjeffery@seguin.ca>

Hi Taylor,

Further to our conversation the owners are requesting that the zoning by-law amendment application be withdrawn.

Please confirm whether my attendance at today's meeting is still required or if Council can be notified of this withdrawal request.

Thank you,
Melissa

Melissa Markham, MCIP, RPP

Melissa Markham Planning Consultants Ltd.

1025 Rebecca Lane

Huntsville, ON P1H 2J6

705.783.8217

[www.melissamarkhamplanning.com]www.melissamarkhamplanning.com