

Feedback on the proposed licensing program (posted in order of submission)

- I am very much in support of the licensing program. In particular, having a system of accountability for property owners that have repeat occurrences of by-law violations (noise complaints). It will force owners to take responsibility and ensure that their neighbours are not repeatedly disturbed by rowdy house guests
- Is there any discussion as to licensing requirements based on region within Lambton Shores? Obviously the concerns would be much greater in the immediate Grand Bend area but Lambton Shores encompasses smaller towns that a. likely don't have such issues with nuisance/parking/garbage and b. don't make as much income from STR as rentals in GB proper. Licensing fees should be rated on an earnings basis. As it stands, you are asking the same fee from a property owner who makes \$100,000/year and someone who might make \$5,000/year
- The program looks great and very thorough addressing all concerns. I hope to see it implemented
- I agree this is needed in our tourism community. The recommendations seem clear and str licensing should help protect community members and short term rental users from various problems that can occur. It should help with safety concerns for str clients and the community
- Do not want the short term rental licenses !
- The proposed licensing program seems well-thought-out, but I have concerns.
 1. How will a bedroom be deemed suitable for inclusion into the maximum occupancy. Will there be inspections to ensure that bedrooms meet a minimum threshold to be included. I have neighbours that have used RV's and "bunkies" in the past, will this continue to be allowed under the new program?
 2. There was no mention of when garbage cans can be put out to the curb, and how long they can stay on the curb, and also no mention of how to control over filling, leaving bags on top of or beside the bins. Who will be responsible to clean up the mess?
 3. bylaw is often unavailable when noise complaints are received, how will they issue fines for this going forward? Will the bylaw officers be available after hours now?Thank you for your efforts. I hope we all can soon enjoy a peaceful summer
- I believe this system is a great start. Thank you for implementing this. I would however suggest a percentage of the total fees, rather than a set amount. Is \$450 arbitrary? Many STR owners have much higher incomes, hailing from Toronto, and own multiple homes thus making it impossible for locals to buy homes, and raising taxes for locals who do have homes here. To set \$450 as a fee seems cheap. Many STRs go for \$200-800 per night. A percentage of what the STR owners are receiving would be much more equitable. I hope you'll consider this input. What kind of turn around will homeowners see once making a complaint? The demerit points are a great idea but what happens if they continue to be loud?
- I would like to see a way to control irresponsible garbage management in addition to having a garbage area. STR's often have overflowing garbage bins or bags beside the bins being left on the curb already on Sunday afternoon, the uncontained garbage typically gets ripped open and spread around our neighbourhoods. The bins typically get thrown about after they are emptied,

and it generally looks unsightly. Responsible garbage management should be included in the licensing program

- I think this is a waste of time and money .this is a seasonal tourist town and we already have bylaws in place .and as far a parking goes why do new buildings in grand bend where parking is limited dont need parking spots and the developer can pay a fee to not have enough parking .People work hard to be able to pay for these overpriced cottages and now you want to steal more money from the hard working people we pay mor taxes here than they do in toronto .leave the hard working people of lambton shores alone
- I think that this is an excellent proposal. It covers all of the important issues that I had experienced with a recent neighbour who converted his dwelling to a short-term rental. The 'hot line' is a very important solution as it will expedite and hopefully resolve any issues that neighbours of a short-term may experience with 'problem' renters.
- I am concerned about the density of STR in my residential neighbourhood. It needs to be limited so one street does not become overrun by STR visitors. The fees are not enough to enforce the licensing requirements. These are businesses and should be taxed and regulated the same way any other accommodation rentals are
- We built a 5 bdm brand new build late last year in Grand Bend with the intent of renting it out as an Airbnb for up to 10 people. We don't understand why there would be an occupancy maximum of only 8 people. We completely understand the 2 person per legal bdm and the attempt to reduce the rentals being used as party houses, we don't want our investment to be used for that purpose either, but we have spent almost a million dollars to get this business up and running. Now to find out this licensing will be implemented and our income will be reduced significantly because we can't rent out the 5th bedroom because of an arbitrary maximum on building occupancy? This we don't understand. There are a lot of run down rentals that are cramming as many people as will pay out there, we are not one of them. Have the rentals inspected to make sure they comply with occupancy prior to issuing a license rather than setting the maximum to 8 people. We're ok with paying the unforeseen yearly licensing fee, and the application and having rentals monitored but if there aren't rentals for larger families to come to this tourist town, we aren't going to have any businesses left that are able to survive. We also own another business on the main strip that relies solely on tourism to survive. Without tourism, both our businesses would fold. I'm not sure how this is good for anyone
- The street I live on in Huron Woods is slowly being taken over by renters. There is no longer a community feel as the cottages are rented to large groups. There are late night noise issues and large numbers of vehicles parked in and around driveway. The more that can be done to stop these rentals, the better. The weekly rates are expensive which is why there are large groups splitting the cost. I strongly support anything to cut down on the renters and a different large groups of strangers every week living on the streets of what once was a nice quiet community
- Your licensing fee isn't high enough. STRs make at minimum tens of thousands of dollars a season. That money usually does not stay in our economy due to urban investors. Said licensing fee should also be used to start planning for affordable housing as STRs remove long term housing from the market
- It is a great plan! Very comprehensive
- Nobody wants this. Nobody asked for this. This is just Another tax On the community and another bloated program that will run at a loss which will force you to increase the cost even

more later. You're focusing on the wrong problem; overnight renters that pay money into the community are not the issue. There are one or two problem cottages however that's a policing issue. The issue is daytrippers that spend no money in the community, park illegally and urinate (or worse) in the lake (because they have no other option). You're allowing 10,000 people to flood the town that has 16 public washrooms. (What would happen if the sky dome only had 16 washrooms and 10,000 people showed up?) You need to limit the number of people that come to town by restricting visitors to the available number of parking spots and washrooms. Have parking available to book online and discouraged visitors unless they have parking booked in advance. Charge \$100 per day and Allow businesses in town to provide rebate vouchers based on dollars spent. Sell the parking lots that are downtown and remove the parking from the beach. (turn it back to beach so people stay close to the washrooms, Rather than head to Oakwood and Pee, or worst in the bushes) Buy some farmland and trolley / bus people in. Close down main street to vehicles on the weekends between 11am-8pm. Local parking only in the village. Keep the washrooms on the beach open during the summer 1 hour past sunset (Why would you go lock up the washroom before the sun sets? Where do you think people are going to go to the washroom?) Renters have somewhere to park and somewhere to go to the bathroom... they explore the town and spend money at all the shops and restaurants. They support the locals that own income properties. they are not the problem. I live in the heart of the village next to the renters and I rent occasionally. I deal with day trippers that are encouraged to come to town when there's nowhere to park and nowhere to go to the bathroom. They circle like sharks around the village looking for parking. my kids can't play on the street in front of my house like I did because it's too dangerous. All the restaurants are full. They park illegally, Pee in the bushes and they set up a hibachi on the side of the road. Why are we encouraging this? When is the public hearing on this proposal?

- I think the application /permission fee should be greater to deter some of the people that would rent occasionally a few times a year just make a little money to cover taxes and such. I also think the limits need to be very closely monitored. A lot of properties rent to supposedly the limit, and it ends up with a lot more people in the property and cause disturbances for the neighbors. I also think there should be a limit on the rentals per street around here, not every house on a street
- This proposal seems very extreme!! Demerit points -- all your demerit points are at least 4 points, meaning if a STR got 2 infractions - they are shut down for 6 months. We have a STR. It was new in 2021. We screen our guests as best we can and have a very strict no party rule, but we can't control what people do. If guests violate our rules - we live an hour from Grand Bend - so we could be notified by the city - it would take us an hour minimum to get there and we would lose 4 points for that and 4 points for what the guests were doing - that means we loose capacity to rent the property for 6 months - and have to cancel all our remaining summer contracts. That is a HUGE financial impact not to mention all our guests who have booked time off to come to the cottage for their week in the summer. Suddenly, they have no place to go when they may have booked it with us a year in advance! Have you considered the legal ramifications that we could be sued over that. All because guests who we screened as carefully as possible broke our rules!!!! If you have demerit points, they should be less per offence and be targeted towards repeat offenders who consistently rent to guests who are just there to party. The rental fee is rather high!! London charges us a rental licensing fee of \$50 per year. We pay

taxes on our property, bring tourists to the area which helps the economy / local businesses. This just seems like another tax grab and our taxes are high enough. I mean \$150 seems reasonable and certainly covers the work involved for the city. \$450 is extreme - are you going to lower our taxes then? Limit of 8 people. I do not understand this one at all. This would not even allow a lot of families to be together. We have grandparents who rent the cottage and bring their kids and grandkids. This would not even allow for them to do that! For instance, our family - 2 of our kids are not married. If my husband and myself wanted to bring them + our married daughter, son in law and their 5 kids - we could not come to Grand Bend and rent a cottage for a vacation!! This definitely needs to be revisited. What about bigger cottages?? Our cottage is large and holds 14. Suddenly - we can only rent it at half capacity and tell families too bad - don't come to Grand Bend if you want to spend a week together as a family! Again - you seem like you are going to punish everyone for a few bad apples! Make it so that if you have cottages that are constantly a problem - you can do something about it, but don't punish everyone

- There should be an exemption from the program for occasional renters. For example, if a family is renting their cottage for two weeks a summer (ie. to former owners or tenants) they should be required to be licensed in the manner of a full time rental property. I don't see this addressed. I also don't see the point of this program in general. It appears that all of the areas of concern can be addressed by current by-laws. It seems to be rules to satisfy vocal minority of NIMBYists (a new term I've learned, Not In My Back Yard). It all seems to be extraordinary bureaucracy without an identifiable or tangible goal. The council seems to be pre-occupied with creating an ever increasing collection of rules (ie. tent and umbrella bylaws) with no credible impact. Stop over legislating and complicating peoples lives
- We welcome licensing proposals however we think it is overkill to ask property owners who have one family cottage and rent it to be licensed as if they had multiple units. Of course if you have many rental units a license makes sense but one mom and pop cottage rental should not have to go through applications etc. Especially since my guess is these are not the units that are problematic. We watch the airbnb units where no one meets people and no responsible person keeps watch over the rental. These are the places causing problems
- I am wondering how long does the third party have to contact the responsible person? Do they try over and over again and if so for how long? How does the person filing the complaint know what is happening in the process and how long before their complaint is resolved? I personally feel if by-law is sent to the address then the fine and demerit points should be automatically given. If a str gets the allotted number of demerit points then there should be no review and they automatically face the consequences
- Looks fair to me and have witnessed first hand with a rental beside me. Quite often the rental has too many people and more people arrive on weekends. They should pay fees just like any other business and restrictions need to be in place
- While I am in favour of a licensing fee to offset the cost of additional bylaw enforcement how will you ensure a smaller community will get the same benefits for their dollars and it won't be disproportionately allocated to Grand Bend? My second concern would be the occupancy guidelines. I feel 2 people per bedroom and 2 additional is reasonable why put a cap of 8 in place. You have also defined a legal bedroom as well. Our property has 7 bedrooms and 3 full bathrooms so a capacity of 8 seems inappropriate

- This proposal has a lot of problems. The annual fee is pretty high considering the length of the main season. Many cottages have capacity for more than 8 people so I question the maximum occupancy. Having a responsible person available to deal with issues within 30 minutes does not seem like enough time. What if the owner lives out of town? Even someone living close by could have trouble getting there within a 30 minute time frame. How much will it cost to enforce this licensing proposal? How is it any different than calling bylaw when there is a problem....they can't even get to a problem area within that time frame
- As with the earlier process, there still seems to be an unbalanced approach to what I believe is one of the bigger concerns for all residents, the noise complaints. As a local resident, ourselves and 2 of our direct neighbours have had to make multiple noise complaints to both the Bylaw and the OPP, and these have never been from an STR, but been always been from local owners with large, noisy parties at their own homes (and in one repetitive case, a local restaurant/ bar). This scenario seems to be largely ignored with a primary focus on STR's? Is there some underlying reason for this possible bias? Thanks
- The people who are operating an AirBNB or, a bed and breakfast are no different than a commercial business entrepreneur starting a business for profit, thus someone wishing to do this should have to apply for a permits to operate such business with appropriate permits and fees, as well as to obtain the neighbours approvals and proper taxation for such business. I personally would rather not see my neighbours rent their cottages out ,however with the ridiculous real estate values ,some people are forced to do so to off the costs of buying into the initial purchase of what would be a family cottage ,thus these people are classified as an entrepreneur and need to be regulated appropriately
- Licensing programs aims to have the municipality dip into the revenue that is being earned by the hard work of property owners who sacrificed and worked hard to be able to afford a secondary home. There, fixed it for you.
- I do not believe that having short term rentals in Lambton shores is an issue. Homeowners should have the right to do what this wish with their own properties. They should abide by the local laws and by-laws. If not then they should be dealt with individually. This should not be a paint the brush to all when there are only a few bad apples. Deal with them individual
- Suggestion that the demerits could be lowered to five and 10
- The limit of 8 people per rental is way too low. It is totally unrealistic and punitive. We have many large cottages that multi-general families rent every year and enjoy time together in a family setting. Some of these large cottages have 6 or more bedrooms and can easily accomodate 12-14 family guests. They are not there to party, but to see each other. The limit should not exist at all, or be based on cottage size and parking availability
- We are not in agreement with the program. If you do implement the program please be more flexible with max people aloud and reduce the fees, reduce the liability insurance. Thank you
- In order to be fair to short term renters that have rentals but do not want to become a licensed short term rental operator, I think that the municipality should allow renters the opportunity to stop using their property as a short term rental from the date of implementation of the program. They should however be allowed to honour previously arranged rentals but remove their property from any rental sights and cease to continue renting.
- This is absolutely ridiculous. Simply another money grab on the back of those that are already paying taxes on the property they are renting out. The capacity limits are unreasonable when

you cap at 8, a 5 bedroom house can easily accommodate 10 people. This is a resort town, if you don't want STR then I suggest you live elsewhere. Bylaws are in place for a reason, enforce the existing bylaws if there are complaints and be done

- This is excellent. Good to see someone is taking licensing, air bnb owner responsibility and the communities safety seriously. This seems fair to both str owners and local residents. Well done
- While the proposed program should greatly improve many of the issues we are experiencing with short-term rentals in our municipality, it still falls short for those of us who live here year round. Without limits on the number of short-term rental accommodations allowed, residential neighbourhoods like mine will continue to be a target for those looking for lucrative income, rather than a friendly community to live in. I would implore the municipality to put community first, ahead of tourism
- I believe that the maximum occupancy of 8 to be highly problematic. At the current time, we are offering a 15 person occupancy. Downsizing to 8 is gonna brutally impact our ability to generate the rental income we need to survive. We have set up our rental in such a way that a bigger family/group could stay. With this proposed licensing program, there should be the ability to have some exceptions in larger places which are already set up to accommodate more people than 8. What is the rationale on capping at 8? Shouldnt the cap be related to capacity, size, set up? If we are wanting to take a balanced approach, it would only be fair then to allow exceptions to the 8 person rule or for that number to be increased
- This proposal is a waste of time and money. No one will follow these bylaws. The annual fees will not cover the costs to enforce these bylaws
- There appears to be a lot of thought and work put in to develop this plan so far. A lot of good ideas and seems to be a fair process but I think the maximum number of people allowed is too low. I like the 2 per room plus 2 rule but for a large 6 bedroom cottage does that really make sense? Or when my family goes to a cottage we have my parents / my brothers and their girlfriends then our kids so 11 which easily fit in a 5-6 bedroom cottage. I think if the septic system supports it the maximum number of occupants should be raised to 12 or 14 - - - - based off 2 per room plus 2 rule and having a septic system capable of handling the load
- We do not support the proposed bylaw. It is very expensive and prohibitive. We believe it will drive many short term renters out of the business. The Tax/ fee that is proposed is too high and I don't think that most will be able to recover this through higher rents. The higher rents that we will be forced to pass on will also deter visitors and tourism in Lambton Shores. The demerit point program is draconian in our opinion, Who decides whether complaints are legitimate and how can we appeal a complaint if one is made? Who will be the judge and jury? Will there be a complaints board and if so how can a balanced review board be ensured such that its not just the anti SDR's on on the board? There also seems to be a heavy emphasis on site plans and compliance requirements for the applications. If renters need to higher professionals to prepare these site plans, compliance documents and application forms this will force the small operators out of the business and will increase the short term rental costs to visitors. We do not believe that this proposed bylaw has much consideration for the taxpayers and good citizens in Lambton Shores that have provided guest services to tourists that wish to visit our community. Although we have never had any complaints from neighbours or anyone during the last seven years that we have provided this much needed tourist service and we have been rated as super hosts with airbnb for the last 5 years we anticipate that if this bylaw is enacted in the form

proposed we will no longer offer our short term rental service to guests and visitors to Lambton Shores. It is unfortunate that rather than addressing the few problems that might have arisen over the last few years, the municipalities remedy is to punish all of the short term rent hosts. We certainly recommend that the municipality not proceed with any bylaw for Short term rentals but rather use the enforcement methods available through your current bylaws to enforce any of the complaints that arise

- - \$450 license fee is steep given most complaints come from minority of properties. Appears municipality is looking to entirely offset cost of 3rd party company when most STR owners run a good operation with no complaints from neighbours. I understand need to improve monitoring system however \$450 is steep
 - We have run an STR for over 20 years with zero complaints. We closely control and monitor what happens on the property. What accommodation has been made for longtime good operators. There should be a grandfathering process.
 - Septic systems do not need to be pumped every 3 years when property is only being used seasonally. 5-7 years is more in keeping with seasonal usage
- I have been operating a STR to subsidize our family cottage just outside of Grand Bend without a single incident for 6 years. This is how I afford to keep the property and enjoy it with my family. We have a very diligent screening process and vet all of our potential guests thoroughly. I think the majority of STR owners do the same, because ultimately it's their home and their neighbours. This overreach licensing program penalizes all the hard working, tax paying owners that aren't in it for profit, but to allow cottage ownership! \$450 annual fee is absurd as is the maximum occupancy. We only rent to families (in a 5 bedroom 3500sq/ft home) and often have 10-11 guests consisting of 3 generations of family, so now these guests aren't allowed to visit grand bend?! Or two young families trying to afford a family vacation can no longer enjoy Lambton Shores? As cottage owners we pay our taxes (which are not cheap) for use of municipal services a very small portion of the year (mainly summer season), and now on top of that you want to charge this group an additional \$500?! City of Toronto charges \$65 for STR licensing, how an earth is Lambton Shores justifying \$450 plus \$50 in licensing fees? It's a complete cash grab and I for one strongly appose it. We have owned this family cottage for almost 30 years paying taxes and spending money in local businesses, and this leaves a very bad taste in our mouth. If you are having problems with select areas or properties focus on those properties or issues don't ruin it for everyone else! Not only the property owners trying to supplement the cost of ownership but local business' that thrive on tourism dollars and all the visitors that potentially cannot find accommodations and visit Grand Bend because of this ludicrous proposal
- Not good idea. Will create beurocracy and unnecessary issues with home owners in Grand Bend. Existing way people rent cottages add to GB character No need to change it. Proposal draft will make it more paintfull It looks like money grab on the top of taxes we all pay. Do not implement
- This is an over reach -painting all of us with the same paint brush. The problem should dealt with at the source. Fine the people that are the problem and fine them with a licence not all of us . Smells like a money grab. Regulating this is just a bunch of people controlling us again and charging us with the bill. I have never heard from anyone else that of this happening anywhere else in Ontario . Its going to create more revenue but will it pay to have someone in charge of this and pay their wages. Its a lot of red tape you are creating .Our own associations, that we pay a fee to, also cover this

- Hello all, Thank you for the opportunity to submit my feedback. Being in real estate and living in the area, I sell a lot along the lakeside communities. I tend to see many buying up many of the cottages and renting them out. I have had many conversations with residents as to how his or her neighbourhood is no longer quiet and safe as it used to be. I for one find that my area is not as it was about 5-10 years ago. Our areas used to be peaceful and quiet. Now we see many who come in to these small areas, invite friends and family to where at times they are very loud and obnoxious. Many times, they have a lack of respect towards the residents. Heck we even see many who allow his or her pets to run unleashed while leaving their droppings on other people's property. At times, we have also heard about these unknown dogs attacking other dogs from the area. I believe the proposals you are suggesting is a good start. I welcome the new proposals
- Totally agree
- The 8 person limit is too low. I have a four bedroom place that sleeps 9 (one room has a double bunk on the bottom and single bunk on top so it sleeps 3 and the other rooms sleep 2) and have many families that need 9 beds so that they can bring the grandparents too. The limit should be 2 to a room plus 2 to a limit of 10 (not 8). Otherwise there is a bias against multigenerational families
- Existing cottage rental scheme works for Grand Bend for years. STR idea is clear money grab and putting unnecessary rules and stress on cottage owners. Instead of this city should have better bylaw enforcement-existing enforcement is far away from being effective. This program will not change anything from possible renters behaviour within city but will put additional stress on the owners. Bad idea. Another tax with post-covid financially strangled community. This will cause fear for renting and will create less business for local restaurants, shops. Another tax. Stop this idea
- This is a money grab by the municipality on top of already high municipal taxes. If you want to implement licensing then do it without a fee. This will discourage and harm business for lambton shores. There is already enough existing bylaws and red tape. Do the right thing and just scrap the idea.
- Absolutely ridiculous to compare us to "other cities" and what they do..we are cottage country! I've been renting in GB since I've been 16! The town is changing and morphing on its own.. I do not support any document implementation for str..just a basic money grab, and to think anyone would be available in 30 minutes of a complaint is ridiculous..One big NO on this idea
- Hi there, My young family and I bought in Grand Bend about 2 years ago. While I am okay with many of the new items proposed for short term renters I want to highlight some areas that I feel need more rework. As for the demerit based point system, that seems fine.. However what's to stop permanent residences from abusing that power? How is it ultimately reported? How does the city verify it? We had a neighbour who took issue with us solely for my wife and sister-in-law being a different color. We were even told by other [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] owners that we were not allowed on the private beach despite us being owners and paying association fees. The point I'm trying to make is there are times of discrimination and I hope these new systems are not abused to run certain types of people out of town. As for the 2 people per bedroom, with an additional two up to 8 people, doesn't make a whole lot of sense as a small 2 bedroom bungalow downtown can have 6 people and a 3,500-4,000sqft house 5-10 mins down the road with 4-5 bedrooms is capped at 8. I think square footage should be taken into account. There are quite a number of larger properties just outside of the downtown area

that house 10-12 comfortably with parking to accommodate. The garbage and recycling is not a big deal, creating a secured space for them is a good idea but I'm wondering why it only applies to renters? Full time residence often leave their trash outside as well, attracting animals and producing bad smells and bad visuals. This should be something applied to the whole of Lambton Shores

- This is a well thought out proposal and should go a long way to resolving the most critical issues of short term rentals.
- I did not see any mention of what the permit fees will be used for. I assume the monies will be used to offset the cost of administration and any additional staff, i.e. hiring additional bylaw officers. I agree with this proposal and believe it will provide the necessary controls. Well done
- This appears to be a step in the right direction regarding short term rentals here in Grand Bend. If the steps are followed, we should not experience the disruptions to our home life which we have in the past.
- Hi, clearly a lot of work has gone into this program. I am just wondering how you will know if an STR has applied for the applicable license? What's to stop people from not following the STR program
- I totally disagree with a STR licensing program and think of this as another tax grab on top of all the property taxes that we presently pay!
- So very needed for many different reasons. Well done and the sooner this is finalized and implemented the better off we all will be. Look forward to updates. Will there be avenues to address those who are knowingly bypassing the effort?
- Thank you for going through the process of potentially getting this program started. My goal is to reduce the negative aspects of the rental operation and also provide home owners additional income while operating within the rules. What we have experienced is the overcrowding of the units, excessive noise and garbage problems. If those issues are improved upon, then this program would be a success in our minds. Thank you.
- I don't disagree that having a program to ensure that the bylaws are followed and fulltime residents are not impacted by noise and parking issue, etc... But why is this being rushed for 2022 season? Hosts have already booked their homes and especially during COVID, many people aren't leaving the country and choosing to vacation locally so applying the license and limitations will impact hosts dramatically and they will pay penalties as they are forced to cancel on guests because their booking doesn't adhere to the new policies. I believe this should be planned for 2023 which gives everyone ample time to adjust and plan once all the phases are complete. Also, where is 8 guest limit coming from? This seems like a limitations for the main stretch that has smaller homes and limited parking but in other areas of Grand Bend there are houses that comfortably take 12 or 14 people and they are 1/2 acre lots or larger with driveways that can take many cars and they are far from other homes that having a larger group is not a concern. Consider my family that likes to visit Grand Bend. We have 2 kids and we go with both sets of Grand parents and my sister and her family. That's 12 people to go on vacation. Now with these limitations, how do we go proceed with our yearly get away? These restrictions should be designed based on property type, location and available room for accomodation, etc... Shouldn't paint every property with the same brush and impose 8 guests maximum. I believe that some of these changes are good to adapt to changing times but the approach and

limitations will impact many local businesses which doesn't seem to be something listed in the negatives in the FAQ

- I think this licensing is a good idea. There are too many renters right now that are not considerate of the people living around them., either by noise , parking anywhere or just general disrespect, I think the demerit points will encourage owners to be more vigilant to the people they are renting too, knowing that if things continue with complaints they will be fined and eventually lose their license. However, saying that, it will only work if watched carefully and the appropriate outcome is carried through. I suggest that if renters have to be reprimanded twice in any rental period they should be evicted and not allowed to rent again in Grand Bend
- Properties that have proper commercial zoning for hotels/short term rentals should be exempt from licensing. We already pay a much higher tax than residential units
- Hi there, Thanks for considering my feedback. I have several concerns. We have seen the number of short term rentals skyrocket in our neighbourhood as properties turn over. I think there should be a consideration given to limit the density of these properties for several reasons. Without this item I think this policy is short sighted and will have a negative impact on people wanting to live here full time and support a community. With other areas prohibiting them (Goderich..) we will be swamped with them, especially with the new builds being proposed. How many tourists can we safely accommodate with this and the additional traditional hotels expanding (Colonial ect).

Items of concern wrt number of STRs:

-Safety for families as we never know who is living next to us from day to day (especially when you have small children).

-Lack of a community feeling as we have become one large hotel for Toronto

-Skewing of house prices as they are observed more a hotel property

-Lack of reasonable long term rental accommodation, this will limit economic growth if we cannot attract people to live here if they cannot find somewhere to live.

Please consider a limit on the number of licenses and/or density.

Secondly with respect to the demerit points: We have struggled for the last three seasons dealing with constant noise during the summers, despite complaints (as minimal by law enforcement) this continues. Even if the noise complaint is resolved under the new system, it still puts the burden on the permanent residents to complain so that we can live in peace and quiet. I don't think we should have to do this and rely only on a charge to have any impact on the owners. If there are valid complaints, this should have an impact. I did not see the fines but they should be substantial to bite..How are you going to address this, and will there be sufficient staff to monitor and enforce this? Many of us are at the end of our rope dealing with this every night, no consequence to the owners so frankly they don't give a hoot. How are you going to limit the number of people at a property during the day, we have had instances of 20 people at a house living it up with the wee hours, are there limits on this (ie they may say only 8 are sleeping at the house...).

Thirdly, Many of the rentals in our area are rented "under the table". With the licensing system will there be a mechanism to make sure taxes are paid? Thanks again for considering my input. I am not against short term rental as a whole, I just think it has gotten out of hand. If having a thriving permanent resident community is a priority then more needs to be done to preserve this. Many of us have had it with the lack of enforcement and welcome more and with some

teeth so that behaviours change and guests respect that it is not 24 hour party time every day of the week when they come to visit...

- I think the definition of STR owner should be modified. I believe there should be a number of days that if exceeded require a license, for example 28 days in the year. There are many people that allow family/friends to use their house but are not really STR owners. The way this reads is if an owner takes any amount of money they are considered a STR owner
- I stand by my initial comments. I do not think a licensing program is necessary and I strongly oppose it. I have a five bedroom property that I rent out to families (or mature groups). In the proposed bylaws I would be limited to 10 people. As it stands I limit my house to a maximum of 12 people. How are children classified? I am very disappointed that this is even being considered and seems like a money grab
- The proposal licensing program is suggesting there only be a max number of 2 people per bed. With a max capacity of 8 guest per household? If your home has 6 bedrooms shouldn't you be able to occupy with the amount of 2 people per bedroom? I guess my only feedback is that you should have the occupancy of 2 people per bedroom.
- I recognize that my choice to live in a beach community comes with the challenges associated with visitors and their guests here for a vacation. I am an open minded and a "willing to share our idyllic lifestyle" sort of person but unfortunately I have experienced a number of negative situations that you just felt you had to accept and endure as there was not much that could be done. I appreciate that the municipality is open to reviewing ways to minimize the impacts to our beautiful community and to ensure a quality of lifestyle for both visitors and permanent residents we all can continue to enjoy. I suspect that those owners who offer short term rentals in good faith are rarely aware of what goes on or how many people and cars in fact come and go from their properties once the agreements have been signed. I also suspect that how the short term renters behave when at the beach in a short term rental is far different from how they would behave and treat their own home and neighborhood unfortunately. Not all of them but I would say a good number. I get it - time to let loose and relax and enjoy but they also need to be respectful that for many of us, this is our neighborhood and our home.

Some experiences I would like to share:

Impact on our homes and neighborhoods:

- cars pulling into my laneway at all hours of the night and day or parking on the narrow road ways making it challenging to get out of the lanes and drive around
- cars parked on my front lawn when their own driveway was too congested and full with trailers and boats and a place full of people and multiple families staying or visiting - (suggestion : short term rental stipulations might be that you cannot park trailers and boats in laneways)
- having to close windows and add white noise at night to drown out loud parties, shouting and yelling, and blaring music that continues well into the early morning hours (ie 3-4 am) (and I am a night person ... I feel badly for those that go to sleep early !)
- unsupervised (not an adult in sight) children playing on the roads in the forested residential areas where cars cannot see them when backing out or rounding the many twists and turns
- unsupervised children running across the backyards as none of us have fences in Southcott - chasing wildlife, breaking branches on trees - I have had to go out several times to ask them to stop

- leaving garbage at the beaches rather than taking it with them and discarding as I have witnessed on more than once occasion

Impact on Wildlife:

....and finally one that gives me great angst - the short term rentals that bring their cats (especially) and allow their dogs off leash, and let them roam freely across the properties to terrorize and catch the wildlife. Yes I know there are permanent residents that also do this but it is compounded exponentially by short term renters as you see the activity dramatically increase seasonally. Domestic cats are well fed and as such kill only for the joy of it. Research estimates that cats kill between 100 million and 350 million birds per year in Canada, 38% of those by pet cats, and the rest by feral cats. Its our wildlife that makes where we live so very special. I really believe that rental agreements should stipulate that if they are bringing their cats, that they must be kept indoors when renting - yes its a hardship if the animal is an outdoor cat, but they are coming from usually urban residential areas with limited wildlife and a limited ability to roam -not a natural forested area such as we have. As well, rental agreements should stipulate dogs must be kept on a leash at all times unless in an enclosed yard. I have spoken to more than a few people walking past my home in the summer who encourage their unleashed dogs to "chase the squirrels " - there is no need for this. Compounding this is the feral cat issue we have in Grand Bend. Cat Rescue services in the area are well aware of the number of short term renters who leave their cats behind when they leave perhaps because the cat was no where to be found when they had to be out - I was astounded to hear this as it is so cruel and unkind to domesticated cats - frankly I am appalled at the treatment of a so called pet ! Thank you for this opportunity to share my experiences... I realize the hardest part of establishing expectations and rules will be how to enforce them but as a permanent resident, I appreciate the effort and the intent as its a good place to start to ensure everyone's experience living and visiting here will be a good one.

- Short term rentals differ from location to location. Seasonal cottages should not be included in the licensing. Especially when the property owners are on site. Problems are arising when property management companies and absentee property owners are using short term rentals for year round properties, thus creating a housing/long term rental shortage. If B and B's are not part of the licensing, neither should seasonal cottages be included
- I support the STR licensing program. There is much needed control required to hold absent STR owners/operators accountable for unruly rental guests. As a permanent resident of Grand Bend Southcott Pines I enthusiastically support this program.
- This all sounds good to me except that I would've expected a lower threshold for demerits before suspending their ability to rent out. If someone is getting 6 demerits in a 2-year period, that's not over the threshold but has bothered or inconvenienced a lot of people. Why not have 2 be the threshold, such that you get essentially a warning after your first violation (every 2 years) and suspended after your second?
- Used to travel to different areas in SWOntario when husband was alive. Never had problems with staying in STR. Motels, Inns and other accommodations were never as clean nor as ready to fix a problem. When inspections come around be sure to check all places. In one motel unit we stayed in there was a notice to wash dishes and utensils Before use, others had mice. A lot of problems. This is the reason we used STRs. Owners often used them personally so they were

cleaner and better equipped for our use. If you license STR make sure the owners are not just paying into a money grab

- I am against any licensing of short-term rentals. It will drive the fees up for the renters and the property values will plummet
- I would like to comment as a new property owner in Grand Bend, I am very disappointed to see the licensing of short term rentals moving forward without a process to vote by quorum by the community at large. Understanding this licensing process would have directly impacted my decision to buy in Grand Bend. I purchased a home in a community as an investment for myself and my children in the years to come. As well, I have invested my time and energy renovating the property and promoting Lambton Shores as a family vacation destination. I invested in creating a web page and screening my potential short term renters with a responsibility contract in place. As a tax payer in Lambton Shores, I do not see why I should be paying an additional fees beyond my property taxes. In the end I will comply with the licensing program, however, I am very disappointed in the lack of engagement with new property owners who have invested in your community to date. If there is an opportunity to contribute to the program moving forward, particularly to contribute as a decision maker for the points program, I would be keen to contribute. You should know that this program may impact my decision to stay invested in Lambton Shores in the years to come. There should be an investment in women bringing business opportunities through real estate to your community not a policing of private properties. Responsible home owners and business owners should have the accountability for their tenants
- I have lived in Grand Bend my entire life. I live in Grand Bend year round. I think this is an important step for the municipality. I support the idea. I appreciate you thinking about the residents in this area and asking for our input.
- The notice period is rather short. Perhaps start in 2023? Do you have staff to process and approve all of the applications? Do I have staff to do all of my applications and plans in time. We've already booked for 2022. Start on 2023
- Addresses that are being offered as a short term rental should have a proper 911 street address sign. Information in case of an emergency services and phone numbers should be posted for "Renters" Such as: Address of House / Location, Police Emergency and Non Emergency number, Hospitals, walk -in clinics, health centers, drug stores, etc. Suggestion for Owners to provide a welcome package with things to do in Lambton Shores, by-laws for noise, parking, dogs, campfires, safety measures for swimming in the lake, weather conditions - storms, rain, fire, fishing, boating, etc. What I have read so far is a well prepared licensing plan. Thank you.
- I believe the proposed STR plan should definitely help address the concerns of residents. I was unable to find out what the fines are for owners of STRs. Would be useful to publish the fines
- To Lambton Shores staff and council, The Municipality has done a great job of developing a licensing program for the short term rentals. I was glad to be able to provide my input initially. I am very glad that you did not include B & B's. It is 28 years this year since I started our 'traditional' B & B, with your approval, and competing with short term rentals that mostly have clients due to 'Air B & B' has been quite a challenge for the past few years. I am very happy that you have also tackled some safety issues. If you could send me a copy of the final licensing program when completed, I will gladly show it to customers that come to the [PERSONAL

INFORMATION OMITTED] when they complain about a Lambton Shores short term rental that may be operating properly or without approval etc. Many thanks!

- Short term rentals have really had a negative impact to those with cottages or homes in the area. To have different families move in and out weekly has crowded our neighborhoods and taken away the safety of our small town. Cottage rental fees are so high, that in most cases multiple families rent and stay together to make it more affordable. This creates a very noisy environment with cars everywhere.... On lawns.....parked along roadways etc. it has crowded our beaches to the point where the residents can't enjoy our neighborhood. Also.... Renters often don't care about how they act, the mess they create, and the noise levels. It's unfortunate that people are able to run a business with these rentals with little to no consideration to the community. Overall it's a very negative experience for the non rental homes
- As a local resident for almost 50 years and a NON STR, but living surrounded by them, I find most of your recommendations to be somewhat reasonable. Of course, unrealistically I would prefer that STR could be banned, but reality says otherwise.
However, I have two points that I strongly disagree on the draft proposal.
 1. That the number of occupants per STR will not actually be enforced this coming year, assuming passage of the by-law, but a grace period will be allowed. For many peaceful neighbourhoods, this only means one more season of putting up with hordes of people inhabiting a STR. THERE SHOULD BE NO GRACE PERIOD , as responsible owners of STR voluntarily monitor the number of people that occupy their rental units. So why should owners of STR units who do not care about neighbours be given leniency??
 2. Parking, only addresses minimum parking spots. What about addressing maximum parking ?? When these STR units are often rented, it is not uncommon for 6 to 8 additional vehicles to come up at least during the day. In these cases, the vehicle owners do not care where they park, infringing on the peace and quiet of neighbours and their property. Since, many of these STR units, especially in quiet residential areas, command exorbitant rental fees which are then diluted by inviting up hordes of other people to share the costs.
 3. Fire safety codes and standards for the buildings are fine, but what about the adverse side-effects of these so called "social bonfires". Many of these fires are unsupervised with burning embers flying everywhere. This is a distinct fire hazard in heavily wooded subdivisions. Then there is the question of significant smoke emanating from these social bonfires. With the number of people becoming more and more allergic to airborne pollutants and the rapid increase in the development of respiratory diseases amongst the general population, this should be addressed. Short term renters do not care about the health of others, as they will be leaving shortly. Generally, what they do while at a STR, they would never do at their actual home. I recognize that as a Council, you must balance any laws against what is legal and what can be supported in a Court of Law. You must also balance the needs of RESPONSIBLE owners of STR rentals. They do exist, as one of my neighbours rents out to people whom I rarely would ever know they are there except for the vehicle parked on the driveway. Not all renters and owners of STR units are irresponsible
- I think this looks very well thought out and should really help ensure enjoyment of all property owners
- I think this is fantastic. There are many short term rental properties that are wonderful and very considerate of their neighbours but there are a few that just don't care about anything except

making money. The bad ones ruin it for the rest. The ones that are considerate are most likely obeying all of these rules already so it shouldn't affect them much but it would sure make a few streets in town much more enjoyable for the people who own their properties.

- I greatly appreciate the the Municipality is taking steps to make Lambton Shores a community that can be enjoyed by both short term and long term visitors and residents. While tourists are needed for the economy, there needs to be a balance.

The demerit point system inquiry

1. Why aren't demerit points taken off when an initial phone call is made to the short-term rental hotline? I would hope that neighbours aren't just calling the hotline to get rid of a rental, but are calling for a legitimate violation of noise, over parking etc... Perhaps if Short Term Rental business owners are aware that neighbours's concerns will result in demerit points, "business owners" may be more selective and better vet the guest they host. This would also be the case if/when a resident is infringing on the by-laws too.

2. What happens to illegal Short Term Rental proerteis? There is a difference between a family gifting or renting a place occasionally to a family friend occasionally vs. full-time underground business. What happens to short term rentals who do not register their business and continue to run an underground business? What weight does the municipality have with these rule breakers?

3. It is fair that there is a limit on the number of guests that each Short Term Rental can accommodate. Does this also include "day guests" who arrive for the day to hang out with the people who have rented the cottage? Is there any guidelines about "extra guests" who may claim that they are not spending the night, but then it gets too late and need a place to rest?

4. How will these new steps forward be communicated to the community at large? What methods will be used to clearly communicate the rules, timelines and etc.?

There are the initial questions and inquires that I have currently as a home owner in the beach side community of Grand Bend

- I feel there should be more than a 6 month ban in renting if the demerit points reach 15. There could be several repeat offences like noise, fireworks etc that add up and by Labour Day they reach 15. A 6 month ban at that point is not a deterrent as the summer rental season is over. The owners can start again the next summer. Meanwhile the neighbours will have been disrupted by noise, fireworks etc all summer. I think the ban should extend to the following summer
- Why has the council not addressed the number of STRs in residential areas. This has direct impact on maintaining the integrity of residential communities in Lambton Shores. Bayfield and Goderich have banned STRs which could potentially lead to more STRs in Lambton Shores. Permanent residents who have lived, worked in this area have made significant contributions to Grand Bend. If Grand Bend was largely comprised of STRs do you think a medical centre , a Grand Bend Foundation would exist? The licensing fee is too low. When STR are charging up to \$6000 per week , the licensing fee should be higher. If you run a STR it's a business , please explain the rationale for STRs not paying business tax
- While I appreciate a balanced approach, I don't feel the proposed solution is strong enough to deter Short term rental owners to ensure they are renting to people who will respect these rules. Over the past three years, we have been unable to enjoy our summers at our cottage because the same STR owner, despite calling bylaw enforcement numerous times, continues to

rent their home to people who are not respectful of others - by having loud parties, profanity, loud music, etc. It is maddening! Please estate much stiffer consequences!! Thank you

- I think the Committee has done a great job of coming up with this proposed licensing for short term rentals especially in Grand Bend..For many years now, people have been buying properties in our area with the sole purpose of renting them out.... Some have renters who are always causing trouble with neighbours especially when it comes to noise complaints...I believe this is the only way to take control of this situation....

- Hello, Dear Madams/Sirs: As the owner of a house in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED], who lives overseas and depends on the rental income to make house payments, I have a couple of comments:

1) The occupancy limit is not realistic. Many families that rent our home need to be able to fit 10 people. Therefore, in our four bedroom, three bath and two living room home we can more than accommodate 10 people. The 8 person limit is not relevant in our case.

2) I personally have a company that manages the property and these people (referred to as the responsible person in your draft) get are busy or may live up to an hour away from the properties they manage (like in our case.). So you are saying if THEY do not respond to an issue in 30 minutes that the HOMEOWNER needs to pay a fine? That's pretty harsh. Isn't this why municipalities have a police department? I can see that the responsible person needs to take charge of the situation, but have an issue with the 30 minute window.

3) The Hearing through the SRT Committee: because we live overseas, we would never be able to attend this meeting.

3) Overall, I am suspect of this entire idea, to be honest. You are asking home owners to finance this regulatory structure that we do not want. This is like asking people that do not want to eat donuts to finance a donut shop.

Thank you for asking for feedback. I hope that my points will be taken into consideration

- The Code of Conduct should include bullet points/brief description of bylaws that were noted (e.g. no fires allowed?, time of noise bylaw, etc.) or an appendix (prepared by municipality) that outlines specifics. The demerit point system should help to ensure STR owners abide by the rules and try to ensure the tenants are responsible.
- Hello, We are very concerned about this new licensing program. Particularly the limit on 8 guest per cottage. Many cottages in Grand Bend are very large and designed to accommodate large groups of people. This is such a wonderful way for generations of families to gather! We absolutely understand and agree, guest to our area need to be respectful of permanent residence and our beautiful nature. But limiting guests does not ensure that. We'd like to see more bylaws that discourage inappropriate behaviour. But limiting guest limits in one for many local businesses that thrive in high season. Please reconsider this licensing. Thank you,
- Appreciate you reviewing and getting feedback on STR and how to ensure it fits with the lifestyle and culture of Lambton Shores. One very concerning point is the limit of rental on 8 people. Our experience is one of the key benefits of providing spaces for greater than 8 people is the ability to bring together multi generational families - grandparents, adult children and the grand children. Limiting the number based on other reasons would impact this group and would be a major mistake, this should not be in the final recommendations
- We're quite concerned with the proposed limit of 8 people in an STR. The proposal indicates a limit of 2 people per bedroom. Our STR is a larger 2-storey 5 bedroom home which we restrict

to families or adult groups over the age of 30 to a maximum of 10 people. It is common for multi-generational families to rent our place ranging from grandparents down to grandchildren. This would not be possible with an 8-person limit and feel this current limit is arbitrary and would be better based on the number of bedrooms. Thanks.

- Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. The max limit of 8 guests is too low and will limit family get togethers and reunions and less rental income for cottage owners. A more reasonable approach with larger cottages is 3 or 4 persons allowed in a bedroom with a single over double bunk or a double over double bunk -2 extra persons per living room/recreation room so a larger cottage with both a living room and a recreation room could accommodate 4 extra persons (2 in LR, 2 in recreation room)
- short term rentals should be treated as commercial business and pay extra taxes for all the problems the short term renters bring with them to family neighborhoods
- I have a STR in Bluewater so this does not affect me but I find this overreaching and restrictive. We, as cottage owners are being punished by the few who are not responsible. The limit of eight people is especially disheartening as it does not allow families to vacation together. Families are rarely the ones causing the commotion but rather it's cottage owners who renter to young adults looking for a place to party. Those are who you should be targeting
- Thank you to those involved in bringing the STR Plan to date. As a resident of Grand Bend for 48 years and a resident of [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] for 46 years we have seen a tremendous change in the face and personality of Grand Bend. Mostly this has been for the good and those involved in municipal development are to be commended. As with any increase in population for an area there have been growing pains. The most painful ones have been involving STR. The problems have not been life altering but have been a great nuisance from time to time. This has mainly involved excess capacity in rental units leading usually to excessive noise. and abuse when talking to the renters. I am concerned with the maintenance of fire safety standards as well. I feel that your balanced approach is the correct one. Thanks again.
- This proposed License program should be phased in to New purchaser's NOT implemented on current Owners of STR's This program will hurt the local economy as there will not be as many people. Visiting the area and bringing in money to economy. Parking: The parking should not to a max of 2 vehicles even if the proposed 8 max renters it is not to say that everyone comes with two vehicles. The car link it should be at least a max of 4 and if the parking is on private property the local government should not have a say where the vehicles are allowed to Park. Insurance: this by no means should the Lambton Shores Government have a say, this, it is already in place by a lender (Financial Institution) FI and has to be strictly adhered too if it does not met certain criteria then the FI will not approve. Just a few points that do not make sense
- While I understand the need for some structure and accountability around short term rentals, I have an issue with the 8 person capacity maximum. A blanket maximum makes it difficult for large families to find suitable accommodations, and unfairly punishes owners who have specifically bought properties that will suitably lodge large groups. For myself, we bought a 5 bedroom "cottage" with bunk beds so that we can easily have friends and family visit overnight, and would like to allow other families to have the same opportunity. We also use a property management service who ensures we are renting to responsible guests. We have no desire to be a 'party' cottage, and are taking the appropriate measures. Our goals is to offset the cost of owning a vacation property for our own use, and the proposed program is too heavy-handed

and inflexible to make that a reality. If the plan is to outsource ongoing enforcement to a third party, is it not possible to have said third party inspect properties and the time of the license application, consider the method of rental and make recommendations for things like maximum occupancy on a case-by-case basis, ensuring the rules fit the property? I also worry that such strict limitations will negatively impact the many seasonal businesses that operate in the municipality. I'm happy to discuss any concerns in depth

- I think this is a very good program. It ensures the safety of people renting properties, make the owners responsible and sets up a call line if things get out of hand. It also addresses the number of people in each house. Very well done and I hope it will be approved in time for rental season.
- My family and I think this is a ridiculous idea and are trying to get money out of our pockets when we're trying to make money with our hard earned money all done LEGALLY. A \$450 annual fee is pointless and ridiculous. If safety was such a concern there should be no fees associated with this. By law officers already get paid an extensive amount to do the bare minimum work. That's all tax payer money ... we strongly disagree and this is not something that'll work to our advantage.
- We are enthused that you are going ahead with licensing STR. A cost effective balanced approach seems to be a favourable way to go. To be fair to the smaller establishments perhaps the cost of the license should be a percentage of the rental charges.
- The demerit system is an absolute insult. If a store or hotel has a rowdy customer who is disturbing the peace, who gets in trouble if the police is called? The customer, not the store owner or hotel manager, so why are you proposing this ridiculous demerit system to penalized STR owners over the behaviour of their guests? Even the best vetted guests can exhibit disrespectful behaviour and this is not the fault of the STR owner. Many businesses depend on tourist dollars and this mockery of a proposed system will drive STR owners to sell, diminishing the areas ability to house tourist. Shame! And the cap on how many people your rental can house?? 4 adults can rent 1 room at a hotel/motel, but STRs are capped at 2 per bedroom?? This proposal reeks of motel/hotel lobbying
- I agree with the plan thus far, although I wonder if the penalty should be longer than 6 months for accumulated demerit points. Many short term rentals don't rent over the winter months anyway, so perhaps it should be 12 months. I also wonder if there will be many rentals that do not register with the municipality. In that case, what redress do the neighbours have if there is a disruptive rental in the neighbourhood that is not licensed?
- I support the proposed licensing program as posted on the Lambton Shores website. I understand and appreciate the desire for a balance approach to STRs; in this case, a measured approach means licensing with no capacity limits. However, once the licensing program is implemented, I would request that the Municipality commit to reviewing its impact and implementing capacity limits if warranted. Capacity limits might be warranted if the number and concentration of STRs continue to increase such that STRs outnumber private residences in a particular neighbourhood or community. Capacity limits might also be warranted if the revenue generated from the licenses is not sufficient to fund the required bylaw enforcement. (Of course, in that case, the cost of the license could be increased, which might also have the effect of reducing the number of STRs.) To conclude, please explicitly communicate a commitment to review the licensing program after 2 full summer seasons (i.e., Fall 2024), if not sooner

- The density of STR's is not addressed in the proposal. It would be beneficial to limit the number of STR's in a neighbourhood and also limit how close to one another they can be. The owner/operator's of STR's information should be shared with Revenue Canada to ensure that the income generated is taxed properly. An inspection of the property should be done annually by Fire Dept to ensure working smoke and CO alarms, that the Fire Safety Plan is up to date and also to ensure that non-compliant rooms are not being used as sleeping areas. Cost of this inspection should be a separate charge to the owner/operator. Complaints against a property should be tallied, not just convictions. The STR compliance committee should have access to the complaints and then should have the authority to issue demerits if the complaints are justified and not vexatious. Overall, we feel that this is a very well thought out and detailed draft by-law and appreciate the effort that was put into it!
- Believe the licensing program is well intended, however is it practical in reality?? (some key points)
 1. Secure Garbage. We have wonderful roll garbage and recycle bins, which keep garbage contained and secure (if anything you may ask that the bins be labelled)
 - 2.. point 2a)Occupancy Limit . Limit of 8 people/ thinking that is per cottage? - any family with 6 children or more, are not able to come to a cottage, really that is discrimination know a number of these families and many families want to travel together on holidays, so 3 families with one or more children may not be able to vacation together. Many grand parents like to book a time away with the children and grand children.
 4. point 2 a) cont'd If there is more than one cottage on a property - would not the limit be higher, how are families able to go away together, wonderful way for them to connect for memories of a life time.
 5. point 2a) cont'd . If anything possibly an age restriction of 25 for groups of more than 8 people.
 6. point 7. Time to Respond Many of these rentals are to help pay for the property so one may own a cottage, having a 30 minutes reaction time is not always feasible, 30 minutes is far to abrupt (people will always react in that time if they are able, however sometimes cell phones are out of range, or the battery dies, or people are at funeral, and the notifications will not come through. Thinking having 2 people to contact will be very helpful. Respectfully (Does one realize if we phone a government office, we are often on hold for more than 30 minutes - and sometimes disconnected before being put through) Why is this being treated like a large business?
 7. Demerit Points. IF the neighbours do not want a short term rental in there area, all they have to do is complain, and unfortunately people do complain unnecessarily (in some areas, see this as a very real concern)
 - 8.Demerit Points - just trying to understand why are demerit points are so high, have to be almost perfect (demerit points see them being 1 or 2 max, based on the guidelines of the triggered consequences
 9. Demerit points far to high. 2 incidents of any kind and one is out of business
 10. Consequences . If the short term rentals even have to cancel one short term renter, for a week that is very negative, and harms the short term rental industry reputation- 6 months shut downs, each of those short term rentals will be out of business.

11. Consequences Doesn't even allow for the opinion of changing to long term rentals, if short term rentals are not allowed

12. Carbon Monoxide detectors, many cottages only have hydro, so possibly add for cottages with propane or gas Carbon Monoxide detectors are necessary.

13. STB Inspections - The \$50 non refundable plus \$450.00 fee, thinking this includes the STR being inspected, line 8 doesn't make it sound that way.

12. Number 11 - Liability- Is too broad, if the guests are at the short term rental itself understand, however if they are not at the short term rental then that is beyond our capacity to be responsible. The wording should indicate on the short term rental property only.

Understand that short term rental has gained popularity, however it offers so many benefits to the community.

1. local business, especially for restaurants

2. business for gas stations

3. business for flea markets

4. business for local stores

5. business for landscape companies

6. business for lawn care companies

7. Business for cleaners

8. business for construction

9. business for retail

10. business for more businesses not mentioned in above.

Other benefits

1. Bringing younger people into the community for longer term residency, new blood in the community, keeping the community thriving

2. More people offers the community more events (more choices for the residents) leaving a more content community

Lets support small business, the best that we are able

- I am totally opposed to the idea of allowing private homes to be purchased, and rented out as a "Commercial " business on a daily or weekly base. This is not fair to the Motel owners, or other Commercial businesses in the community. We have to pay "Commercial property Tax", yet these owners pay nothing extra, and bog down the ammenities which we the normal residents have to support and pay for. I was told when I purchased my first home in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] 43 years ago, that no commercial business was allowed to be operated from a residence. My question to your council is, "what are weekly rentals, if they are not a Commercial business? Some municipalities, such as Goderich, have banned this business completely. I for one am in favor of doing the same here. The noise, and loud parties at times can be most frustrating. Your bylaws are on paper only, and are not enforced, especially for noise, and "No Tires to be parked on the paved streets". Neither of these are acted upon. I personally try and leave each Thurs. and go to my 2nd home to avoid the noise and stress I am confronted with during the summer. A very sad state of affairs, but I am giving you my honest opinion and thoughts. My request would be, |NO weekly rentals in residential subdivisions, and any properties that are rented out, charged a commercial business tax, the same that is applied on business in the area. I would be happy to discuss my thoughts with any of your officials at anytime

- As a STR owner, I am opposed to these strict, rules, that Lambton Shores is placing on owners. Our rentals are located in a private, gated community, where the attached rules, and regulations, for the most part do not even apply to our properties. We have plenty of parking for our tenants, as well as specific garbage spots, where the bins sit. We have smoke and co2 detectors, as well as fire extinguishers. We have proper rental insurance as well. We do not exceed the occupancy numbers, due to the size of our cottages. I feel that 450.00 per year, is a lot to pay. These measures, I am sure, will make many owners think twice about continuing to rent out cottages. This will result in many people not being able to have their summer vacations, because the number of rentals will decrease. This also decreases the amount of money being spent in Grand Bend, for restaurants, and retail establishments. We already have a vetting system, before we rent, and do not rent to anyone under the age of 25. Our rentals are all families or older couples. Our rentals have never had any complaints, by our neighbours. We have never had any issues, with noise, garbage, or any of the other issues, which I think are mostly related to the downtown area of Grand Bend. I was part of the initial zoom meeting where our input, as STR owners was asked. Everyone on the call was a responsible owner, who had never had any issues with their renters, over the years. I still think that we, as responsible owners, are being penalized because, of those who are not responsible. I also, feel, that trying to implement this plan this year, is too late. We have our properties rented out, and doesn't give us much time to get all of this organized.
- We need an increase in the number of bylaw officers to patrol area. Also increase in the hours of availability to contact the officers. Lastly, a direct line to reach the bylaw officer, or they are carrying a cell phone so infractions can be reported promptly and responded to immediately.
- I am pleased to see the occupancy limit of eight and the reference to not using STRs for parties. That should help resolve some situations that's I have observed in my neighborhood. I think the annual fee is low. Houses are rented for thousands per week in this area. I am pleased to see the reporting protocol but I am concerned about how that will play out of there is a delay for the by law enforcement officer to get there. That's a half hour wait for the responsible person, then a further wait for the enforcement officer to go out and then may not cause the points to be accrued. So people could be kept up for a long time by noise and the owner could still bears no consequence. If the officer goes out and corroborates that there is executive noise, the points should be automatic
- I am a full time resident [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] in Port Franks. I really welcome the licensing program as there are more and more properties being used as rentals rather than residential in our area. My question is about parking. You have required minimum parking places. A single family residence in our area has been converted into 3 separate units and at times there are as many as 10 vehicles parked on the front yard between the house and road. Is there a possibility of a requirement of maximum vehicles??? Other than that I appreciate that there will be much more regulation than previously. Thank you.
- I have read the proposal and feel there is, unfortunately, a need for these rules and restrictions in Lambton Shores. We own 2 cottages on Ipperwash beach [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] and do not rent out. We just purchased the cottage directly [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] which we planned to rent to family and friends not as a profit centre but to cover the hard cost of the cottage. Taxes, hydro, insurance and water, approx.

\$12,000 per year. I noticed a couple of possible conflicting issues or oversights in the proposed licensing program for STR.

Occupancy limits: max 8 people?

Our cottage has 5 large bedrooms, 3 bathrooms and enough parking spaces for 8 cars. This cottage sleeps 11 very comfortably with all the supporting facilities. This rule should reflect the possibility of this type of accommodation being offered. It could be a change in the rule or the ability by the owner to request an exception or variance to the rule. It seems like an oversight by the government committee as the rule currently says a 2 bedroom one bathroom STR can have 6 people, but a 5 bedroom, 3 bathroom STR can only have 8 people?

Demerit Points System:

I don't plan to be issued any demerit points so my comments are not for me but to point out the future problem of this part of the licensing program. I understand that the committee's intention is to deter operators from having infractions and therefore losing the licence to operate the STR. In my opinion, the limits of demerit and penalties are very harsh. The committee has stated that if a property gets 7 demerits then the property loses the licence immediately for 6 months, 15 points then it is suspended for 2 years.

Scenario - 6 month loss:

In May, the operator rents to a family that invites a second family to join them therefore 4 demerits. In June a similar situation happens and 4 more demerits. Therefore 7 demerits which means a 6 months suspension which takes the STR out of the rental pool for the whole summer and fall.

Scenario - 2 year loss:

An operator rents to a family that has a second family visiting. Because of drinking they stay over, have some fireworks and make lots of noise. The responsible person is missing in action. All these are infractions of the same situation and all deserve demerits.

- Exceeding occupancy 4 points,
- MIA responsible person 4 points,
- Fireworks 5 points,
- Noise 5 points.
- Total 18 points.

This operator loses the licence to operate their STR for 2 years all because of one mistake, they rented to the wrong family? The committee should possibly have 2 demerit points for first infractions and then double for second infraction. A single incident like scenario 2 should have a max of 6 points. Because of the seasonality of the area, all demerits should only remain for the remainder of the calendar year. Operators get a demerit reset every January. Demerits in July would be removed Dec 31. You want to create an environment of compliance of the rules and having the demerit system too harsh and unbending will not achieve what the committee is trying to do. Some operators could just take a fine for non licence compliance which might be less than the rents they are collecting?

Offer a VSTR Licence Program:

In our situation and probably many others that only want to rent a few weeks a year to off-set hard costs, it might be wise to offer a Very Short Term Rental licence. A VSTR would be an owner only renting less than 4 weeks a year. In this case, it could be a nominal licence fee and a registration of the actual weeks they will be offering to rent. The other requirements could still

need to be in place. Lambton Shores needs to encourage STR, under conditions, as not everyone can afford to own a cottage in this beautiful area. It would be sad and a waste for many cottages to be left empty because the owners can't be bothered dealing with too many rules and controls. We need the rules and the Municipality needs an economical way to enforce those rules. The Municipality must make sure the rules are logical and fair for all. On the other hand, we don't want to have a future where all the cottages are owned by corporations that operate them only as a STR business. That would be a sad scenario.

- Painting all short term rentals with the same maximum occupancy "brush" will deter people from renting in grand bend. I often rent our STR to families of 10 people, as this is a child and family friendly area, and our house easily accommodates this occupancy with 5 greatly sized bedrooms and 3 bathrooms. Majority of our family rentals will find a new town to rent in if capacity is maxed at 8 because this does not allow two families/grandparents to rent a house together, which is the whole point of their holiday!
- As a tourist and short term renter every summer in Grand Bend for the past 6 years, I am beyond appalled by the fact that there would be occupancy limits put on all cottages, especially ones that can house more than 8 people. My immediate family (whom I vacation with) is a total of 9 people (not accounting for the additional family we have vacation with us from time to time). With this proposed licensing program, my immediate family would never be able to stay together in one cottage in Lambton shores again. Like even covid had a 10 person limit.. 8 person limit is ridiculous and my family will definitely no longer be returning to vacation in Lambton shores ever again... so much business lost and happy repeat tourist will stop coming cause they wont have a place to stay! There is no logic to this rule whatsoever
- I heartily agree with the new proposals regarding STR . Since we purchased our cottage 8 years ago the residences on either side have been sold and are currently STR. There are at least 5 rentals on our side of the street alone. There is definitely a need to control the number of people allowed in each rental. We own on [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] which has fairly tight confines for space. It is not unusual to have 8-12 people occupying the one cottage , while the other newly renovated one is advertising accommodations for up to 15. Most renters are civil but the sheer amount of people cause significant issues with parking , noise , garbage etc. I also believe that most people don't know the noise bylaw actually runs 24 hours a day. Many renters think the 11pm-8am noise bylaw is the only one and feel free to crank the music or noise the rest of the day. We try to be tolerable within limits but some have to push the envelope. I am sure the Bylaw infographic poster on each rental will help a great deal. At least they can't plead ignorance. The responsible person is a great idea and takes some of the onus off the Bylaw officers. In our experience they have been very professional and timely when dealing with complaints. Hopefully this will free them up for other duties. I no longer try to resolve any issues personally since I had a beer can thrown at me one night , am getting too old for that stuff. The demerit system throws some of the responsibility back to the owner. We have said for years that these party places would slow down if the owners were fined for violations as well . Know your clients. I don't think your licensing fees are out of line . According to the posted rental rates for our two nearest neighbors' it amounts to around one nights accommodation hardly a financial burden . I have also heard some talk that it will affect the tourist trade here. Anyone who thinks this will significantly affect tourism in Grand bend is delusional. By addressing fire safety , garbage, parking and insurance issues as well I believe you have covered

all the bases quite neatly and effectively with this document . I am no great lover of red tape but things were starting to get out of hand. Thank you for putting this together and I look forward to seeing this come into effect

- My wife and I are owners of a cottage in Southcott Pines which will be our fulltime retirement home in 2025. We do not begrudge a STR owner wanting to recoup their investment. Our complaints regarding STR renters arise from: 1) not being able to access the designated Southcott Pines beaches -which are limited in overall area- due to the influx of STR renters, especially on long weekends; 2) some STR renters NOT obeying the "No Parking" bylaws pertaining to the east side of Shoreline Drive in Southcott Pines; 3) some STR renters not respecting the noise bylaws late at night. We do not profess to have the answers to these issues, however the enjoyment of our community and all that it has to offer for the property owners and fulltime residents of Lambton Shores should absolutely be taken into consideration as discussions into this matter move forward. We know that Lambton Shores -and Grand Bend in particular- will change appreciably in the short and medium term as the population increases. We trust that council will draft bylaws and policies that will serve full time residents and their families through these periods of growth and improvement
- Great idea. Our community is being overrun by AirBnb rowdy short term renters. Eek. Long time resident
- I am pleased to see the proposal and hope it is put in place. I think we need to support our local hotel and motel and restaurant owners first. A question is, will the properties approved with a STR license be listed and available for the public to see? How can the public know if a STR located next door, is licensed or not?
- Multi-generational Families have long traditions of lawful reunions and quality summer get-togethers. Most of the time is spent outdoors and also enjoying Grand Bend (GB) restaurants, patios and stores. This is important for Families, our Community and Businesses. Whether it's people visiting Cottage Owners or those Renting Cottages, laws should be enforced. The loudest noises we experience as Cottage Owners is other Owner's parties. Renters are closely monitored by Rental Agents/Owners and generally on a tighter leash. The vast majority of Renters are very respectful and don't want to risk losing their deposit. If you restrict only Renters you penalize Families' that can't afford to buy cottages and that won't stop Cottage Owners/Kids/Visitors creating excessive noise, over-crowding and breaking laws. Don't Discriminate against Renters and enforce the laws, whoever breaks them
- I find licensing program unnecessary. There is bylaws for a reason and they should be enforced. People have been renting their cottage out forever. Now we have some people who complain about everything. Owners of the cottages are not responsible for the actions of their renters. Yes that could have a list of bylaws on their lease agreement and if the renters do not comply they should be ticketed. Having demerit points is again punishing the owners for the actions of their renters. Taking away their license would not only create problems for them, but also for the people who have rented their cottage in advance. Please use some common sense and scrap this proposal
- Not interested. Cash grab and yet again, more government involvement in the private ownership. If they want to benefit on the backs of owners, I suggest they share in the cost of ownership by way of a property tax credit

- In the STR Report under the title of "Background" is the following statement. It is intended that the licensing by-law would not be applicable to hotel or motel operations, campgrounds or to bed and breakfast establishments as defined through the Zoning By-Law. The question remains; Are B. & B.s allowed in communities zoned "Residential" ? A number of years ago there were 2 (two) B. & B.s operating in Southcott Pines subdivision. It is clearly not a situation that I would like to see repeated. Please advise what the "Zoning By-Law" states regarding the operation of B. & B.s . This is a serious omission in the STR report
- parking violations continue to be a problem along with too many occupants in each rental. Looks like some of these things are being addressed. Also rental pets where visitors just let them run into the bush to do their business
- Program is a joke, it is obviously due to irresponsible and absentee landlords in Grand Bend and will punish the entire municipality
- Why is the Municipality regulating this, everyone knows the only area where noise complaints, over crowding, & garbage are a concern is in Grand Bend. Hire some more By-Law officers and deal with the issues when they exist. Demerit points?? are you serious?? Fine the offenders heavily and you will eliminate the need for the additional bureaucracy. Not to mention the appearance of the "tax grab"
- The occupancy limit of eight persons is short-sighted. Our property is a family home large enough to comfortably accommodate two families. I agree that much should be done to ensure the enjoyment of property should not be hindered, however a hard limit on the number or occupants fails to offer a reasonable option for property owners. There should be concessions made for allowing additional persons in the case of families with children
- I don't believe the licensing should be on a break even basis for Lambton shores. This should be revenue generating, in my opinion. These rentals are often party places and have already changed the environment for family cottagers. Civic staff related time, increased garbage pickup and police responses should be compensated to some extent and \$450.00 license fee is one or two nights income for these rentals. Should be increased. Proof of insurance as a short term rental should be enforced each year at time of licensing. Seems to me this should just be a starting point to see what works and where improvements can be made
- I think it's another way for you to gauge those of us who own a home pay taxes and should have the freedom with my own to do with my home what I wish. Why should I pay you anything to rent out my person space. My taxes should cover enough money the government get from my hard work and my own decision to do with my property. How dare you destroy my independence I'm a law abiding citizen whose guest are always happy with what I offer. I feel it just jealousy showing it ugly head, you didn't do it so let's get greedy with those that have. I'm totally against you dictating to me what I should do with what I worked hard and saved for in order to create a lifestyle for myself.
- As a local living in grand bend for many years - STR are needed but the need to regulate them is needed even more. I think once we regulate we can get rid of the party go-ers and noisy people. Unfortunately everything is usually booked up in motels and my own family visiting from Toronto can barely find a room. They always end up booking a Airb&b
- 1. I am a third- generation property owner in Grand Bend, with some concerns regarding the proposed licensing program.

2. Several years ago it became financially necessary to offer a maximum 6 weeks of rental opportunity to other families in order for our family to afford continued ownership and necessary maintenance on our cottage. There is no "profit" realized. The 6 weeks we make available have already been confirmed for 2022, and deposits have been submitted.

3. We have never had a by-law complaint, or even a by-law visit, or police visit, or parking citation, or complaint from our adjacent year-round residents, because we rent to responsible families only.

4. Our annual repeat renters are invariably extended families, ranging from great grandparents such as myself and my wife to young grandchildren.

5. Our cottage at [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] has 5 small bedrooms, each with a double bed and comfortably accommodates up to 10 member families. I'm concerned that the 8-occupant proposed limit would result in some family members being left behind.

6. The families that rent a week from us each year come from all over Ontario and consider their family time together to be the highlight of their summer. The added costs of additional structures to secure trash, guaranteeing a 30-minute, 24/7 response time, and fees for inspections, could very well reduce the availability of affordable family vacation accommodations.

7. The profile of Grand Bend is changing rapidly, new business structures on main street and new high-rise cottages with roof-top party decks on side streets. Fair enough, but please keep in mind the average family and their available resources, so that they too can look forward to a wonderful summer week in The Bend.

- Good morning As someone whose family has rented in Grand Bend for over 50 years and am now a property owner ... I find this idea to be a money grab. We rented a cottage in Norman Heights for over 10 years as a kid. Every cottage around us had renters like us in it. Families came year after year and we got to know them. The cottages were small however many had tents outside and many people brought sleeping bags and slept on the floor. No one around owned the cottages but respected the property, their neighbours and looked forward to visiting year after year. There were no noise issues nor problems of any sort. It was a great way to grow up as a kid. As an adult .. I wanted my kids to have the same type of childhood that I did so I purchased a cottage in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED]. Lots of great family memories and no issues with noise etc. I then purchased another property in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] and we use that for extended family and we rent it out. It is a cottage with 5 bedrooms and we strictly rent out to families. We have had no issues with parties, noise, garbage etc and have asked our neighbours if they have any issues. They have not. We rent to a maximum of 10 people and no parties, pets or extra people allowed. If you have a maximum of 8 people ... that limits multi generational families to vacation together in a somewhat economical way. Many many cottages have more then 4 bedrooms so this limitation is ridiculous. Cottages are a summer Canadian tradition that many can't afford to own thus the reason people rent them. Hotels make no sense as you then have to eat out at a huge cost. Cottages allow people to still buy groceries in the area and eat out from time to time .. but also to cook several meals themselves saving some money. There is also a major lack of hotel all along the highway 21 corridor and in and around Grand Bend. If you have to limit the number of people in a house .. it should at LEAST allow 2 people per bedroom at the very least. Children under 5 should be able to stay in a room with their parents and should NOT be included in the

head count. For the over 50 years I've been coming to Grand Bend ... the majority of issues with renters occur around the main strip. My own kids rented a place called [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] while they and their 20 friends were under age .. no parental consent .. no police anywhere and no owner to complain to. Every weekend that place had massive parties with underage kids and I felt so sorry for the people in the area .. whether owners or renters. The police did nothing. The place should have been shut down and the owner fined many times over ... but yet it was allowed to continue. Owners like him gave every other responsible owners a bad name and now this ridiculous licensing. Being a beach town ... it should only be expected that people come in the summer. This license will drive prices up, less people will come and the business that thrive during the summer will no longer have the sales they need to survive. Grand Bend is a ghost town in the winter and instead of penalizing those that bring revenue to the area .. perhaps finding a way to better deal with the actual offenders and encouraging tourism in the off season will make Grand Bend a better place for everyone. It would be nice to know how many complaints actually come in during a year, where they are (Strip area only?) ... and what was done to rectify the issue. If it's only a handful of people/areas causing this .. they should be dealt with instead of everyone being penalized. Who is this " Third Party " that will be responsible for this? By chance have they had input into this thus giving themselves a nice revenue stream. Seems like hiring a couple of extra bylaw officers who actually enforce the existing bylaws would make much more sense then hiring another company. The taxes that are paid in most areas of Grand Bend should more then cover the bylaw officers to come out if indeed the need arises. The high prices of the homes and the taxes they collect should cover these fees

- As a STR owner, I am able to comfortably accommodate a 15 person stay. I am very clear on rules regarding no parties, respecting noise by laws, no additional guests besides the ones registered, etc. I do my due diligence and take the appropriate steps to ensure things run smoothly. This proposed licensing program is highly penalizing STR owners based on no inappropriate action on their part. Capping stays at 8person will not enable me to book my cottage at the rate needed to cover costs. We will need to sell and buy elsewhere... somewhere that doesnt create such unfair policies for STR owners. There is no reason for a max occupancy. One or two or 8 people can cause more trouble than a group of 9 or more. Will local resident be forced to abide by a 8 person max on their property? If not, why do these rules need to apply for STR owners? Additionally, why are STR owners being penalized for the behaviours of others? We pay taxes in order for the appropriate services to address behaviours that are counter to laws and by laws. With a 30 min response window, you are essentially asking home owners to become emergency services or pizza deliverers who have a ser response time. Its absurd
- (1) Consider a higher annual licensing fee.
(2) What about demerit points for offenses not listed?
(3) What happens to the license if the property is sold, ownership transferred, etc.?
Good work. Seems like a reasonable, well-balanced proposal.
- Our family has rented our cottage to vacationers for many years without a single problem. Due to the size and price of our family's cottage, we usually end up renting to several related families. This is income we count on to pay property taxes, utilities, and the maintenance on this home. Limiting the # of people to 8 is random and will pose a severe hardship to us and many other families that rent out their large seasonal cottages. If Lambton Shores only allows 8

individuals at one time, we will not be able to charge enough to cover our cottage's expenses and we are not alone. Our 7 bedroom home (+ a loft bedroom) should NOT be limited to only 8 guests due to the size of the dwelling. This will prohibit families of multiple generations from choosing our home to rent so they can vacation together. This may force us to sell our family cottage which has been in our family since the early 1920's. This would break my heart. We have personally had so many good memories there and we wish to continue this not only for future generations of our family but also for those families who rent from us. I respectfully ask you to reconsider the low individual limits on your proposed by-laws

- Special notes for properties that have deeded beach rights. Access to the beach is for the guests of the short-term rentals only. Not for all their friends and relatives that are just coming for the day. The complaint process should also include this scenario. Example: Family rents short term rental and hosts party for 50 people at the beach. Thanks
- Regarding occupancy rate, is the set total of 8 a firm number. Will the municipality match the number of bedrooms advertised with the municipal records. Parking is always a concern in Southcott due to the width of the roads and I assume with the licensing proposal increased enforcement would take place. You state that the licensing fees would be revenue neutral, however this seldom works and a higher fee would make sense with the understanding that if a surplus was realized this could reduce the fees at a latter date
- I own a property in Grand Bend. Some times, my family and I go up to stay there to enjoy the experience of being by the water and in a great town. My family alone is more than 8 people and the house can accommodate that number of people. At times, we do privately rent out our home to short term renters or allow friends and extended family to use it. In all cases, there are more than 8 people who are occupying the property. This proposed licensing is highly problematic as any of the above situations would generate demerit points and a potential reporting on the hotline. However, in 2 out of the 3 scenarios, I would consider it being used for personal use and not for business. If the property gets flagged as a STR under this licensing program, we need to pay outrageous annual dues and be scrutinized regarding the occupancy, secure garbage, responsible person, etc... but will this apply all the time? Only at times when we are renting it out to strangers? How will those situations be distinguished in the program? For the few weeks when the home is rented out in a year, why can we not just manage that ourselves? Why so much overreach by the municipality? So much control given and very little control maintained by the home owners and STR businesses. Very unfortunate and confusing for those who live and rent out their property (mixed model). The program is black and white and doesn't leave much opportunity for exception. Properties that are fully rented out and never used by owner should fit within the criteria of this program. The others, like my situation, should be the exceptions. This licensing will necessarily deter home owners from renting out their place and in turn, will impact tourism. Please reconsider this program. It is not balanced in its current form to support home and business owners
- I think the demerit points should be higher for exceeding occupancy limits, the noise and open fire offences, or the number of demerit points needed for a suspension of license be lowered. There needs to be very strict enforcement if Lambton Shores is going to allow our neighborhoods to transform into a majority of short term rental properties. Also there needs to be a limit to the number of licenses issued in a given neighborhood. The density of short term rental licenses must be limited

- Good Day, May I present a concern I have in regard to your demerit points system. In a scenario where a STR has a rowdy tenant, early in the rental season, and they cause two reports of excessive noise during their rental, that location will receive two infractions of 4 demerit points for a total of 8. The responsible person has done what she or he can to prevent it, but to no avail. That property has an immediate 6 month suspension. This does nothing to the individuals initiating the problem. It does, however, effect all the innocent tenants that have booked for the remainder of the season, putting them in an unfortunate situation that they were not involved in, having no longer a place to vacation. Can we consider that there be an accumulation of points for the STR property during the rental season and when the points have reached the 6 month suspension level, it be in force at the beginning of the next summer rental season, so as to not effect the tenants already booked, following the initial offense. Thank you,
- Hi, We do feel the licensing program for short term rentals will benefit our community. Thank you for being very informative, but we have a few more questions. How will the public know if the cottage owners who rent their properties have a licence? Is there a penalty for cottage owners who rent their properties and do not have a licence? Will enforcing the cottage owners who rent their properties to purchase a licence be the town's responsibility? If so, how will this be done? Thank you again!
- Change the licensing to No limit on the amount of people allowed as long as all the bedrooms are legal bedrooms for 2 people plus the property has the required sewers/septic, parking, fire prevention etc. for them. I do not think a limit could be legally enforced if the building has the rooms. The limit would just cause lawsuits to go ahead and hold up the start of the licensing program until resolved
- The \$50.00 application fee and the \$450.00 annual for Short Terms Renters is a gift from Lambton Shores. The annual fee is reasonable I would like to see the program expanded to renters who exceed from 30 days and beyond. (Long term renters don't necessarily play by the rules). In Manatee County Florida, they charge a total 12% Resort Tax of the rental amount received. 5% goes to Manatee County and the other 7% goes to the State. In light of the fact, 2 units on my street on [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] are listed on VRBO at close to \$1000.00 per night, you may want to re-think how much money is being left on the table with your current structure. In short, I am all for owners paying a rental tax to Lambton Shores
- Fines need to be imposed for STRs that are not registered. If an STR should not be operating legally, neighbours should be notified so that it can be reported if it continues to be rented out. Animals should always be kept on a leash at STRs and it should be signed indoors accordingly as a reminder, and renters should have to sign a recognition of the clause in their contract. There needs to be some form of recourse for neighbours who are accosted and verbally abused by guests. Private neighbourhood beaches need to be protected from renters who abuse the privilege and continue leaving garbage, broken glass, etc., as well as extreme noise and explicit language. Some recourse needs to be available to property owners to be able to use their own beaches without being driven away by foul, obscene language and rowdy behaviour. Neighbouring property owners need to be aware that their concerns are addressed and that repeated offenders will be prosecuted and not continue. Fines need to be greater than one month's income to make an impact. (A \$500 fine is barely 2 days rental in most cases). Taxes should be higher on STR than for surrounding properties due to them being a business. (If they are making

thousands of dollars per month they should be taxed at a higher rate than for a principal residence or cottage. Fees can be found on STR websites to tax accordingly.).

- Obviously a lot of thought has been put into this draft to meet the needs of both owners of STRs and residents. I appreciate the clear set of rules / expectations and specific consequences for infractions. Having a dedicated responsible person who will try to diffuse the problem before it gets to demerit points or fines is a brilliant idea. I believe the time is right for Lambton Shores to have a STR licence program. I applaud the committee that created this draft. I am in complete support of the licensing program that you have proposed
- As a 32 year Grand Bend full time resident/homeowner who now has an Air BnB on each side, I really appreciate the time and thoughtfulness that has gone into your draft bylaws. I heartily support the registration process, the fees , and hope there is a mechanism to flag the income from STR's to CRA. I also appreciate the demerit and fine system and hope it can actually have teeth . I do wonder how a potential complainant is expected to prove their concerns?? Noise and light problems are very annoying , but there are bigger ones that keep us up at night - especially fire safety as we see irresponsible actions regularly by renters here in our treed area. We are pretty sure a lot of illegal drug use goes on beside us given the behaviours we have witnessed.. I'd also love to see some kind of. a privacy bylaw in which , eg, hot tubs require a screen - we have been treated to a lot of things we never wanted to see and hear, and frankly should never have to again . We should be able to go out on our deck when we want to!!! What would be perfect in my estimation is a geographical area in which short term rentals are allowed . Then it would be safe to move if we eventually have tobut I love Grand Bend , and I don't want to see the day we feel forced out. Please don't water down any of your regulations, supervision , fines or enforcement . And please be prepared to enforce new bylaws and consider strengthening them if necessary.
- We have bookings from now until December 2022 with guest occupancy over 8 people, not just over summer. Our purpose in purchasing this property was to generate enough rental income to cover expenses. If we have to cancel or alter our bookings to less guests occupancy, we will lose our bookings and essentially generate less income, working at a loss..all while being expected to pay annual fees for the licensing program. How unfair and impossible... we won't be able to survive continuing to have a STR ... this thought is devastating. Please, please, please.. remove the max person occupancy. It is beyond problematic.
- 1) I'm concerned with the maximum number of people being 8; I think this is too low considering some properties have 5 bedrooms or more. It seems overly restrictive. I like the restriction of 2 people per bedroom + 2 more however I think it should be capped at 12. Question: how will you distinguish between STR overnight guests between visiting guests that may come for the day and not be staying over nor part of the STR agreement?
2) The demerit point system is also overly strict. 2 offenses in a 2 year period would move to licence suspension. I think there should be more wiggle room and the focus should be more on fining the individuals or guests that actually breaking the bylaw. An STR owner can do everything they can to inform guests of rules & bylaws but at the end of the day they can't stop guests from committing them. I think the demerit points assigned for each category are too high & should be lowered.
3) Another concern is the time that the responsible person has to respond; I don't believe 30 minutes is fair to the STR owner. I believe 1 hour would be more reasonable.

4) \$450 annual fee seems excessive; especially for STR owners who follow all the rules and don't create problems in their neighbourhood; there should be a base fee which is lower than \$450 and if receive demerit points your annual fee increases

- Addressing Short Term Rental Licensing:

Application and Annual Fee. We suggest annual inspection not necessary. 4 to 5 years if no complaints. Other municipalities can do an annual fee for \$150, not \$500, why can't Lambton Shores?

Contacts seem a good idea

Occupancy limits are too specific. We feel it is owner's comfort and should relate to beds/mattresses and directly correlate with parking. Owners must have parking to accommodate renters and renters should be aware in advance of number of parking spots available and location. Please note that different groups do not always share a bed e.g., men's golf groups, adolescents. [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] discussed with [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] that if a family of more than 8 people want to rent, they should rent 2 cottages. We see this as another issue, you will find renters that are all family that cannot rent one cottage will congregate and you will have 16 people at the cottage (maybe not overnight, but most of the day and evening) causing parking, noise and septic system issues. We rent frequently to 3 generation families, they want to be together. e.g. grandma has 2 children, their partners, and 5 grandkids under the age of 10, that is a count of 10. This family does not sound like an unreasonable amount of people at my cottage that accommodates 10. What do you think will happen if they rent 2 cottages, will they stay separated for the week, or will they congregate at one cottage?

Parking: Owner must be clear to the renter how many parking spots available and where they are located. A specific number of people in a car gets into controversy.

Liability: appropriate

Fire/Safety: appropriate

Garbage/recycle: Define secure storage area. We feel the municipal roller bins are secure and we have enough bins to accommodate our renters. Your concern here is vague. We manage our renter's garbage on a weekly basis and as necessary.

Campfire: fire department may be enlightening on what is appropriate. We have a sunken fire pit lined with fireproof steel (about .75 metres in diameter) and a gravelled/concrete outer ring that is approximately 3 metres in diameter.

Penalties: If the owner is licensed and has complied with short term rental by laws, they should not be fined for delinquent renters. We are not our brother's keeper. We do respond to issues immediately at our rental property.

Septic systems were not addressed? Should be a yearly inspection. [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] was a rental manager in the recent past and septic systems in Southcott and Huron Woods an ongoing problem.

There are by laws in Lambton Shores that cover most of this material. You already know who the offenders are. [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] stated in phone call to [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] that 10% of the landlords of short-term rentals cause 100% of the issues. Enforce the bylaws you have. It would seem a lot easier. We suggest you create zones where most of the complaints come from i.e., Southcott, Huron Woods, Main Street Grand Bend

area, Port Franks, and perhaps areas west of highway #21. These areas should be licensed because that is where you would be spending your by law licensing revenue.

- Re. Video Demonstration: the Responsible Person and Complaint Process - Step 4 of 5 indicates the action to take place "If the responsible person is unavailable or unable to resolve the issue directly, By-Law Enforcement will be contacted to notify them of the complaint". Is this action initiated directly & monitored by the Hot-Line Operator throughout the entire process?
Re. Pg 5 of 19, Draft copy of the Short-Term Rental Accommodation Licensing Application Guide - Fire Code Declaration, 3rd bullet - Tenants and visitors are instructed to notify the Owner if smoke alarms or carbon monoxide alarms have been disconnected, are not operating, or have been impaired in any way". How are tenants and visitors to know it's their responsibility to notify the owner & aside from the initial fire code inspection, what confirmation is in place, at that point, to ensure the owner complies?
Re. Pg. 7 of 19, same document as above - Short Term Rental Compliance Committee paragraph. Have Terms of Reference been established, indicating Role, Mandate, Composition, Term of Office (appointed by Municipal Council, Length of Term, etc.), and Conduct for this Committee?
- Hello, Thank you very much for putting this together. Much appreciated & needed. ASAP employment is crucial. We are long term, full time residents in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED]. The tranquility of the neighborhood, beach, etc, has been negatively impacted by the significant increase of LTR's over the past several years. Renters yelling vulgarities, open drugs, uncovered fires on driveways/ patios/ beach, speeding cars, fireworks on rooftops, mismanaged garbage & litter, etc, etc. I hope there is a way to enforce participation in this excellent program... Many may try to avoid the program? Some will deny their numbers, violations, etc & challenge compliance? We will do our part to help monitor. Thank you
- Thank you for the interest in short term rentals. Currently we have a small rental in Forest. We promote local tourism from Grandbend to Wyoming when advertising our STR. We have a guide book and daily excursions planned for guests. This is something very important to why we started with a STR. Previously we had a long term rental and had on going tenant issues. We are classified as commercial residential and have one long term commercial tenant and a STR that is booked approximately 10 nights a month on average at an affordable rate. We do this to promote business for Forest and area. As you know there are many empty store fronts and we are trying to help the community. We pay commercial and residential public tax, BIA and waste tax. Although we do agree with a STR licence, we find that we are already paying enough in taxes. A 500.00 fee is acceptable for STRs with income of 100 000.00, our gross income for 2021 was just under 5000. Which is quite a difference and we feel this should be taken into consideration. We could share our guide book with you so you are aware of our commitment to our community. Thank you
- -Has there been any consideration given to STR over/under 100 days? E.g. Less than 30% occupancy rate doesn't require a license.
-Has there been any consideration to grandfathering existing rental properties? E.g. New rental properties require license.
-What can STR owners do if they are being harassed by neighbours/neighborhood?
-As an STR owner, can I find out how many complaints I have had in the last 10 years?
-How long do demerit points stay on your record?
-What feedback from the STR owner break out sessions was used in the creation of the policy?

-What is the noise complaint definition? Is a simple phone call from a neighbour or is it a fine.

-What is the Demerit Point/Suspension Appeal process? Escalation procedure?

-Demerit points / suspension seem high - eg. one noise complaint and a failed response within 30 minutes = suspension

-What is the definition of guest vs customer? E.g. what if friends and family are using the cottage vs. STR.

-Does a violation by the owner count as a violation of the STR ?

-What happens if owners rent without a license?

- This is just another restriction on people's rights to operate a business. It appears to writer that the rules that are being proposed are in response to the full time residents desires. These restrictions are going to cause many of the STR owners to cease operations for their business. One troubling requirement that is being proposed is to have somebody available 24/7 and be within 30 minutes of the property. I do not believe that is reasonable given the fact that many STR owners do not actually live in the community. It also appears that if a neighbour does not like to have a STR nearby they merely have to make a few complaints, even of a minor nature and the STR owner's licence is suspended
- After reviewing Highlights of the Proposed Short-Term Rental (STR) Licensing Program on the Municipality of Lambton Shores website, here is my feedback with respect to this proposal. I wish to state that I do not own any rental properties or have any financial interest them. The Municipality of Lambton Shores has failed to provide convincing evidence for the necessity or desirability of this program. You state: Licensing programs aim to address concerns related to short-term rental accommodations operating within residential neighbourhoods, which can vary depending on the community or municipality. Concerns like what? Please be specific. How many complaints are a result from short term rentals? You know what the addresses are. What percentage of complaints are associated with a short term rental? Please provide a brief summary for the years 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021. Without supporting data no justification can be made for this program. I bet no one has kept track. The proposal continues to state: Although the Municipality of Lambton Shores has existing by-laws (e.g., Noise By-Law) that could address some concerns related to short-term rentals, the substantial increase in the number of short-term rentals in the area has resulted in an increased need for by-law enforcement that exceeds existing resources. To address this gap, the licensing program provides a framework to work directly with STR Operators to limit the frequency of issues related to short-term rental accommodations, and will operate as a cost-recovery program with mechanisms in place for non-compliance. You have not provided any specifics. What exactly is an increased need for by-law enforcement that exceeds existing resources? Please provide the number of by-law offenses for the years 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 with a brief description of the most common offences. It could look like this: Offence Noise Parking Dogs Liquor Offences ETC Total 2017 xx xx xx xx xx xxxx
How many of these were from short term rentals? Then we could see if there is a real or perceived need. Have case numbers increased over the past five years, if so, by how much? If there is a need for additional by-law enforcement, hire casual seasonal employees, rent a couple of vehicles and offset this cost from the proceeds of the tickets they issue. The municipality already has have every tool it needs. Again no justification for the STR. Up next: The Municipality will maintain a contract with a third-party service that provides STR address identification, a

24/7 hotline for STR complaints, and ongoing communication with an STR's Responsible Person (see next drop down) to address complaints or issues before By-Law Enforcement is contacted. Specifically, who is the provider? How is the cost calculated? Yearly / monthly / per incident / flat fee? Will the municipality have to sign a long term contract? How will you measure the performance of the provider? Again, far too little information presented to make a convincing case. Licensing Process and Application Fees. Fifty dollars to apply and four hundred and fifty dollars per year. What service or value does the property owner receive for their \$500? The fee structure is supposed to operate on a break-even basis. How have you arrived at the \$450 yearly fee? You have not provided any financial information to substantiate this fee. It looks like a cash grab to me. There is nothing in this program that could not be achieved with the existing laws the municipality has at its disposal. You also have no business interfering / regulating the legal business arrangement between private parties. This is reprehensible. If renters / owners misbehave sanction them accordingly. That's it. This program is superfluous and worse adds additional layers of bureaucratic procedures to what should be a straightforward process. I looked at the animation shown on the Lambton Shores website. Staying with the noise complaint here's how the sequence of events will more likely proceed.

1) Complainant calls the 'hotline' which is probably an answering service. Assuming it is staffed 24 hours a day the hotline takes the pertinent information.

2) The hotline people place a telephone call to the appropriate party and (time is 2:00 am) they get, wait for it, voicemail. "Hi, you've reached XXXX please leave a message".

3) The appropriate party fails to return / acknowledge the call from the hotline because they are sleeping and the call has gone to voicemail.

4) The hotline folks dutifully wait 30 minutes and it is now 2:30 am. They now call by-law enforcement.

5) If enforcement decides to engage, it will take them a minimum of 15 – 30 minutes to attend the scene and manage it. That 15 – 30 minute time frame assumes one is on duty at the time. If not on duty the time will be much longer as the person will need to get up, get ready then proceed to the property. By the time they arrive everything is quiet. Most people will just call the police. The STR has resolved nothing... I'll refer back to the gypsy moth spraying issue and discussion that took place in the early part of 2021. [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] indicated the municipality had no interest in spraying on private property and I respected that; it was the most difficult part of his argument to refute. So this is a private property matter. Use the rules / laws you already have to deal with it. Why is the Municipality looking at a licensing program? It sure looks like you are more than "looking" at a licensing program. Referring back to your website under the heading of What's Next? It appears that approval and implementation of the STR is already a foregone conclusion. The Requesting Public Input on Proposed Licensing Program (Underway) is going through the motions only. You have already made up your mind and will implement this program whether it is needed or not. Another way to expand the powers of the municipality. And finally, as I clearly warned in my initial feedback on this scheme; the minute the municipality issues a license, they become culpable if anyone is injured on this property. Some drunken fool falls off a deck sustaining serious injury. They sue the owner and the municipality as they issued the license. Can you not see this? When the municipality pays out on a case (and it will) it will extract the money from the tax-payer directly or by higher insurance premiums. Either way the tax-payer loses. Why expose the municipality

to unneeded liability? This in itself should dissuade you from perusing such a program. The program as presented has many flaws; it is long on vague statements / assertions and short on specifics, facts and data. The municipality has not demonstrated or justified a need for a short-term rental licensing program. The program should be abandoned; but I suspect it will not

- If not for someone posting this feedback opportunity on Facebook, we would not have known what was happening in regard to STR's in our community and have been able to voice our opinion. Should this information on such a serious topic not have been mailed out to every resident of Lambton Shores? STR's Defined – There is such a wide range of rental accommodations within the Lambton Shores area, it is difficult to lump them all into one bag and even more difficult to police. Bed and Breakfast establishments are, in our opinion and experience far different from unsupervised Air BandB rental situations. You state, "while some municipalities and cities have opted to prohibit or limit the number of STR options, Lambton Shores aims to find a balanced approach that supports local tourism and the growing sharing economy, while ensuring STR accommodations are safe and appropriately managed." What is a 'balanced approach'? What tourism is needed to be promoted in Port Franks? What is a "growing sharing economy" in Port Franks? We are not Grand Bend. We are not Ipperwash. When an owner/occupier is onsite during a rental period, the likelihood of needing to call a bylaw officer or a police officer are reduced substantially. On the opposite end of this continuum, when an Air BandB pops up in your neighbourhood, the owner of which has multiple other properties (27 to date) scattered across the province of Ontario and Quebec and who is not invested in the least in the area, cannot be evaluated using the same criteria. As a concerned neighbour, it is logical to approach a 'live in' neighbour when concerns arise. When the owner is nowhere to be seen and is running a very busy establishment, that same level of human contact and conversation cannot happen. We trust that there are, in addition to the members of the Municipality and STR owners, regular full time homeowner residents on this committee which is creating the proposal. Has your planning department explored the Goderich solution to the STR issue? It appears to us to be a very reasonable solution if this Municipality insists on allowing an influx of STR's.

Please visit: [By-Laws - Town of Goderich](#)

"Short Term Rentals The Town of Goderich does not permit Short Term Rentals (i.e. Airbnb) under the Town's Zoning By-Law. The Town of Goderich Zoning By-Law allows Bed and Breakfast style uses in residential areas as 'Tourist or Guest House Dwellings'. A Tourist or Guest House requires the proprietor or owner to live in the same building, and includes the rental of rooms, not the entire building. This is different than the typical operation of a full-time Short Term Rental (i.e. Airbnb), which typically includes the rental of an entire unit to the travelling or vacationing public, with the owner or proprietor not being on site while renters use the space. Those who are operating a Short Term Rental are in contravention of the Town of Goderich Zoning By-Law and are subject to the following penalty under the Ontario Planning Act: 67 (1) Every person who contravenes section 41, section 46, subsection 49 (4) of section 52 or who contravenes a by-law passed under section 34 of 38 or an order made under section 47 and, if the person is a corporation, every director or officer of the corporation who knowingly concurs in the contravention, is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable,

(a) On a first conviction to a fine of not more than \$25,000.00; and (b) On a subsequent conviction to a fine or not more than \$10,000 for each day or part thereof upon which the contravention has continued after the day on which the person was first convicted
If you are operating an Airbnb, we ask that you bring your property into compliance immediately, as active enforcement of the Town's Zoning By-law will be administered. If you have any questions surrounding the Town's Zoning By-law, please contact 519-524-8344, Ext. 5 for the By-Law Enforcement Department."

Similarly, Lambton Shores is not one homogenous type of living area. We moved to Port Franks specifically to avoid high volume occupancy and rental situations like in Grand Bend. When it is stated that STR's help in the area of commercial endeavours and bring in tourism, the differences between Ipperwash, Port Franks and Grand Bend are vast and varied. Lumping all these areas together creates unfair and unbalanced biased structures. This only adds to regulation and policing difficulties. In your definition it is stated that STR's are a commercial transaction. If that is the case, should the proprietor of said business not be present when transactions happen. We will use the example of a dog kennel. If the owner is not present, no dogs can be lodged on the premises. If the owner chooses to go on vacation or take a break, the business shuts down temporarily. We see this as a good analogy for the STR situation. We agree that any rental situation should be licensed. When a fee is paid in Port Franks, will that \$500 fee cover services related to Port Franks only monitoring and service or will it be put into the general coffers and used anywhere deemed necessary? Fine and Demerits. It appears that a newly structured department will be required to deal with all the impending fall out from these new regulations. Neighbours are being automatically turned into rats as we, who already reside in a neighbourhood, will be the only ones who can monitor the number of renters occupying a rental property. In this 'complaints driven' system, those of us who invested our life savings into a 'forever home', wanting nothing more than a peaceful, quiet existence in tranquil community, are forced to become ever vigilant policers of our environments. Our community of fulltime residents and many of the seasonal only residents are of an age where this should not even be a thought. Although a very different demographic, the impending shift from single family home to total rentals is reminiscent of the Flemming St. area of London, Ontario. The attraction in London was the College and the attraction here is the private beach. It is not a far fetched scenario. It is already happening and it is easy to see how quickly this community can become a totally different animal.

1./2. Maximum Occupancy – The Air BandB which opened next to us in December, has had numerous guests. The majority of the visits consisted of more than 8 guests we believe.

3. Responsible Person – The owner of the Air BandB next to us lives in the Toronto area. He cannot be present at the property within the stated 30 minute timeline. Is he allowed to hire a local someone to resolve issues of concern?

4. Property Standards Bylaw – Because the property next to us is tucked on a hill in the bushes, we cannot see the appearance of their land, however there already exists a spattering of garbage that has accumulated on the Municipal land which fronts their land and ours. This was not the state prior to their purchase.

6. Noise – If we follow the bylaw to the letter at this moment, we believe it may be deemed "frivolous or vexatious" (terms used in this proposal when describing complaints). These terms are very subjective and need to be removed or refined in order to let constituents know

specifically what they are allowed to complain about. Is it like the Boy that Cried Wolf and eventually the valid complaints fall on deaf ears? Unless the people addressing the offences have lived in our shoes, there will be concerns.

8./9. Advertising and Operating Without a License – At this moment, the property at [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] is operating and advertising without a license. If we had not complained, the Municipality would not have known there was an Air BandB operating.

10. Parking – This property currently has no driveway or parking on the premises, even though in ads it states that there is parking on the premises. As it stands, any parking for this residence must happen on the Municipal Land in front of the property, thus making it illegal. Currently, they are making money using Municipal owned, “No Parking” zone land.

11. Building Code – Will there be an inspector enter each and every licensed rental to monitor the legality and safety of the bedrooms and other building code issues? What about the 50 year old septic systems that have been used seasonally and now are expected, without update, to support the bathroom needs of 8 people on a daily basis year round.

12. Fire Code – Will the Fire Department be inspecting all the smoke and carbon monoxide detectors in each newly licensed establishment? Surrounded by woods, it wouldn't take much for my house to be engulfed by the neglect of unsupervised visitors. What an enormous task and stress on the existing Municipal employees! The Goderich model could eliminate many of these concerns once compliance is achieved. Third-Party Monitoring Service Contract – We have lodged a complaint using this Third Party Service. It does not instill much confidence in the whole thing when you are asked what your ZIP CODE is OR when you are getting an automated return phone call from UTAH asking if the problem is resolved...if not call your local police. Calling the police for an after-hours parking infraction is ludicrous. In the dark, how are we supposed to know if, for example, a parking infraction has been resolved or dealt with appropriately? We hope some more thought goes into the 24/7 Hotline service because as it stands, it is ineffective. Responsible Person - The owner of the property should be the only person responsible for anything that happens on their property. Absentee land owners should not be allowed to run an STR. Parking Requirements – It is suggested that if an STR does not meet minimum parking requirements, it may be possible for them to acquire off-site parking pass. In our opinion, if an STR does not have parking on premises, they should not operate as an STR. The property next to ours, does not have any parking on premises, yet in the Air BandB ad, it is stated that there is available parking. We have seen up to 4 vehicles on a number of occasions. These vehicles have been illegally parked on Municipal Land. There should be no parking there at all. The major concern is especially in the summertime, when public parking at the private beach entrance is full and people begin to search out other spots to park for the day. They will see what looks like a parking lot and join in the STR's parking. How is anyone going to be able to monitor this type situation. Code of Conduct – It is good that a Code of Conduct be posted in each STR. In our opinion, STR owners should be required to post the Municipality's Code of Conduct in any type of ad for their property, so there is no excuse for renters not to be well versed in the expectations of the rental. Your STR committee should also be reviewing and scrutinizing the Air BandB or other rental platform ads for appropriate wording in order to preempt some of the inevitable issues. Is there a daytime limit to how many guests of the guests are welcome on an STR premises? Can't the Issues Be Addressed with Existing Bylaws- If the Bylaws were reworded, and you followed a plan similar to the Goderich one, the issues could be

addressed. You state, “there is a substantial increase in the number of STR in the area and it has caused an increased need for Bylaw enforcement that exceeds existing resources”. A Licensing Fee will not resolve this problem. By the number of STR positive and negative impacts listed, it is obvious that the negatives outnumber the positives. All the negatives you have stated will definitely impact our area: noise; nuisance; parking; environmental; safety and garbage. In Port Franks, which is the only thing we are concerned with, the ONLY real benefit is increased income for the STR owner, who, in our case, is not a local therefore probably not supporting our local economy. We hope that in your struggle to find a manageable balance, you have listened to the voices of all with equal consideration. If you honestly want a solution, we think that you should give greater consideration to the Goderich style solution. Certainly, there would be STR owners who are upset, but if you got rid of those STR’s in which an owner is not onsite, many, many of the major concerns would be eliminated. We have friends who run very successful and responsible Air BandB’s. They are present and respectful of the community and their neighbours. We are not lucky enough to experience that in our immediate vicinity

- We would like to thank you for the will, and tremendous amount of time and effort that has gone into working toward a short-term rental licensing programme. There are many aspects of Report DCS 08-2022 that are quite encouraging to long-time property owners in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED], such as ourselves. A great deal of research has been done with input from various segments of the community to identify the pros and cons, and challenges of STRs. There are two comments in this report, however, that we find most disturbing. One, under Challenge 1: Noise Nuisance, states, “It is noted that although the Municipality does have a Noise Bylaw in place, many STR neighbours that had been impacted by noisy/disruptive behaviour did not call By-law or OPP for unknown reasons.” We will tell you why people did/do not call Bylaw or OPP. It is because there is no satisfaction in doing so. We have had Bylaw Officers tell us when we call about noise, “There is nothing that we can do until 11:00 p.m.” When I have read the Bylaw out to them, their comment has been, “How do you know that?” I say because I have the Bylaw in front of me! How many people have been told that nothing can be done until 11:00 and not know that the Noise Bylaw does, indeed, protect them from noise during the day? Why aren’t these people (Bylaw Officers) familiar with the Bylaws they are hired to enforce? Or perhaps, if they tell people they can’t do anything till 11:00 at night, those people will go away, and the Bylaw Officers won’t have to do any work. Also, by 11 o’clock, in recent years, Bylaw has been off duty for four hours! OPP Officers called during the night have told residents that they can’t do anything about their complaint because it is a Bylaw issue. That is not true because the Staff Sergeant in charge of Grand Bend assured us that OPP look after noise and other Bylaw issues when Bylaw Officers are not on duty. Perhaps these Officers’ excuse is the same as the Bylaw Officers. If they say they can’t do anything about it, they don’t have to do any work. The twisted perception of Bylaw was experienced one afternoon last summer. After calling them twice about a loud noise machine blasting out rap music, we intercepted them on the street and ended up engaging in a debate about whether we were hearing the noise 25 feet away or not, when we were standing 75 feet away from the noise! Then we were told that the music “wasn’t that bad” and the renters “had a right to play their music”! Obviously, the Officers were taking the side of the rule breakers against us, the complainants. Is that how they are trained? [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] assessment of the situation when it was reported to him was: “I believe the officers should have handled the situation in a better

manner and the issue addressed. “ We question why Bylaw Officers aren’t telling the noise makers that a complaint has been received and they have to turn their music off (not down; that doesn’t work) or take it inside where it can’t be heard outside. The renters have lost their privilege to play their music, by playing it so loud that it has disturbed the neighbours. That solves the problem and is the end of the issue! The second comment that we find very troubling, is under the explanation of the Demerit Point System and Fines for Non-Compliance. It reads, “Staff are recommending that demerit points are applied when a conviction is rendered, or fines are paid and is not based on complaints to discourage frivolous or vexatious complaints against certain properties. Really? Are you aware of people who complain just to be frivolous or vexatious? In our experience, people put up with noise a long time before they finally call. At that, they are still reluctant to do so. In this Report, you questioned WHY they didn’t call. Then you label people who do call vexatious! Also, if “certain properties” have several calls made about them by the same person/people, it’s because the issue has NOT been resolved, not because they want to be frivolous or vexatious! Both of these comments in this Report point to the same, distressing attitude: support the rule breakers and ignore or put down the complainants. It seems that the Municipality is going to an awful lot of effort to produce a well thought out programme only to have it fall apart at the enforcement level. So going forward, a resident finally gets up the nerve to phone your Hot Line. The “Responsible Person” is contacted and may or may not appear, and the noise may or may not subside. If Bylaw Officers are called, will they determine whether the noise is sufficient to lay a charge during their brief encounter with the situation or will they consider the concern of the people who have lodged the complaint? We will tell you that putting up with noise from a neighbouring cottage for a long period of time is not the same as an Officer briefly attending the area. We have experienced Officers driving by the identified cottage without even stopping because there is no noise being emitted at that point. They decide the issue is not worth speaking to the renters about during their brief assessment of the situation. What about the hours that the residents have been putting up with it? We expect Officers to stop and speak to the parties involved with the reported noise, whether there is noise being emitted at that point or not, and inform them that a complaint has been made, and if there is more, a fine will be laid. Then lay it if more noise is heard, either by the poor residents having to make another call or Officers checking on the situation periodically. We are quite encouraged by the Parking Site Plan for every STR cottage, even ones that have more than one cottage on a property. When the proposed regulations are implemented, we should not continue to see copious vehicles parked illegally all around the premises like this rental property that has four cottages, and which provides NO parking within its boundaries, nor any other legal parking options. In fact, we were told by the renters last summer that this rental was advertised with “free parking”! Hopefully, the Municipality will not tolerate this blatant disrespect for the parking laws for another summer. You can see by the pictures that ALL the vehicles parked here are parked illegally. We are pleased with staff setting the Occupancy Limit at a maximum of 8 people. This will certainly help with controlling noise, parking, and garbage. It will be a challenge to regulate as many cottages have been designed for more people. As [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] says, in his public videos, “More beds, more heads, more money for me!”. In conclusion, we have high hopes that we may be able to fully enjoy our cottage this summer, without undue interference from renters, when all these regulations are implemented and followed up with enforcement. We trust that the Lambton

Shores Administration is supportive of the intent of this new proposed Short Term Rental Licensing Programme and that Bylaw Enforcement Officers will be encouraged to follow suit

- Why do the changes being considered impact all of Lambton Shores, when the the majority of the issues are clearly centered around the Grand Bend area?
- I have been a resident of Grand Bend for the past twenty years. Both full time and seasonal. Our family and neighbors have had few issues over the years with rental visitors. The real problem we have had has been the lack of enforcement. That is the towns' real problem. Addressing the lack of enforcement would be better than implementing another bylaw that will become yet another enforcement problem. There are parties with a known history of offending and others coming into town recently buying up properties pushing/exceeding boundaries that are the root cause of the STR proposal. Deal with them first along with the lack of enforcement rather than implement a STR license
- I purchased a family cottage 2 years ago with my sibling and their family as a way for us to have family vacations together in Ontario. While not at the cottage, we thought a good way to bring tourism to the area of Grand Bend during off peak travel times/seasons would be to rent our cottage out as a short term rental property. There are a few areas that I want to highlight as part of the proposed licensing program:
 - 1) The demerit based point system: I am extremely concerned about my neighbours being able to abuse their power and report what they feel are minor concerns that could be easily addressed and managed before reporting them, and I am worried they will report infractions whenever they feel like it. We've had various instances over the last two years where folks in our neighborhood have told us "that we don't belong" because we are a different race and ethnicity. They have also demonstrated inconsistent behaviour when we have renters that are white vs. renters who are ethnic. I worry about the potential for racism based on experiences we've had in the past. What stops permanent residences from abusing that power? How is it ultimately reported? How does the city verify it? There needs to be rules in place that protects us as hosts because we are also contributing to the Lambton Shore area with increased tourism, increased employment and paying property taxes.
 - 2) The room capacity: As for the 2 people per bedroom, with an additional two up to a maximum of 8 people, this rule doesn't make any sense. There are many properties in downtown Grand Bend that are small 2 bedroom bungalows that would be able to have 6 people whereas a 3,500-4,000sqft mansion in Southcott Pines or Huron Woods with 4-5 bedrooms would be capped at 8. I think square footage should be taken into consideration just like maximum capacity rules in other businesses, as a short term rental is a business. There are quite a number of larger properties, including manors and mansions, just outside the downtown area in communities that legally accommodate 10-12 comfortably with adequate parking.
 - 3) The garbage and recycling: The garbage rules must be consistent across ALL grand bend properties, not just those that are short term rentals. Why should there be any difference in the way garbage is managed? Full time residents often leave their trash outside as well and it should be locked up to keep animals out (Animals don't know what houses are a short term rental vs. a permanent residence, they just know garbage) This should be something that is applied to the whole of Lambton Shores. There is already an "Us vs. Them" mentality in Lambton Shores specifically in the Grand Bend area and I think many of the rules should be uniform across all properties regardless of the use, so that we can continue to have a harmonious community.

Therefore any rules that are put in place for short term rentals should also be applied for residents or should have a very clear explanation for why it is different

- Families want to enjoy vacationing in Lambton, not wanting to come and cause ruckus. However, the 8 person max capacity doesnt differentiate between adults and children and therefore limits families with multiple children from vacationing as an infant, child or teen will take up a one person spot much like an adult. Doesnt make any sense to even impose occupancy limits when from one person to a next, it will be different on how they behave. Doesnt it make more sense to essentially limit or ban those dont follow the rules rather than prevent a couple of families with young kids from vacationing together
- As a short-term rental property owner in Grand Bend and other STA properties throughout different municipalities, most of whom have recently introduced short-term bylaws, I expected Lambton Shores to implement STA-specific bylaws. Most of what you are proposing sounds reasonable, except for the following:

* Max occupancy limit of 8 guests. Based on your draft application guide, you're allowing a two-bedroom property to host six guests or a three-bedroom to host eight guests regardless of the size of the property or, more importantly, the size of the septic system. Yet a property like ours with five bedrooms and a septic system to support up to 12 guests would be restricted to 8 guests. Capacity limits should be based on the number of bedrooms, parking and the septic system. You should consider increasing the capacity limit to 12 if at least four children are in the group (or maybe 14 guests if there are at least six children), e.g. two adult guests + 1 child guest per bedroom with a maximum of 8 adults or 12 total guests. There are plenty of larger 4 or 5 bedroom properties in Lambton Shores that can comfortably accommodate two or three families totalling 10-14 guests. Infants (under 2 years old) should also be excluded from the count. Many families want to travel together not only to spend time with each other as a group but also to help with the cost of travelling, so three families with one or more children may not be able to vacation together under the proposed capacity limit. Over the years, we've had repeat groups with three and four generations of a family book our property, but they would no longer be able to get together under the new limits. Occupancy limits are essential, but you'll be surprised just how little of an effect they'll have on noise complaints, septic backups, illegal parking etc. Property owners, hosts, and property managers who are diligent and take a proactive approach to properly screening and managing their guests will have a more significant impact. The following is the "boilerplate" response we send to booking requests. Since updating it a few years ago, we noticed a huge improvement in quality guests. The idea of noise detection devices and exterior cameras monitoring traffic in/out of the property has helped us avoid the party groups.

Here is a copy of what we send to booking requests:

Thank you for your interest in our cottage. As a host, we aim to ensure that you and your guests have a comfortable stay and create lasting memories while visiting Grand Bend. But to do so, we kindly ask that you first:

1. Provide the full name, age and city of residence of each adult guest and the number of children and their age.
2. Reply in this message thread confirming that you've read and agree to the attached "House Rules/Rental Agreement." A few key points from our House Rules: We use the Ring video

doorbell and another exterior video camera to monitor traffic coming in and out of the property to confirm the number of guests. If the number of guests entering the property is higher than what was agreed, it will, unfortunately, result in you being asked to leave. No loud music. No parties. Noise must be kept on the quieter side after 10 pm. Unfortunately, if your group exceeds acceptable noise levels, we will ask you to leave. We use a noise detection device called NOISEAWARE to monitor noise levels inside and outside of the property and alert us when the noise exceeds acceptable noise levels for a prolonged period. These devices DO NOT record conversations; instead, it merely measure sound levels in decibels, so your privacy rights are protected. Our property is on a septic system, so it's essential, especially with larger groups, that you limit your use of water by spacing out short showers, not leaving the tap running and flushing only toilet paper down the toilets. Reservations must be made by an adult 30 years and older. The person reserving the property may be asked to provide identification to verify age and must be the person to check-in and remain a guest at the property during the reserved stay. We have a maximum limit of 8 adult guests or 12 guests total guests if at least 4 children are part of your group. These limits are non-negotiable. Please take the time to read the complete set of House Rules and let us know if you have any questions about the rules, property or the area.

*Your demerit point setup is essentially a two-strike and your out system. A combination of points from any two infractions would result in a 6-month suspension of license, which would be the death of any legitimate rental property that books their guests via any of the popular online platforms such as Airbnb VRBO, etc. The number of negative reviews a host would receive from being forced to cancel six months of bookings would severely impair their ability to rent again and force them to start accepting more questionable guests. I'm ok with issuing demerit points with the potential of revoking a license, but only if you have procedures in place to properly investigate all complaints to prevent disgruntled neighbours or competitors from filing false complaints. Some municipalities have implemented fines for false complaints to help encourage reporting only legitimate complaints. Grand Bend is growing and thriving, and the STA industry has played a big part in that growth. To sustain that growth, it would be best if you considered a more STA-friendly bylaw. Thank you for allowing us to provide our feedback and for taking the time to consider our suggestions

- I travel to Grand Bend every summer with my family of 10 and it's deeply concerning to read of the proposed changes to maximum occupancies in short term rentals of 8 people. The memories that my family makes every summer in Grand Bend are priceless and being in a short term rental allows us to be together and experience moments throughout the entire trip. With this proposal, we'll now be forced to be separated which defeats the purpose of being able to travel together. If Grand Bend wants to compete with other tourist regions and cottage rental locations in Ontario like Blue Mountain, Prince Edward County, Muskoka, Crystal Beach and N-O-T-L, then this rule should not be in place otherwise you will lose travellers like myself and others who want to come in medium sized to large groups! I definitely would not return to Lambton Shores should this rule be implemented
- Please consider the benefits to all the businesses, and that neighbors may put good short term rental out of business. For long time residents this is a big change, and understand the reluctance to change.

1. Secure Garbage. Are not the wheelie bins secure garbage and recycle, maybe for the garbage, short term rentals need the larger wheelie bins, as the garbage smaller ones are not that large.
 - 2.. point 2a)Occupancy Limit . Limit of 8 people/ thinking that is per cottage- some properties have more than one cottage. Large families, (more than 8 in the family and cousins, neices, nephews, grand parents want to travel together on holidays. Often these ae annual trips
 4. point 2 a) cont'd If there is more than one cottage on a property - would not the limit be higher, how are families able to go away together, wonderful way for them to connect for memories of a life time.
 5. point 2a) cont'd . If anything possibly an age restriction of 25 for groups of more than 8 people. Ie the person registering has to be over 25. Any time we have young groups, we turn them down, as we do not want a party.
 6. point 7. Time to respond. Many of these rentals are to help pay for the property so one may own a cottage, having a 30 minutes reaction time is not always feasible, 30 minutes is far to abrupt (people will always react in that time if they are able, however sometimes cell phones are out of range, or the battery dies, or people are at funeral, and the notifications will not come through. Thinking having 2 people to contact will be very helpful. Respectfully (Does one realize if we phone a government office, we are often on hold for more than 30 minutes - and sometimes disconnected before being put through) Why is this being treated more harsh then government concerns.
 7. Demerit Points. IF the neighbours do not want a short term rental in there area, all they have to do is complain, and unfortunately people do complain unnecessarily (in some areas, see this as a very real concern)
 - 8.Demerit Points - just trying to understand why are demerit points are so high, have to be almost perfect (demerit points see them being 1 or 2 max, based on the guidelines of the triggered consequences
 9. Demerit points far to high. 2 incidents of any kind and one is out of business
 10. Consequences . If the short term rentals even have to cancel one short term renter, for a week that is very negative, and harms the short term rental industry reputation- 6 months shut downs, each of those short term rentals will be out of business.
 11. Consequences Doesn't even allow for the opinion of changing to long term rentals, if short term rentals are not allowed
 12. Carbon Monoxide detectors, many cottages only have hydro, so possibly add for cottages with propane or gas Carbon Monoxide detectors are necessary.
 13. STB Inspections - The \$50 non refundable plus \$450.00 fee, thinking this includes the STR being inspected, line 8 doesn't make it sound that way.
 12. Number 11 - Liability- Is too broad, if the guests are at the short term rental itself understand, however if they are not at the short term rental then that is beyond the capacity to be responsible. The wording should indicate on the short term rental property only
- Good Morning I have read over the proposed Licensing program for the Lambton Shores Area. I have a number of concerns with the proposed program. Most of the people who own cottages in the area and use them as STR do not actually live in the area so it is unrealistic for them to be expected to be able to attend their respective properties within 30 minutes to deal with an issue. This is especially true when it is late at night and a call is received to deal with a noise complaint in relation to their guests. The OPP are a 24/7 organization that is available to deal

with such an issue in an appropriate manner whether it be by warning, or a charge under the noise bylaw. Many STR owners are going to find many of the proposed rules overly restrictive, such as inspections and providing site plan information. This will cause some of the STR owners to get out of the industry altogether. Finally many STR have already booked their guests for the summer prior to any of these proposed changes and I believe changing rules in the middle of the game is not fair. If these proposed changes are passed, then I believe that there should be a grace period to allow STR owners time to adjust for the way they will be forced to conduct their business moving forward. One way to do that is not to begin enforcement of the by-law until January 1, 2023. I sincerely hope that the concerns that I have brought forward are considered

- Wow a lot to be addressed on this form. For Septic - as seen that on the last point, that is simple, the septic would have to be pumped if full. Sewage do not know much about. Carbon Monoxide - places with hydro only won't require that - so should say places with gas. Noise - realize things may not be perfect, although think it is imperative that one understands that if neighbors prefer no short term rentals, they may be the concern, not the short term rental, how does that get handled? Kids like to play - the noise could possibly see after 11 pm, children should be able to play during they day. Demerit points - concerningly high - sorry kind of sounds totally unreasonable, think most people do their best, their are always exceptions, afraid the good people will be penalized to heavy for minor infractions. If a short term rental has to be cancelled, that is negative publicity as well as there are fees for cancelling rentals. 6 months the business is basically dead. Sorry sounds like a death sentence, not working with people. Capacity - do you know how many families have yearly get aways, memories for the extended families and families together. Liability - how are we able to be responsible for guests outside of the property, no one is able to agree to the way the liability is written on the form. Response Time - think hosts do their best, however 30 minutes is not that feasible (ie this is an addition for many people, and responsible people will always do their best) 2 contact people important, and large business and government, to get them to call back, or even finding a phone number with a live person is becoming a hassle, so think the strigent time frame is a concern. However know it is important for concerns to be addressed. Shut down time - really, meaning to be polite, but are we being real, 6 months - ie put people out of business, and are the concerns brought forward always legit. Maybe a staggered demerit system is better, ie noise 1 pt, 2 pt etc based on time of day???
- Licensing - if there are 2 cottages on a property - that may be nicer for family functions (have an age limit ie good screening, and the booking guest must be over 25) The idea is for extended families and large families to stay together, and still have space. Garbage - we have the 2 large wheelie bins, and keep them at the back area of the cottage, think that is more than secure, think the large wheelie bin maybe important as short term rentals may have a little more garbage. The part that is missing is all the benefits for the community, yes there are 2 sides to every story, but short term rentals really help local businesses. Thanks for your help
- Hello. I am a cottage owner in grand bend and currently using my cottage as a STR. Although I don't have a problem with the annual permit fees but there are a few other things that I would like give my feedback on.
 1. MAX OCCUPANCY NUMBER: many people rent cottages with extended family. For example my family stays at a cottage every year. Me my kids and husband, my aunt's and there husband's and there kids always stay together in at STR. And my 6 year old loves that we get to stay together for a whole week with her cousins and aunt's. Changing the max occupancy would

mean that we would have to tell one of our families they would have to stay behind even though the house has 6 bedrooms and can accommodate 12 people. I believe that if your home should be able to accommodate the number of people based on the number of bedrooms. NOISE COMPLAINTS: I don't think the owner should be receiving a infraction based on the STR renters. Tickets should be issued to the people/people making the noise. The owner could be contacted directly on the noise compalint and made aware of the situation. As for the renters age I will not rent my house out to someone under 25 that is just for my own comfort. And I will not be accepting return guest that cause problems. After the last 2 years local business have had I'm sure they could all use the business they can get and limiting grand bends ocpancy to a max 8 could make guests think twice about visiting grand bend. And local seasonal business don't need that. I hope city council comes up with a fair decision for everyone. And I hope that you keep in mind that not all STR are loud and messy. Unfortunately there are always those people/group ruin it for others. Thanks for taking the time to read this

- The demerit system is good but there needs to be a fine levied with each occurrence and the fines need to have an escalation aspect per property, per occuence. I think your application and licensing fees are too low. Your intent is to have the policing of the STR's pay for itself. I think you are underestimating the cost you will incur in policing them because there are so many in Southcott Pines alone
- Thanks for asking for our feedback. We have a cottage in Port Franks that we use most of the time and rental to family and friends at times. That being said it is cottage country and adding many restrictions change s seems a bit strong. In regards to the possible 2 complaint rule from a nieghbour...as a penalty of closing down for a 6 month period seems very excessive. Some run this as their business and I'm sure most of the owners are hands on at making things comfortable for all nieghbours surrounded by the cottage at question. If everyone kept a solid form of communicating with their neighbours there would be less issues. Or responding in a timely manner of any concern is more than acceptable. Sometime you can have a neighbour that is never going to pleased with a renter staying next to them or even a good neighbour that visits their own cottage regularly. This should be a more balanced approach! As for securing garage...Not every home/cottage has the means to set up a separate area to make sure the bins are secured. And with bears and the crazy wind we get the bins sometimes end up down the street even if they were secured. For the most part I have not witnessed many issues with the bins and have been in the area for 3 years. This seems like such a petty issue. Overall Port Franks Residents have been mindful of their home/property and it still feels like the friendly town that I remember from years ago. Thanks for reading my response and hope everyones input helps in making the right decision moving forward in keeping short term rentals staying
- 1. We don't believe the licensing fees are sufficiently high. Every owner in Southcott Pines pays to have this wonderful environment to live in, the people who wish to reap financial gain from all our efforts, should have to more than just pay to have the necessary municipal administration of their business "break even".
2. We don't believe the licensing fees are sufficiently high to ensure that licensees are motivated enough to ensure that their renters respect their neighbours. Is there going to be a standard contract for renters to sign where they agree to all the parking and capacity constraints? Posting the bylaws at the rental is fine and no doubt covers the legal aspect, but prevention is far better. Forcing renters to acknowledge their responsibilities prior to arrival might help.

3. We agree that the responsible contact requirement is a great idea. We doubt that texting renters during a party will have any effect, so noise bylaw enforcement will need to be robust and consistent.

4. We really don't like the idea of short term rentals in our neighbourhood, but it looks like we aren't going to have a choice. In Whistler, BC, we have seen what can happen when short term rentals invade a neighbourhood - it's not pretty. We urge you to make sure that all the proposed bylaws are strictly and consistently enforced otherwise our neighbourhoods will become party playgrounds.

5. The STRs should be taxed, just like any other business in the municipality. The hotel, motel, campground operators in Lambton Shores are competing with STRs for business and should not be burdened with competitors who don't pay business tax

- I see you have identified over 200 STR's yet many owners have not received this information about a licensing program and it is spreading by word of mouth. The information for the license needs to be communicated to the owners so that they can provide feedback in a timely manner. The biggest concern I have is the 30 min. time frame for a 'responsible' person to be on-site. As a widow of young kids, this is next to impossible since we live an hour away and I cannot drop everything at a moments notice. Do you propose I hire a maintenance company so they can be on call on my behalf? The second concern is the hotline number, I currently have a neighbour who is very difficult when I rent out my cottage 6-8 weeks of the entire year and is at the point of harassment. What I foresee happening is constant calls from them. I have never had more than 6 people at my 3 bedroom cottage, parking and garbage is not a problem for me. The third concern is this licensing fee, it is excessive
- Perhaps the licence fee should be lower for STR's that are located beyond a 1kilometre radius of Main street and Ontario Street. It seems that the rental prices are significantly higher in that area compared to properties that are not within close walking distance to the Main Street and main beach area. It would likely also be the case that the frequency of complaints comes from within that area. A common fee seems unfair and will end up being passed on to visitors. I realize that tracking rental rates is unwieldy but there must be data available to staff that shows where the majority of complaints arise. Staff could also do a survey of rental rates by scanning the internet. A maximum occupancy of eight seems unfair to larger homes that may have more than three legal bedrooms and are used by large families. Perhaps a different limit could be considered where the renters can demonstrate that they are related. For example, Two grandparents with two children and their spouses plus four grandchildren for ten people in total.
- We welcome a short term rental licensing system. Every neighbourhood in Grand Bend is affected by STR issues. We have concerns as to whether the By Law Officers are available 24/7? If an issue occurs in the middle of the night, are the ByLaw Officers sent to the premises if the issue can't be resolved or is it handed over to the police? How does the municipality ensure that all of the eligible STR 'S are licensed? What happens to a property that is not licensed and gets a complaint registered? If higher licensing and application fees were charged, we feel there would be funds to hire more By Law enforcement staff
- Municipality of Lambton Shores proposed STR Licensing Program will have very negative impact on the STR business in Grand Bend area. It will eliminate a lot of small business operations to a minimum capacity, and it will bring STRs business to downfall in longer time.

- There are good business practices that can be implemented, and we all will benefit from its proper approach and self monitoring. STR businesses that fail to do so will eliminate them self over the time since people will not rent if there are not safe or not proper accommodations. We did not expect this level of monitoring to be thrown on us by municipality and eventually to create such a negative impact on small business in Lambton Shores. I would expect more support and advise to us how to improve our operations and operate on more competitive way to bring more tourists and business to the Lambton Shores and Grand Bend in our case. I am completely against demerit points, they will be used against all STR operators in very easy manner, and we will never recover from it. If you close the STR it will not open again to face the same or even more severe obstacles next time. All this controlling and forcing to close STRs will impact in negative way the real estate and business in the area since there is lot of people buying it as investment for the beginning before later settled in the area. Plus, businesses are opening in the area because tourists are coming to enjoy Lambton Shores. I think it should be more to cities like Grand Bend to take up more control and enforcement of their area than Municipality of Lambton Shores. All these restrictions need more time to discuss end and this should not be implemented this year, all rentals are already booked and this will create a very big issue.

 1. Complicated and very restrictive rules with all demerit points will be hard to satisfy on our end. Severity of them will create a fear of loosing a business in a very short time.
 2. Loosing License at their beginning of season will send all renters back home, ruin their vacation and destroy my rental operations. How can we do that to family who is just so excited to come for vacation with kids and now go back home. This would be very devastating to everybody.
 3. This might force me to close my operations since I might lose my License very easily in a very short time and I can not take such risks and be responsible for families that their vacations were just ruined. The Grand Bend and Ipperwash areas are so attractive and bring so many tourists in the high season that we need to be extremely careful to interfere with current set up.
 4. We have our family coming during summer season and its more than 8 people and we know there is more similar situations in our area so we need to view this as well and not close my STR because of that-since the same rules will apply from the moment I apply for the License and for the duration of this. We rent only in summertime.
 5. If we start losing STRs in the area this will create a big deficit in your budget, will you raise the prices to thousands of dollars to keep it operating and employing personal for monitoring that program to what cost. This is not going to be cheap operation to ran and monitor. Covering the whole county. I would recommend to the councils to see for improvements of this type of operations and help struggling small business in Ontario rather than to look for ways to bring more hassles and obstacles.
 6. Demerit points just do not make sense to me since, there is simpler way to contact owners, have a discussion, give us some personal advice, warnings and see how to improve the operating business and not close it. This will benefit both parties in my opinion. Some STRs might not be aware how to operate properly, not to punish them right from the get-go rather help them to improve the business.
 7. In one of requirements you asking to have someone be available in 30 min or we loose demerit points- this will require have at least few people in hand and be available at any

moment, this is summertime and the costs and logistics involved with that are in my opinion not feasible. We provide you with phone numbers and contact information, and We will deal with our bad tenants to resolve the problem.

8. I would think that we all have Liability Insurance policy to protect our investment and to cover any liability issues. I am surprised that this comes a municipality issue.

9. At this moment 2 or 3 or families can enjoy the area all together since they still can afford that type of vacation, hotels or motels do not provide this opportunity. This is one of the reasons why STRs are so much in demand. We need to make sure to maintain this type of tourism in our area. We are attracting tourist because we offer good service, good pricing, and very good accommodations for the money.

10. Every municipality like Grand Bend or Southcott's Pines Community have its own regulations regarding, excessive noise, open fire, building codes and permits requirements, we had to have all this approved by the cities already. Do we need double or triple checking all this? Do we control regular inhabitants the same way in the area and watching them all the time?

11. Septic systems are cleaned the same way as all other permanent inhabitants in the area, we have to do this to make sure that our tenants do not have any issues, and this operates on higher level for only 2 months, after that is being used at minimum level for the rest of the year. Local people in the area have visitors and families coming and nobody complains about louder music, or they have parties, or their septic's fail occasionally, its common expectation thing in summertime. We have City complains Office and OPP as well to handle these situations. I would expect that most of us pay very close attention to that, we love the area and looking forward to protecting it as much and we can.

There was study done for Southcott's Area few years back and the septic impact was just fine and still safe. City of Grand Bend has city sewer systems so how this can be such a big problem. It's a seasonal affect only and there is enough time after to clear any complications. In conclusion as an STR operator I do not see too many real benefits for us to have all these rules and controls over our operation. In fact, it will be very stressful to comply with all these regulations to follow and being afraid with possibilities of loosing business, possibly in one day. This will bring our costs up and this will be transferred to tenants, this might send them somewhere else in different locations up north which offer similar attractiveness and have no such restrictions and be more flexibility with the rentals. As I pointed out at the beginning, I think it should be more to particular cities like Grand Bend for example to take up more control and enforcement of their area since they will know more of local issues and benefits than Municipality of Lambton Shores.

- thank you for your concern for the short term rent. Please consider the following. Many benefits for businesses and community development. Rollie bins - they are very secure - think the larger bins are honestly better sometimes more garbage from short term renters. Keep behind cottages, they are securely out of site as well. Capacity - per cottage - 8 - many families and extended families have more (lets keep the family together). Liability - the note should say limited to our property - owners are not able to sign a unlimited liability for the country. Hosts will get back to you as quick as possible, however cells do not work everywhere, batteries may die, so the 30 minute limit - that is not very practical (possibly hosts should gain points if they are able to respond within 1/2.

- I am a co-owner with family, third generation, of a cottage in Grand Bend. We have been renting out our place during part of the summer to returning families with no problems occurring. If rentals are going to be limited to 8 people, family members will end up being left behind. Which more than likely, will stop these reliable families from coming. We have 5 bedrooms that accommodate more than 8 people comfortably. The place is kept up on repairs and whatever else is needed. As far as noise goes, the times my family and I have stayed in our cottage, there has not been out of control noise. If there are any incidences, the by-law people handle it very well. It is very disturbing of the changes that are being made in this quaint little town. The ambiance the town has had for many many years is disappearing. This proposed licensing program is only adding on more disruption. Please do not let this happen!
- - The license fee is completely unacceptable and nothing short of a cash grab. It is more than 8x the fee than for the City of Toronto.
 - 8 person max is also short-sighted, what happens to homes that have sleeping accommodations for more than 8?
 This program is not required and the proposal has not been thought out well. It should be cancelled. I will not back this proposal.
- I will start by suggesting that a license of STR is unnecessary as current by laws adequately ensure our community lives in harmony. Having said this I do understand that there is a greater issue in an area such as Grand Bend. This being the case perhaps the issue needs to be focused to that local area and perhaps start with this area as a pilot license program before rolling it out to a larger area with little to no issues. Below are my feedback based on the 10 points on listed on the website.
 - 1) Definition should not be Short Term Rental but rather Short Term accommodations. The majority of owners in our community allow large groups of family and friends that greatly exceeds the 8 person maximum cited in this proposal creating disturbances such as noise and parking. As such the definition should not be limited to rental or lodging agreements. The rules being applied must be applied to all both owners hosting as guest as well as operators under short term rental agreements.
 - 2) Licensing fee is ridiculously high at \$500 per year (\$450 +\$50). Suggestion that this be a 5 year license fee and the price dropped to \$250. This is similar to a drivers license term and considering that a demerit point system is being suggested by the Municipality this falls within a similar frameworks. As per suggested definition in 1 all persons offering short term accommodation of any sort must apply if we are going to foster a fair and inclusive community.
 - 3) Demerit point system similar to driver license are gear to individual behavior of the individual and not related to association. As such if such a demerit point system policy is to be invoked it should be limited only to those activities that the license holder can control. In short an individual can only control his own behavior and can not be responsible for the actions of others. As such the following items should be handled through direct fines to those in direct violations of the offence and not to the owner. This is similar to loaning a car to an individual or a car rental company renting a car, the owner of the car is not responsible if the user speeds, drives through a stop sign etc. The following items should be removed from the draft proposal:
 5. Fireworks By-Law 16-2008 Conviction related to Premises.
 6. Noise By-Law 30-2002 Conviction related to Premises
 7. Open-Air Burning By-Law 60-2009 Conviction related to Premises
 10. Used or permitting Premises to be used contrary to the Parking Site Plan

- 4) Third Party Monitoring is a slippery slope. If this party only monitors addresses on file how can they apply a demerit point that identifies items such as 9. Operating without a License. If a third party is needed to assist in By-Law Enforcement it should not be limited to address on file.
- 5) Responsible Person: The suggestion that any individual must be able resolve any reported issue within 30 minutes is beyond what the typical response time of many Emergency Response Services can do. Suggest that this move to 90 minutes. This will allow enough time to return the call to the Third Party Monitoring Service to clearly understand the issue, attempt to contact the guest directly and if necessary drive to the location to handle directly.
- 6) Occupancy limits should be applied to all residences. Children under 2 year old should be exempted. Considering this is a limit geared to sleeping accommodations violations should be applied between 11pm to 6am. Maximum occupancy of 8 should not include children under 2 years old and if "legal bedroom" accommodations allows for greater than 8 it should be allowed.
- 7) Parking Requirement. No issues
- 8) Proof of Liability Insurance . No Issue
- 9) Fire Plan. No Issues
- 10) Garbage/ Recycle. Our area has Municipality approved and labeled garbage and recycle bins on wheels that are rolled to the front curb every Sunday night for Monday Morning pick up. Uncertain what extra would be required.

- I feel this is an infringement on my constitutional rights. I've worked hard all my life to save go without and invest to continue my life style I do short term rentals it is my inconvenience no else's what I do with my own home. I pay taxes I follow the law. How dare you try to dictate to me what I'm allowed to do with my property. How dare you earn money from my hard work and motivation because your to lazy to make money for yourself, you just want to take it from those of us who have insight. I make sure my guest follow all the rules and it's my home so I'm very fussy on who I allow in. I am totally against all your recommendations
- I think it's a great idea to have a licensing program in Lambton Shores. We live in Port Franks where there are a lot of STR's. We are fortunate to live in an area where there is actually just one STR that we are aware of. I think there should be occupancy limits. Some people are irresponsible renters and they figure they are on vacation and can do what they please and have as many people as they want. They can be very noisy and disruptive and this isn't fair to the full time, tax paying residents. I think this program would provide accountability to the owner who is renting out their property and is often never there as they get a service to clean between renters. Garbage disposal would be a great concern with our garbage day well past the day when renters usually finish their rental period. I think it's important that the mechanism to deal with complaints is timely and efficient
- I want to write to oppose this STR licensing "tax" and "punitive only" approach to rental solutions. My concerns/questions:
 - 1) can you please share the ACTUAL statistics the provide evidence that there is a real need for a STR program. I've read all of the reports on the municipality website and they seem to all be based on "opinion" not fact. One's opinion completely depends on their own perception of the positive or negative aspects of STR. Actual statistical evidence would include:
 - how many by-law complaints, violations, fines, safety issues relating to parking, noise, garbage, occupancy, etc have been reported annually for each of the past 5 years? Are they increasing? At what rate?

- how many of these complaints, violations, fines, safety issues arise from rental versus non-rental properties? I.e Is your tax on STR cottages a fair one based on where the issues actually stem from? I have personally witnessed loud parties and street parking coming from owners', not renters', behaviour - but I saw no such question in the public consultation

- how many complaints have been received by renters who feel unsafe in their rental properties? How many fires, accidents have been reported due to unsafe rentals?

- How many community members have complained about feeling "unsafe" by STR? How many of those complaints led to charges? Fines?

- What percent of the 250 or so rental properties have had serious issues with/fines levied for renters' behaviour? Are you taxing everyone for the issues with a very small percentage of "party" destinations? Is this fair? Can you please share the supporting evidence that indicates that there is an actual issue, not a perceived issue, that needs to be addressed?

2) Re: the public consultation report. I want to again reiterate my thoughts when I personally answered the survey - 90% of the questions were dedicated to the negative aspects of STR. It seemed to me that you had already decided that you were going to implement a STR license program prior to actually involving the community. I would like to request a revised public consultation without the obvious bias.

3) the program seems 100% punitive to the property owner. It does nothing to establish a collaborative working relationship between the county and cottage owners who bring affordable rental solutions (and as a result, significant spending to local businesses) to the area. It is all about all extra taxes, dermit points, fines, and taking away ability to rent. Why have you taken a "punitive only" approach to this valuable service to the community?

4) the application process is onerous and could be very expensive for cottage owners. What inspections might be imposed?

5) what is a by-law Infography? I assume the municipality will be providing a concise, easy to understand document outlining ALL by-laws that might be relevant to renters at any time during their stay. It will become imperative that renters know EXACTLY what they must and must not do from a municipality perspective with every possible potential complaint that could be levied against them - but it must be concise too so renters read and understand it

6) 30 minutes to receive a complaint and resolve it seems unreasonably short

7) please confirm that you will be charging the people causing any issues directly, not the property owner. It should be very easy for by-law officers to ask renters for ID in order to levy the appropriate fine to the appropriate person responsible for the misconduct. Levying fines to property owners themselves would be unfair.

8) this extra tax will be passed on to cottage renters. In this era of unprecedented inflation, historical level gas prices and rising interest rates, as well as 2 years of Covid shutdowns, I would think that Lambton Shores would be focusing on getting people back to the community in an affordable and positive way. The STR tax to property owners, that will be passed on to renters, is in contrast to that goal.

9) will there be public consultation prior to issuing the final demerit point specifics. Right now the numbering system makes it FAR TOO EASY to get 7 demerit and lose one's license. This could result from one bad renter despite several years with no issues. This does not see, fair.

10) can you please clarify what this means: "Demerit points are assigned to the licence, which will be unique to each individual STR".

11) if the property owner is going through a reputable rental agency who is responsible for screening the renters, dealing with renters as needed, and collecting the funds from renters, will these agencies be the one who need the licence, are levied the fines, and lose their ability to continue to rent? How does your licensing tax account for this arrangement? And again, why would taxing the property owner and not the rental agency be fair in this scenario?

12) is there going to be a "grandfather" clause for property owners with a track record of fine free renting for several years? This would be a fairer solution rather than a broad tax to all

13) there seems to be too much opportunity for "false" complaints, and an arduous task to reconcile this potential issue

14) 2022 summer rentals agreements are already complete. Any implementation of a STR licence and tax should not take place until in the fall at the earliest. You risk cottage owners saying no to this unnecessary task and a massive disruption to renters for plans that have easily been in place for a year now.

- I have little concern with the STR proposal and understand the initiative and strategy. I do suspect there may be an issue in the Grand Bend downtown care (off Main Street) as I understand parking, garbage/recycling, and renter party size may exceed capacities. The one issue I have is that I own a place in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] which has ample parking, no issue with parking or garbage/recycling, and we have 6 bedrooms with 7 beds in total, so can safely manage a 14 person occupancy. My only concern and pushback would be with the occupancy 8 person limit, as this will only punish those who have the larger size and occupancy capacity. If a 2-person per legal bedroom or bed limit is set, that will still solve any issues of those smaller homes that allow a larger party than they can safely handle. I would be in favour in a revised occupancy limit restriction, removing the 8 person limit and revising to a 2-person per legal bedroom or bed limit
- 1. How are good hosts being rewarded? Lower fees?
2. Initial license fee seems very high.
3. HOW COULD THIS POSSIBLY HAPPEN FOR THE 2022 season? Disappointing families/guests is NOT GOOD FOR TOURISM/BUSINESS. 2022 is already booked up. What if the cottage doesn't pass inspection? With no time for the homeowner to make adjustments, many families could have their holidays cancelled?!
- 4. Has this been thought through properly? Take the time to get it right. MANY FAMILIES WILL BE AFFECTED. ON BOTH SIDES.
5. Do hotels need to pay this fee when they are advertising on Airbnb or similar platforms? If not, why not?
Grand Bend needs STRs. Period. We need common sense solutions not this RED TAPE
- In my opinion, the existing bylaws are sufficient to regulate cottage country as they always have been. Respecting the existing bylaws and addressing concerns between neighbours when issues arise is the best approach. Over regulation can act as an economic disincentive to tourism, it creates additional red-tape administration for home owners looking to offer STRs and fosters a tattle-tale culture that pits neighbours against each other. I believe that if people were informed and brought up-to-speed on the comprehensive nature of the existing bylaws most would agree that more rules and regulations are unnecessary and would be a disservice to the community of Grand Bend.

In your FAQs, you cite these concerns as challenges of STRs,

Noise and Nuisance

Parking issues

Environmental (such as exceeding capacity of approved sewage/septic)

Safety (such as building code and fire code concerns)

Garbage

Does the introduction of your proposed STR licensing program solve the issues that you are trying to mitigate against? It should be pointed out that these concerns are not unique to STRs. These challenges are a by-product of a growing downtown core and expanding community. Lambton Shores and Grand Bend has experienced a rapid stage of growth over the past 5-years and remains a popular tourist destination. We have more homes being built that act as secondary homes. We have multiple dwelling locations that include expanding retail space going into our downtown core. Covid-19 restrictions and the limitations on international travel have increased visitation to our local Ontario beaches. It should be considered both prudent and expected that utilities, garbage collection, and other supporting civil services are expanded in reaction to support this growth. I would encourage the council to consider these concerns before making any decisions on this particular matter and to vote against licensing of STRs. The program in my view does not serve the greater good of the community, creates wasteful administration, and ultimately does not address the concerns noted. I appreciate your consideration

- It is unfortunate that Lambton Shores feels a STR license is needed to control private properties.

Fees should be tiered according to:

1. the type of structure (seasonal cottage, year round cottage or home, size, assessed value.)
2. the number of weeks it is rented during the year (rented 4 weeks a year should not pay the same as a place rented many more weeks a year)
3. length or rental times (daily, weekly, monthly). A place with more frequent turnover involves many more people in and out with less stability.

Capacity:

1. should be limited by the number of legal bedrooms with beds + 2 people. (Ex: If a structure has 5 bedrooms with beds to sleep 10 or 12, it should not be limited to only 8 persons.)

Responsible Person:

1. Requiring the "responsible person" to contact the renter within 30 minutes of notification is brief. An hour would be more reasonable.
2. What if the "responsible person" attempts to contact the renter but is unsuccessful, such as the renter does not pick up the phone, what then?

I hope the STR board will seriously take into consideration the above point of concern

- The annual fee is 10x more expensive than it is in London. Here is the cost structure in London

Fees

Initial application - \$165

Fire inspection - \$171

Annual renewal - \$55

Why can't the costs be structured the same way? I don't see what you are getting each year for \$500.

- I would like to commend the job the consulting firm along with stakeholders and the municipality has done to address the concerns of short term rentals. The process outlined on

the website is both comprehensive and thorough. It addresses concerns of safety, visitor conduct, noise, fire and environmental issues. I am pleased with the recommendations and sincerely hope they are passed and implemented for this high season. The only other piece of the process is the ability to amend the by-law as required for any concerns not addressed or unforeseen situations that may arise in the future. Job well done!

- I am impressed with your proposed licensing program. You have addressed all of the concerns I put forth in the feedback that I offered. If this proposed licensing program goes through as presented in the draft documents, I will be very happy. Thank you for your hard work to balance tourism with the rights of permanent residents. It is very much appreciated
- Thank you. I would like to see all of the contents of the STR program implemented as you have outlined. You have put a great deal of thought and work here to which will benefit Owners, Tenants and their Neighbours. I am a 20+ year full time resident in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED]. About 2 to 3 years ago, 'absentee' Toronto area owners purchased a (then) \$650,000. residential adjacent property to be a weekend Airbnb rental property exclusively. I expected some 'growing pains' and have had several 'issues' resolved. Implementation of this STR program would have, and will help define responsibilities for everyone involved, including me. I travel and often use Airbnb. I have no objections to the concept of responsible folks renting and enjoying their holidays in a residential area as long as they are respectful of their neighbours.
- I am a Port Franks' resident. Your proposal lumps all areas of Lampton Shores in one bag and also lumps all STRs in one bag. That is definitely the easiest way to do things but in my opinion not all situations should be treated in the same manner. I understand that folks want to make money by renting out their properties. But because people can use platforms like Air BandB now we have more (and there will be even more) properties that have become unsupervised motel type situations. I understand that people have rented to family and friends over the years, many without issue. But Air BandB now makes it possible to rent to whomever. Guests may be respectful but there will be many who are not. Air BandBs advertise for example 8 guests, where potentially the oldest guest can be 25 and each other individual guest can be at least 18. If you were of this age where would you rather be in a Bed and Breakfast supervised by responsible adults or a home where you can use a smart lock and enjoy a few days or a week of unsupervised whatever. Motels, hotels and Bed and Breakfast establishments are expected to run their businesses by the letter of the law. And these establishments have someone on site or very close to on site at all times while entertaining their guests. These establishments are a responsible way of running a commercial business. I can only guess that by-law officers rarely need to visit such establishments. That is definitely not the case with an unsupervised Air BandB type location. With what I believe are existing trends (average age of residents in Port Franks is older and investors rather than potential home owners purchasing properties) there is only one way that we are heading... 100% STRs. There are already pockets of Air BandBs in Port Franks. They will spread. The "R" designation for Port Franks will soon be obsolete. There are numerous scenarios to the unsupervised Air BandB type establishment....most are not good. The few complainant home owners that remain may need to be ready to complain at any hour of the day..24/7. Even with a cap at 8 guests per legal dwelling in this complaint driven format, the complainant may be held hostage at all hours of the day and really doesn't know if a complaint is legitimate or frivolous in nature. Only very specific by-laws that are not subjective can solve

this dilemma. Unless you live next to an unsupervised Air BandB you will find it difficult to empathize. These are only examples, some may be far fetched scenarios, but anything can happen.

1. Noise day and night
2. Hot tubs, adds to the noise, dangerous when not properly supervised
3. Dogs are allowed...how many???
4. Parking..where?
5. Security/Safety....dealing with the unknown every day

In my opinion, it is not possible to keep up with the number of potential complaints. Will more staff be hired that will enforce these by-laws all year round and 24/7? Bottom line, if someone wants to make money from their property they should be present. It is the only safe and responsible way. There are those that are able to manage this. It should be treated like any other commercial endeavour. Be there and make money. I do not believe it is too late to consider the 'owner present' model. Property owners need to be responsible. Many municipalities favour this and these areas are still thriving.

- No matter what the licensing programme is, there will be owners who will rent anyway. As with a lot of municipal decisions, the long term residents are being ignored again. In the old Village of Grand Bend the lot sizes are small and it is very hard on residents to have new neighbours every three or four days. (My personal experience). Also, renters are on vacation and "I've paid for my vacation, so I'll do as I please" There will never be enough staff to enforce any of your proposals. Definitely need a hotline for those of us permanent residents who will be constantly using it. Good luck.
- We have a cottage with 6 bedrooms in Lambton Shores. The property has been operated as short term rental even before we bought it 6 years ago. We use the property ourselves from time to time and also rent it out thru Airbnb. We welcome the idea of short term rental licensing program. After reading thru the website and associated material, the following are some of our concerns:
 1. The max capacity is limited to 8. We have a 6 bedroom house with 3 bathroom. Some of bedrooms are bigger. They have 2 queen size beds. The normal sleeping capacity for our property is 16-18. That is one of the main reasons for people to rent our property for family gathering. To limit our capacity to only 8 people, it does not make sense. We also have lots of parking space on our property. The max capacity should be set based on number of bedrooms / property size.
 2. We understand that demerit point system is there to make sure the short term rental operator being responsible. We agree with that principle. However, some of items outlined may be out of the control of the operator. For example, noise, occupancy and parking. As an operator, we will inform the renter of the requirement and regulations. When the renter violate the regulations, the operator is more a victim than a violator. We can tell the renter not to make noise. At the end of day, they are the one decide to make noise or not. Fortunately, in the last several years of our operation, there are only 1-2 cases of noise issue. To penalize the operator for the behavior of renter, it may not be fair. Operator is certainly responsible to deal with the situation. Violating renters should be ticketed by the city. We have good neighbor who keep us informed with the situations around our property,. We also try our best to select our renter so that they respect the property and the neighborhood.

- One thing that wasn't specifically addressed in the documents was the use of tents and rv's on rental properties. This may be incidentally covered under the amount of vehicles or renters, but I believe that recreational vehicles should be mentioned. The people in the tents and rvs use the septic system when visiting renters of a rental property. Maybe specify that they are counted in the maximum number of 8 people or the maximum number of vehicles on the property.
- Thank you for soliciting resident and homeowner input on the matter of short-term rentals in Lambton Shores. We have a vacation property in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED], Grand Bend which we do not rent out in any manner and don't plan to. Our primary residence is in Toronto and we have experienced the results of unregulated short-term rentals as well as under-enforced short term rentals after by-laws were put in place. We believe that allowing property owners to utilize their homes as businesses, in areas that were never zoned for it is a mistake and that the negative impact is felt most by the neighbours who gain nothing from this new commercial activity. In areas of Toronto where short-term rentals became common, tour buses full of people attending concerts, weddings, parties, and sporting events etc. took over entire streets for a few noisy days and nights with the garbage often left to neighbours and city-workers to clean up. By-laws implemented in the past few years have reduced the impact somewhat, and the lack of travel due to COVID-19 has also been a factor but it is estimated that less than 30% of Toronto short term rentals have registered with the city. If it is decided to allow short-term rentals in Lambton Shores, we hope that you will consider some of the following measures to mitigate the impact. I understand that some of these have been included in your proposed by-laws and we thank you for that.
 - Only allow licensed short-term rental platforms (airbnb, vrbo, expedia etc.) to operate so that they can help to hold renters and tenants accountable instead of relying on municipal enforcement.
 - Only allow short-term rentals by the full-time tenant and primary resident of the home. This avoids people and businesses purchasing multiple properties to use primarily for short-term rentals which has happened in many jurisdictions (these are sometimes known as "Ghost Hotels" since the owner is never seen and there is no primary resident).
 - As part of the licensing process, the owner should provide contact information to neighbouring properties so that complaints about noise, parking, trespassing and other disruptive behaviour can be reported directly. Owners should be required to reply to complaints within 30 minutes, 24 hours per day so that they can share the impact of unruly tenants.
 - Require a maximum number of nights per year to ensure that the homes are not being used as full-time hotels (ex. 60 nights per year).
 Thank you again for seeking input on this matter and we hope that you will take our views in to account.
- I like the demerit point system but I think it is too generous. I don't think it has any teeth since they are only applied when a conviction or fine is imposed....not just a complaint....and they can have seven of them! Oh my! 1 or 2 a year seems like lots of chances to improve their quality of tenants/renters. I also like that this proposal makes it easier for neighbours to make a complaint. My husband walking over to complain at a noisy party in progress does not seem safe and makes me very uncomfortable. I'm not in favour of STR at all, so this new proposal is a good start at a compromise

- I support the proposed licencing program for STR, with a few concerns. Max Occupancy: 4 or 5 bedroom homes can support larger groups. When applying, the number of bedrooms and maximum occupancy should be considered, rather than a cap on number of occupants. Will the revenue from the program be used to employ more By Law Officers? Common sense of renters may be a concern for the owner. Fines for the owners, due to poor choices by renters, may be a difficult situation to monitor
- Based on the costs of the program I feel this is a money grab. Bylaws and enforcement are already paid for through our taxes. I believe that this is the municipalities way of making money off of others. If there is a fee associated it should only be a one time application fee per person, not per property and not per year. You havent justified the cost per year with a scalable proposal. This licencing program leaves cottages owners at risk of neighbours who dont like short term rentals in general and just complain to have them penalized. This programing could make short term rentals not happen or worse go under ground. Our community will be greatly impacted negatively if we dont have the short term rentals here to accommodate the tourism. The responsible person clause isnt clear. I live in town and it could be hard to get anywhere wtihin 30 minutes depending on what im doing. I can be available via phone but to respond within 30 minutes isnt even reasonable. What is this person supposed to do that law enforcement cant deal with on their own if the situation is that serious. So to deal with noise complaints why would the short term rental be a different process then any other property? The occupancy limits are not even reasonable. Most private families are bigger then 8 people and when people are vacationing, just 2 families makes up more then 8. If the property is big enough to sleep more then that then each cottage should be individually allowed occupancy limits that represent the size of cottage. Expecting people to have secured store for garbage doesnt even make sense. Why do private property owners not require this but rentals do? This licensing is not reasonable or fair to the STR operators and needs to be re-visited
- This is a tax grab .we already have existing bylaws that are not enforced we pay more in property tax than toronto and the have more services than we have .we have no arena or rec center or indoor swimming pool ect .How much tax \$ have you wasted on this dumb study .we are a seasonal tourist town and the locals only have june,july,august and september to make money for the whole year .we pay more for grocery's ect and now you are trying to steal more of peoples hard earned \$\$\$ i dont agree with this tax grab .You let them build ugly condo in grand bend with no parking but str are requires to have 2 parking spots is totally ridiculous
- The community survey indicated that STR do provide a valuable service to the community - to both renters and the local economy. The initial proposal put forth by the municipality did NOT provide any statistic evidence to support a need for a licensing program in the first place. There may be an "opinion," based on several biases in the community survey, that such a program may be necessary, but no facts based on actual by-law conviction history were provided. In light of these 2 things, I urge you to reconsider the need for this program. However, if such a program were to be implemented, there needs to be benefits and protections by the municipality for the STR property owners for the fee paid, particularly those who are currently renting issue-free. I do not see any protections or benefits in the costly, punish the owners, based approach that is proposed. Can you please provide details re: what benefits and/or protections STR property owners will get from the proposed license program. For example:

- will the municipality offer STR property owners credits for each issue-free rental they provide. These could be used to potentially offset the demerit points, where one bad renter in a 2 year window could result in the lose of a license?
- will the municipality provide a refund for STR property owners who have not had any issues in a given year?
- will the municipality provide a refund if revenue collected by a licensing tax exceed the actual costs of implementing the program?
- will the municipality pay expenses incurred by the STR property owner related to unwarranted complaints, i.e. the cost to have the “responsible person” deal with an unwarranted situation? If the municipality institutes and advertises a complaint hotline, they almost certainly guarantee that the number of complaints will rise, warranted or not. How does the municipality plan to protect/compensate the STR property owner against the extra time and costs required to deal with complaints that are unwarranted?
- will the municipality provide STR property owners with a watchout list of renters who have been charged with by-law infractions so they can ensure they don’t rent to these individuals in future?
- What protections against problem renters does the municipality provide STR property owners? If adult renters have signed rental agreements indicating they understand and will comply by rules and relevant by-laws, will the municipality charge these renters directly for any violations to those rules?
- will the onus and the the legal responsibility be on the municipality, rather than the property owner, to ensure that all STR properties are compliant at the time the license is issued? How will this happen?
- if a property owner who bought their home and successfully used STR without issues to help pay for home ownership expenses prior to the implementation of this program, and who may now be forced to sell their home due to lose of STR license (easily occurring in the event of just 1 bad renter in 2 years) will the municipality help pay their selling and moving expenses?
- will there be a grandfather clause for STR property owners who have not had any fines or convictions against renters in their properties in the past 2 years?

If you are going to ask existing STR property owners, who provide a valuable service to the community, to incur significant incremental costs, as well as jump through hoops to get a license only to have one bad apple cause them to potentially lose it, they need to get some benefit in return from the municipality? I strongly urge you to reconsider this unnecessary (based on the factual evidence provide) program.

- Thank you for giving us an opportunity to respond to the STR licensing proposal. We would hope you are aware that people in general are more critical of other peoples behaviour than their own. Given the opportunity to stand in judgement some residents who may be biased about STR hosts will take advantage and unfairly alter the STR host’s reputation. How will the level playing field be maintained? The licensing fee looks like it would be the same for part-time STR hosts and full time STR hosts. Perhaps a percentage scale could be considered. If a hosts rents out 100 percent of the summer has quite a different rental income compared to a host who rents out only 50 percent of the summer. The proposed licensing fee and the penalties attached to them appear to be steep. Will the municipality be using the fact that STR’s are licensed as a benefit to

bring in tourism? Will my privacy be protected? To enhance the licensing proposal an association of STR hosts could be established to help guide them through this transition

- 1. What is the municipality doing about homeowners who host family and friends that exceed the 8 person rule? This is a common occurrence and creates the same issues cited in the draft licensing program material. This licensing program is an unfair application, based solely on the premise of a financial transaction, and is not applied equally to all property owners. Property taxes are paid by both resident homeowners and operators with the only distinction being that the operators do not have the right to vote members of Council. The lack of a vote doesn't justify a discriminatory practice and system of monitoring occupancy. Occupancy standards are governed by the Ontario Building Code. Noise and parking complaints are already dealt with by the By-Law Enforcement Officer and/or the Police. Taxes already pay for these resources.
- 2. Licensing fee is exorbitant at \$500/year. What is the operator getting for this fee? Resident homeowners having longer-term rental properties are not licensed and/or required to pay a yearly fee. They generate a number of complaints and pay property taxes and insurance, the same as short-term occupancy operators. Based on your definition of occupancy limits, all residents providing accommodations for family and friends, even free of charge, should be registering and paying the licensing fee, otherwise this is a discriminatory practice. Property taxes already pay for municipal enforcement of by-laws and this licensing fee appears to be a money grab.
- 3. Demerit point system proposed does not make sense. Why is the property owner responsible for the behaviours of other people? If penalties and/or fines are to be issued, it is reasonable for these to be issued directly to the offending persons. In Ontario, demerit points for drivers are issued directly to the offenders by way of a ticket and fines. It is unreasonable to penalize and hold accountable property owners for the behaviours of renters. The following should be removed as again, property owner cannot be held accountable for the behaviours of others.
Fireworks By-Law 16-2008 Conviction related to Premises
Noise By-Law 30-2002 Conviction related to Premises (Isn't construction permitted as of 7am and if so, why is the zero tolerance until 8am?)
Open-Air Burning By-Law 60-2009 Conviction related to Premises
Used or permitting Premises to be used contrary to the Parking Site Plan
- 4. Third Party Monitoring: What is the criteria and process for 3rd party selection? What kind of personal information can this 3rd party access? What authority do they have to issue demerit points? What assurance does property owner have that a return call to 3rd party will be answered right away, given tight timeline?
- 5. Responsible Person: Unreasonable 30-minute resolution timeframe. A more reasonable 90 minute-timeframe allows for issue communication, owner to contact renter and in-person by owner, if required.
- 6. Occupancy limits are governed by the Ontario Building Code. If there are sufficient bedrooms to allow more than 8, this should be permitted. Children under 2 should be exempted from occupancy calculation.
- 7. Parking Requirement - No issues
- 8. Proof of Liability Insurance - No Issues
- 9. Fire Plan - No Issues

10. Garbage/ Recycle. There is no extra cost or resourcing issues. Municipally-approved rolling bins for garbage and recycling on-site and clearly labelled with requirement for renters to put to the curb Sunday for Monday pick-up

- I'm concerned about the impact this licensing program will have on small businesses in Grand Bend. It seems overly restrictive in terms of limiting the number of renters to 8 no matter the size of the STR property. I think because of this a lot of renters will decide to rent in Bluewater county instead where there are no restrictions on STRs and therefore taking customers away from Grand Bend
- STR owners should not be taking the brunt of the responsibility for individuals behaviours. Although STR owners should do their due diligence, they are not in control of free will ... individuals will choose to make certain choices and should be penalized accordingly. With this licensing, you would be unfairly and unjustly penalizing the owner more than the individual who is doing the behaviour
- Hi there, I own a cottage in Lambton Shores and am very concerned about the proposed licensing program for short-term rentals. There has been little to no communication about this and the process. I did not even find out about this until this week and many others do not even know anything about this proposal. Many families utilize short-term rentals to supplement the high property taxes we have (with little to no beneficial infrastructure to suggest such costly taxes). We pay for roads, schools, health care, etc with little to no use of them given that cottages are seasonal in nature. Many families have passed these cottages down from generation to generation but must pay fair market value for the transfer of ownership. Consequently, many cottage owners who have kept the cottages in their family for generations must use these short-term rental funds to keep their quaint cottages. With this new licensing program, most opportunities for families to keep their cottages from generation to generation will be impossible. These cottages are also needed to support business owners given that the area increases from 2000 to 50,000 over the warmer months. We provide lodging for visitors and this will result in vacationers having no place to stay. The rules and regulations are outrageous (e.g., resolve an issue within 30 minutes) and lose their license for 6 months with just one complaint! This results in financial hardship and litigious consequences. Short term rentals employ booking agents, real estate agents, gardeners, cleaners, plumbers, electricians, painters, etc. STR also support grocery stores, restaurants, shops, etc. It is very apparent that the Lambton Shores council's draconian proposal is essentially an attempt to ban all short-term rentals, detrimentally impacting families, businesses and the community.
- As a home owner in the village of Grand Bend I have reviewed this program and find it to be fair and reasonable for everyone. I fully support the implementation of this program at the earliest opportunity
- We have reviewed all of the proposed licensing program. Here are our comments: We appreciate very much and also fully support what Lambton Shores is trying to do in regards to the STR situation. Having a large six bedroom rental property next door has been very challenging for us in the last 20 years. Licensing Process and Application Fees: Inspections should occur before licenses are issued. STR Compliance Committee: Local residents should be part of the committee. Fire Safety Plan: Before licenses are issued inspections should take place to confirm compliance with all applicable codes. Visitors Code of Conduct: It should include a strong message that the discharge of any fire works is absolutely prohibited in all residential and

forested areas all year around with no exceptions. Existing Bylaw 16-2008: The Sale and Setting off of Fireworks: is very complex and it may have to be reviewed and revised. The recent wildfires should teach us a lesson. Fireworks are of a high risk when debris ends up in the dried out undergrowth. We stayed home many a times when large groups of renters were present for fears that they would go wild (Drugs & Alcohol) and/or discharge fireworks and burn down our house and walk away by saying " Sorry"

- I am very pleased to see that the Municipality of Lambton Shores has moved forward with the proposal to implement a licensing program for Short-Term Rentals in our Municipality. Without some kind of control on the numbers of Short-Term Rentals in lakeside towns and villages like Port Franks, Ipperwash and Grand Bend, I could see our communities becoming ghost hotel destinations with very few full-time residents in the future. The Municipality might also consider implementing an anonymous tip line or website where illegal renovations and modifications that are being made to properties for the purpose of Short-Term Rentals can be reported. I am aware of single family homes that are being divided into separate units with the addition of kitchens, bathrooms and more bedrooms, and also garages being converted into fully self-contained accommodations, all without permits and for the purpose of Short-Term Rental Income. With these properties being able to accommodate increased numbers of people comes the problem of increased usage of septic systems and, in turn, the eventual failure of these septic systems. As I'm sure the Municipality is aware, many septic systems in Lambton Shores are very old and are not up to current standards. In addition, the plumbing and electrical modifications being done are not being inspected by the proper authorities and could therefore be dangerous. Also, without having obtained building or renovation permits, MPAC will not be aware of the need to re-assess these "new and improved" residences which will have increased in value. Therefore, the home owners of these properties will not be paying their fair share of property taxes into the community coffers
- After reviewing the Short-Term Rental (STR) Licensing Program that has commenced I'm quite shocked and disappointed in such a movement and consideration from council. From someone that has frequented Grand Bend for over 30 years, have a short term rental cottage now, spends, and reinvests my assets back in the community I think this proposal is an insult to those business owners and cottage owners. My family loves Grand Bend, and we never seen an issue that is that catastrophic or felt at risk, even with a 6 year old. Do we have a problem in Grand Bend that I am unaware of? Or should I say a severe problem? I believe that night life is much calmer, safer, and friendlier than it has ever been over the many years of Grand Bends life and culture. Grand Bend thrives on tourism, the beach, and the history that has been built up. Our gap should be focused on maintaining businesses that are profitable, and making Grand Bend a place to be even in the offseason. Not deterring people from coming with strict rules, and less red tape for owners/businesses. It is sad to hear that some believe that all these cottages are gold mines and owners become millionaire summer rentals ---they're living in a box. Let's get one thing straight - cottage season is a season not a full year. If you really think about it --that's 10 weeks (generously). 10 weeks of income has to cover these owners who took a risk for the whole year. Just like each of these business owners who try to make ends meet in a busy 10 week span. If you do the math the cottages are utilized 20% of the year. You take away property taxes, cleaning fees, rental fees, property management, insurance, mortgage and interest – the picture isn't that great as you may think when you see a long weekend stay may be a one-time

450 a night price tag. Not to mention as house prices have increased, you will see owners struggle to keep a float in "seasonal" area. It frustrates me to see this proposal and see how the owner is penalized for bringing "goodness" to the community. Please don't put a blanket over everyone for some rare situations that may occur. It feels like you're trying to create something that looks like campground rules than a residential community. I'm proud of what my family has accomplished, and want Grand Bend to thrive, and prosper. If I do some math for my input to the community -- I hire a local cleaner who I pay legally, who in turn invests in your community. I do renovations yearly which is put back in your community in several ways- from contractor to retail stores. We bring forth excited travelers to the community. On average if 4 people stay and let's say they spend 20.00 each I'm putting back into the community each summer another 6,000 to be spent to those business that need it. The 500 fee so much does not bother me if it goes to good use and for the benefit of the short term families of rental. At the end of the day it is robbing me of a two night stay in only my 10 weeks but I can deal with that. Where I am at loss of words is when I see this demerit point system. Is this really what we want to do? You want to penalize the landlord/owner and not the guests? If you want to take 500 from me, I would expect you have someone on duty during these peaks months, fine the individuals, do what needs to be done if there are that many concerns. I want a safe community also! Not create a point system to hurt the owner, the community and the future pre-booked guests. Do you want to make a call to the person who been coming with their family for 10 years to a cottage, and say sorry your summer vacation is cancelled this year because I received too many demerit points? Don't get me wrong I see there are issues with tenants but as an owner I also get 1 bad apple a summer. It is part of business! But for one bad apple, penalize me for the year, and maybe even two years makes no business sense. You would realistically collapse someone, and impact the community further. If you would consider what these owners really contribute back. If you would shut down an owner for two years, and jeopardize 12,000 of income back to the community with renters is beside me. Is this what council wants to do? With that, I know policing every night is hard but I think if you a want licensing fee that is my expectation. To hold the guest accountable either by police or security. I know you will say you don't have the financial resources to do such but I would challenge to allocate resources in this matter. If it is that much of an issue and you spent all this time and money to draft this than you can find the resources the right way for a need that is causing such review. Not penalizing contributors to the community. Many times this summer, I witnessed 3 security officers/bylaw officers strolling the beaches ticketing people for drinking alcohol. Do you think that makes sense? If the problem is at night when a neighbor is trying to sleep, sure have those officers patrol then, not on the beach as 3 buddies walk up and down looking at the entertainment. If we truly feel there is a rental issue, let's move some resources away from the beach into rental world.. Respectively, I trust we are trying to both better ourselves and grow Grand Bend. I cannot get my head wrapped around this full proposal and as you know I'm not one to voice ongoing criticisms to council. This time, let's do better! Thanks for moving forward in a better way!

- I have been an owner of a STR property in Port Franks for the past 5 years. We do our best to review those renting our cottage and provide our guests with a safe and secure stay. We've had one complaint in those 5 years over animals knocking over our garbage bin and since have installed an exterior camera to monitor the garbage bins. I find some of your restrictions on the number of occupants as unrealistic and unfair. We rent our cottage as a house by the week in

the summer months and we cannot always control the exact number of people on the property at any given time. Our cottage typically can easily sleep 10 guests (25yrs or older and families only) very comfortably and I'm interested who has come up with a maximum occupancy of 8 people?? This licensing program is very restrictive as an owner who pays taxes and maintains his/her property. We take great pride in our cottage as an investment and we have spent thousands of dollars in improving the property inside and out. Further, we own a seasonal trailer in the local area and are truly part of this community. We've had several groups, more than 8 people, who have been renting our property for over 5 years, year after year with no issues or complaints. What this program has not mentioned anywhere in the documentation is that we're providing a service to families who cannot afford to purchase a cottage. I'm totally against this program and I'm not sure where the motivation for such a system has emerged? Your policies will affect the livelihood of my family. The 30 mins to respond to an issue is beyond ridiculous, who's coming up with these numbers? If I'm away from my phone for 20 mins, then I have 10 mins to deal with an issue?? Really??

- Capacity Limits - why 8? what reasonable explanation of this number can be offered - where was this driven from?!?! Our cottage sleeps 12 comfortably and is safe! This number should be relevant to the property NOT a standardized blanket statement
- The fire plan - how will you be able to confirm what is being provided to you is credible? If this is individually prepared for one's own property - anyone can draw a map. How is the municipality going to ensure that the map that is submitted is actually in place - how is the municipality going to ensure safety for guests to ensure that all fire extinguishers are in working order and not beyond the expiration date? Who is going to check this? Some of the older cottages may have outdated equipment! If there is no checks and balances in place by the municipality this is a wasted effort and an expense to those who hire a professional to put together the plan - it is a waste of time if anyone can create and submit
- Garbage in the community is an issue far beyond what you are proposing. It concerns the streets, the beach, the businesses, the local permanent residence etc. etc. etc. this is an environmental issue that is not going to be resolved through penalizing only the STR owners!!!! IF all properties are required to use bins for recycling and garbage - this is the method that the municipality has already put into place and one which ALL land owners are using effectively. What purpose does singling out the STR owners serve???!?!?!?! So my neighbour can have 25 ppl at their residence with no "secured" garbage but an STR owner can only have 8ppl with 'secured' garbage ----- how does this make sense to you???!?!?!?!?!?!?! Deal with the municipality garbage problem as a separate study/active group and you will see progress in your community!
- We have been property owners in Grand Bend for a few years now. Our neighbor had a tenant living at his residence. She sat outside ALL HOURS OF THE NIGHT playing bongo's, playing music we could hear CLEARLY, playing music that we couldn't hear but that we could CLEARLY hear her SINGING all hours of the night DURING THE WEEK - DURING THE WEEKENDS when we get up at 6am for work!!!! Our friend has a permanent resident as a neighbour who has more than 8 people at their residence EVERY WEEKEND and are LOUD and exceeding noise by-laws the municipality has set out. When the By-Law enforcement officer is called and sometimes comes by the music/noise lowers until the by-law enforcement leaves then the noise goes back up to an unacceptable level - how many times can you call the by-law enforcement

Lambton Shores is woefully under resourced to deal with these issues in a timely and effective manner. How will an STR Program improve enforcement of any of these issues?

-There is zero factual data with respect to the costs to develop, launch or administer a STR Program. How can the author(s) of the report speculate that any additional staff costs could be built into the STR program and 100% user supported when nobody knows what those costs will be? This statement is misleading.

-Comparing the seasonal STR situation in Grand Bend to decisions being made regarding STRs in the City of Toronto isn't a valid comparison. The two municipalities have a completely different situation they are attempting to address with a STR program. This is an apples-to-oranges comparison that is irrelevant.

-The report completely avoids what many residents consider to be the primary problem with STRs. Specifically; there are a number of unscrupulous property owners that rent their properties to individuals (usually the typical party crowd) on a per/head basis. In many cases the rentals become parties, that are fueled by alcohol and bad behavior. These individuals generate \$1,000.00s of dollars in profit on a DAILY basis and are responsible for disrupting the enjoyment of other STR clients/owners. These owners are directly responsible for the majority of noise complaints, property damage and disruptive behaviors during rental season. WHY IS THERE NO ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO HOW AN STR PROGRAM WILL ADDRESS THIS ISSUE?

"Alternatives to Consider" Section of the Report

-The Status Quo options makes zero mention of measures that could be taken to enhance or improve existing protocols to address any of the issues (inappropriately) linked to STRs. Why isn't there any consideration for the implementation of a seasonal on-street permit parking/municipally owned lot parking programs? There are 100s of overnight on-street spaces and spaces in municipally owned parking lots that could generate substantial annual revenue. On-street options would not impact on emergency services. There is ample passable space public roadways. Revenues could be used to up-staff By-law Enforcement Officers during summer months. Revenues could be used to implement a night shift to deal with by-law infractions at all hours. Currently; the OPP is the only options for timely response; and this will only result in charges that contravene the Criminal Code. The negative benefits of STRs are subjective and incorrectly presented as "CAUSE & EFFECT" issues. Some of the issues overlap with STRs, but many of the issues are ones that Lambton Shores has been grappling with for decades. Eg: Parking issues are an over-reaching issue in Grand Bend. Day trippers; as opposed to STR occupants are a greater problem.

Grand Bend STR Program – General Comments

-There is no mention of the STR licensing Program intra-net page contained in the report; or the extent to which there has been transparency in developing the "proposed" STR program.

-There is no business case that accompanies this initiative. How much will it cost to administer? What is the projected revenue? Will tax-payers be responsible for costs that exceed Licence and the annual fee?

-Who will administer this program? What is the cost? Are they Provincial Offence Officers? What is their training? What is the anticipated annual cost of the program? What is the funding source? What are the Capital & Operating Expenses? Where are these costs identified in the budget?

-Right-of-Entry. How will enforcement of the occupant maximum be carried out? Right-of-entry inside private residences IS NOT PERMITTED, unless the property it is authorized by the property owner. The property owner will not be on the property when it is being rented? This is just common sense. How will property occupancy limits be enforced?

-How will the municipality be able to determine who is an occupant and who is a guest? Is the municipality seeking to limit the TOTAL number of people that can be on the property at any given time? Are family gatherings beyond eight people not permitted? Are birthday parties beyond eight people not permitted? Is there a time when ALL GUESTS must leave the property? Who is going to enforce such a ridiculous requirement?

-The requirement for property owners to source alternate parking for occupants that go beyond the number of parking spaces on the property is ridiculous. Property owners are responsible for their property. They are not responsible for finding parking spaces at other locations in Grand Bend. This is the responsibility of the vehicle owner. If they choose to park on a street and get a ticket. That is their choice. This requirement must be removed from the Guide.

-If the Municipality was pro-active it should be considering the implementation of on-street permit parking during rental season (June-August). An on-street permit parking program could be a revenue generator and relatively easily to implement and administer. Road widths are easily wide enough to allow on-street permit parking without impacting emergency response. The "demerit" point system, as proposed is not acceptable. Who will enforce the "system"? How will enforcement be carried out in a consistent manner; and by whom? The 30 minute provision for a "responsible" ridiculous. The municipality doesn't have the same requirement for its own employees when tax payers request site visits or by-law enforcement!

- To me one of the important factors are the benefits to local businesses, and making so STR are able to operate professionally, without concern about unjust hassles, as people often think of themselves and not the community.

The way this str reads

1. with 2 issues, only being minor, one may be out of business for 6 months (basically placing an str out of business - not really feasible)
2. Liability - any liability beyond our property does not make sense
3. Secure garbage - The rollie bins are very secure, are you recommending a chain to fasten them, remember the pails may have to be taken to the end of the lane by the guests, that is important, as they have the right to the property on garbage day.
- 4 Cottages which are all hydro do not require carbon monoxide detectors. (no requirement for them)
5. Limiting size of families on properties, that is a concern, families are meant to be connected , maybe an age limit for the person booking the property.
6. Cottages are so small, they do not require a fire route, many are 1000 sq ft or under, and only one floor, so possibly on properties that are more than one floor a fire route makes more sense.
7. 24/7 availability within 30 minutes, many government businesses, hst, tax returns etc etc etc, so when one can guarantee our government is able to be available within 30 minutes, then see one askin for this point. Dead cell areas, funerals, dead batteries etc. These are not full time businesses with staff (why do they have the similar rules to hotels)

8. Properties with more than one cottage or sleeping area, the limit on size should accommodate families. Even larger cottages, are meant to accommodate larger families and extended families. (and sometimes friends of the family as well)

9. Proper wholesome goodness, and rest and relaxation away with a group, is a healing bonding, and great for our society as a whole.

10. Every concern is not able to be eliminated, and eliminating beautiful healthy activities, hurts society as a whole, not just in the tourist area, but in everyday life.

- For a last few years we have offered our home to extended families use for Summer holidays accommodating between 8 and 14 people. Most families we accommodate consist of 10 adults and 4 children mostly toddlers or young children. Up to date we have not have any issue or complaints. We believe that 8 renters capacity is not enough and will brake up families and will not work in our case. We do NOT have 2 nd home to ad additional members. We recommend that municipality make an exception for LARGER homes and allow for additional members of the family to join ! This can be achieved by charging additional licence fee at the time of registration . I would be open to receiving the call or meeting with any member of municipal staff at their convenience to discuss this[PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED]. Most of the other recommendations we already follow including bylaws garbage disposal , insurance, septic system servicing and have no objections to it
- This is absolutely wrong on so many levels. Shame on you for trying to control short term rentals. We've owned our cottage in PF for over 5 years and only rent to families. At \$3,000 a week to rent our beautiful cottage, we're obviously renting to respectful people who can afford to come and they respect not only our cottage but the community and the beach. How would you feel if there was a licensing in place that told you how many ppl you can have in your home? We paid big money for our cottage and keep our property in tip top shape. We respect our neighbours and bring in money for the PF'a businesses. Our cottage is an investment for our children and one day we won't rent. We are proud to own a cottage in PF and feel like our freedom is being taken away, this is still Canada right? Shame on all of you for even trying to implement this, it's absolutely ridiculous!
- We are lucky to live in Grand Bend with the beautiful surroundings, with the GBAHC, great neighbourhoods with great neighbours who look out for each other and have pride of ownership, support local, buy local, and volunteer in the community. I have attended the annual Volunteer BBQ There are so many volunteers and so many great organizations. We have many hotels, motels, and B&Bs. STRs and absentee landlords do not add to what makes Grand Bend great. From the survey 73% of the STRs are in Grand Bend and with 63% of the respondents complaining about being disturbed by STRs something more needs to be done. We are Zoned residential and that is what we bought into . An STR is a hotel like business and should be treated as such and should only be allowed in areas zoned for commercial. 50% of the respondents want additional zoning regulations and this should be done. Item 3 'additional regulations' should be addressed as soon as possible. We need zoning, inspections, and limiting the number of STRs. If there is no budget, maybe an initial STR application fee of \$1000. / property needs to be set-up to cover this. In the areas that are zoned for STRs, there should be licensing. The annual licensing fee is too little and may not even pay for the licensing program as those numbers are estimates. What if there is a shortfall? What if there is an excess? Any excess could be funnelled to the operating expenses of the Grand Bend Community Centre - since most

of the STRs are in Grand Bend. A 6 month suspension isn't a real deterrent when most are closed for 6 months anyway- it should be a year suspension. There should be a demerit points for the number of noise complaints also rather than just convictions. The maximum occupancy is generous and it should be made clear that the the maximum number includes children. The maximums should be in place for the 2022 season. Concessions could be made for this summer if the rentals have already been made but that should require an additional fee. There are many ways to allow families to travel together affordably and support the local community without housing them in residential areas. Many STR owners feel they are entitled to make all the money they can because they have bought property regardless of what the community thinks. We disagree, they must fit into our community and if they don't they can easily sell because there are many people wanting to buy in Grand Bend, to live here. We are excited about all the new businesses opening in Grand Bend and we will be supporting them year round.

- In response to the Short Term Rental proposed bylaw, I think that the occupancy restrictions, capped at 8 persons, are too restrictive at 2 people per room plus 2. Some STR vacation properties may be 2 or 3 bedrooms but there are others that have 4 or more bedrooms and would also be capped at 8 people. Many times family groups of 3 generations or 2 families vacation together. So 2 adults per room may seem reasonable, but 3 or 4 children in beds in 1 room also seems reasonable. These restrictions are not placed on people's personal homes or residences and STR vacation properties should be treated the same. Lambton Shores web pages say there are no municipal business licence required, so is this the first such licence and fee that is? Thank you
- Very impressed with the amount of thought and work being done on STRs. Particularly like the 24/7 hotline, the responsible person to resolve a complaint within 30 minutes, the demerit point consequence, inspections, septic maintenance, applications and fees. Feel there should be a clear, concise definition of a "legal bedroom" right on the Application Form. The Ontario Code is difficult to interpret and has to be looked up. For example is a basement bedroom legal, is one bunkie, or multiple bunkies legal as bedrooms on the property. Clarify if the maximum occupancy (8) is the total allowable on the "property" during a rental duration or can occupants invite unlimited guests daily provided they don't sleep over and exceed 8. Be clear if the maximum occupants includes children. Does the Municipality intend to control how many rentals are on a street, in a residential neighbourhood, and in particular ensure no resident is surrounded on all sides by STRs. Consideration by the Municipality that an initial site inspection be conducted on a new Application to ensure safety code is met up front and infractions corrected prior to approval, and the Municipality determine the number of legal bedrooms on the property. Will the public have access to where Approved STRs are located in the Municipality? This may assist the Municipality as illegal STRs could be reported to the Municipality. Strongly feel that if an STR is suspended, they should not operate in future...they had their chance
- Can we approach this more like a business case? Where is the cost benefits analysis, where is a list of the key issues this proposed licensing program is trying to solve? Why are other beach towns not doing this? What makes Grand Bend unique? Short term rental has gained popularity, here are some of the benefits it offers the community:
 1. local business, especially for restaurants
 2. business for gas stations

3. business for flea markets
4. business for local stores
5. business for landscape companies
6. business for lawn care companies
7. Business for cleaners
8. business for construction
9. business for retail

- Thank you for providing this information and for review by the residents of Lambton Shores and the opportunity to provide feedback. As stated in the proposed licensing program, the Municipality of Lambton Shores has aimed for and accomplished a balanced approach with its licensing program, having considered both the positive and negative impacts of STRs. I am hopeful of its successful implementation. Well done!
- "In addition to the fines related to Municipal by-laws, a framework with demerit points related to STRs will be established through the Short-Term Rental Licensing By-Law. Demerit points remain on file for an STR licence for two (2) years from the date of issue. If a STR receives 7 demerit points, the licence will be immediately suspended, up to a maximum of six (6) months. Should that property receive 15 demerit points, that STR licence will be revoked and cannot be reapplied for a period of two (2) years from revocation. See the draft Demerit Points system. A hearing through the STR Compliance Committee will be required for licence suspensions and revocations." This is outrageous, hosts have a hard enough time/elevated stress screening guests for their home, the last thing we need in addition to that is demerit points directly impact the host and are not always controllable.

2a)Occupancy Limit . Limit of 8 people/ thinking that is per cottage? - many families want to travel together on holidays, so 3 families with one or more children may not be able to vacation together. Many grand parents like to book a time away with the children and grand children. Would need to see the data collected to come to the conclusion of 8. To be completely honest a service like airbnb does a much better job than a city licensing program, even reading the proposal now it already seems outdated. How does the municipality expect to stay relevant and be willing to amend/update/revise the program once implemented
- Your best bet is to actually involve the community, specifically those who have experience running a short term rental. Whoever created this proposal sounds like they have limited experience/exposure to what it takes to actually manage a STR. Adding this licensing program is absolutely unnecessary and I struggle to see the benefit besides more money to the municipality
- First off, as a responsible STR owner, we are very disappointed with the draft licensing program. Here are the list of our concerns:
 - 1) Proposed limit of 8 does not consider the size of our property nor the large families including children that contributes the groups of families that we normally would rent to.
 - 2) The 2 million liability insurance should take into consideration the total amount we are covered thru all third party rental partners and not just put all the responsibility on the owners. example. We currently have 1 million liability thru our house insurance and the extra 1 million comes from our third party rental partner.
 - 3) 30 minutes to resolve issues is completely unreasonable
- As a responsible STR owner, I am disappointed with your proposal that you have put forth. You offered us as STR owners a voice in the fall when you asked for our opinion but I do not see a lot

of that feedback displayed in your draft. As well, I feel that the established rules may affect the ability of home owners to continue to offer STR in a community that relies on accommodations for its large number of tourists that flock to the area in the summer. This, I believe is not in the best interest of the community.

Specific concerns with the draft proposal:

1. Limit of 8 people does not consider the size of the property. I feel that that this should be reviewed with your application based on bedrooms and property size. As well, we like to entice families to stay and this discriminates against larger families.
2. Liability insurance of 2 million is not reasonable to just be from our home insurance. It should allow us to share this expense with with a third party rental provider.
3. 30 minutes response time is not fair and reasonable to allow us to resolve issues as our contact person may be at the beach. Even 60-90 minutes is more reasonable.

I really hope that you take time to read through the feedback that you gave asked for. It breaks my heart that this is being pushed through without considering all that is stake in a community that I have called home in the past 5 years

- It is unlawful to limit private home owners to a maximum occupancy based on absolutely nothing. To state 2 per room plus 2 persons to max of 8, this only benefits those who have 3 or less bedrooms. For the home owners with 4 or more bedrooms, they are limited to the same number of people as the home with 3 bedrooms. Where is the logic behind this arbitrary number? Room sizes vary so much from house to house. Additionally, a home owner should be able to make a decision regarding what is an appropriate number of guests for their space, not a licensing program
- To go from no licensing program to this one is a huge shock for STR owners who have been renting their property for years and also for new owners who are just renting for the first time. The demerit system will basically cripple them if they get more than one incident in a 2 year span. Due to the free will and behaviours of renters, owners could possibly not be able to pay their mortgage for 6 or more months. This can put owners in a situation of bankruptcy or property loss... how devastating and completely inconsiderate
- I do not think it is fair to roll something like this out for the current year. If you believe in this and want it done correctly, to be fair to everyone involved It should not begin until 2023. I know many who have their cottages fully rented for summer months this year with deposits paid. Your doing research and although I dont agree with what your purposing my biggest objection is the timing of this. Gather facts, make a plan however give people renters and rentees enough notice. I think you are punishing the people who own one cottage and use it mostly for their own use but when they arent using it they allow their family and close friends to rent. No where have I found if I myself am using my cottage if I am limited to the number of people i have visiting as well. I also wonder if you have put into thought the decrease this could have on local businesses. People who rent support the gb local businesses. Year around people do also however i do not believe to the extent the renters do. I feel this decision could be a very controlling decision. You want to decide what people do with their own properties and how many people can attend. Just think its not fair for those that already purchased their properties with a plan
- I can understand the need for licensing cottages or homes that run a for-profit business of short term rentals throughout the summer season or longer throughout the year. Unfortunately for

the owners who rent, as we do, to family members and friends for less than 4 weeks in total per season (as per insurance restrictions), the additional costs and requirements for licensing will prohibit us from doing so. We cannot afford to absorb the extra costs of licensing, building a garbage enclosure, etc. or the time required to meet the licensing requirements. The rent that we receive cannot be sufficiently inflated for our guests (family and friends) to cover the additional costs. It is unfortunate that this is an "all or nothing" proposition. The implementation of this licensing program of Short Term Rentals will raise the cost of rentals by owners who run for-profit short term rentals, which will potentially price out average families who wish to enjoy Grand Bend and the surrounding areas. As well the licensing requirements will potentially reduce the amount and variety of holiday rental housing and therefore the numbers of visitors to bring business to local businesses, because occasional owner/renters will not be able to continue to do so. It would be beneficial if there were different levels of licensing to reflect the occasional owner/renters and the for-profit business owner/renters.

- Short term rentals have been going on for decades in Lambton Shores and is the very reason the local businesses thrive. This feels like a cash grab to me and the maximum of 8 guests is completely unreasonable. My mother took great pride in renting a cottage every year to have her children, sister and grandchildren join her for special memories at the beach. A maximum of 8 people would not even allow 2 families to rent a cottage together. I do not support this bylaw. Everybody wants a piece of the profit, but not do the work
- As permanent and long time residents of Southcott Pines we are very pleased to see the proposed licensing program. Unfortunately, often landlords have quickly grabbed the rent money but weren't there to deal with loud and unruly renters. To limit the number renting a home is an excellent idea. Many of the renters and landlords forget that the neighbours are permanent residents. We strongly support all of the suggestions in the new licensing program. It is definitely time that this issue is addressed and new procedures adopted
- Wow, way to bite the hand that feeds you. All this will do is deter owners that do/want to provide short term rentals. Tourists spend a lot of money in Lambton Shores, which is needed because Lord knows the local residents do not (they go and shop in London or Sarnia). If this is about noise complaints, shore up your bylaw officers to respond to such complaints. Just admit this is literally finding a legal way to steal from homeowners who already pay taxes.
- Your program, on paper, sounds like a good start. However, there are many gaps in it.

ENFORCEMENT

The biggest being who is actually enforcing it? Certainly not the person that "answers" the phone call complaints. They will just document and pass the information to by-law. Let's talk about by-law for a bit...you can't even fulfill the staffing required for the normal seasonal influx of problems right now, so how do you think whatever staff you do find will have the time or care to enforce all the complaints and (now) rule breakers? They couldn't keep up with the complaints before and now there are added rules for them to enforce on top of it. Instead of wasting your money on someone answering phone calls to pass on the complaints, invest that money into your by-law program. If there are no repercussions or enough staff to enforce a rule, then the rule is only as good as the paper it's written on.

CAPPING

Now let's talk about the fact that you still have done nothing to limit the number of homes dedicated in our community to STR's. As long as you keep growing the number of STR's you are

KILLING your community. There are NO homes for middle class families here. NONE. You can't rent or buy a house here anymore because they have all been eaten up for STR's. As you start to see the families leave town, you will start seeing your schools diminish in numbers, your year-round sales and support to businesses dwindle and eventually die out, your availability of student workforce diminish (look at Shoppers drug mart - they can't even get enough cashiers to work so they had to implement self serve checkouts!!; or Tim Hortons closing at 7pm because they don't have the students available to work the shifts), and the "community" mentality will be gone (neighbours helping each other and looking out for each other because they live together). You NEED to cap the number of STR's. You need to FIX this COMMUNITY before it totally dies.

FEES

The fees you are implementing are a squirt in the bucket for these big businesses. They are getting a free ride of a tax free business. \$500!! That's one night to these people! (But to my first point, it doesn't really matter because there is no direction as to how this payment will be enforced). And if you don't pay the fee and register, you can't get demerit points taken off. The bad ones simply won't register so you will only be penalizing the good ones. The fee structure needs to be higher and the fines need to be heavier. It needs to be made so difficult that they won't want to bother doing it here. Once you get the number of STR's under control here, you can then focus on rebuilding the community that has so quickly been torn apart this past decade

- This program is a waste of time and money. The cost to enforce this program will be far greater than any revenue received
- This is a ridiculous cash grab. How is this benefiting the community? A detailed budget of how the licenses actually trickle down to community interests is needed otherwise this is just another make work project. The system is overly complicate (demerit points?!). Property owners already pay property taxes why don't you make better use of those funds to help maintain the downtown core. What about owners who rent out their properties on the one off week or so a year to family and friends? Are they going to have to pay the high licensing fee too? I am not supportive of this in any way at all
- I am a small business owner downtown and I rely heavily on STR to bring new customers to my shop during the summer. I am also a resident and am worried what would happen to our vibrant town if this new policy comes into effect. Thank you
- I think this is wrong, the rental market in grand bend is what brings in the towns revenue for the past several decades. Housing costs are astronomical, and if people need to rent to also help pay for it, they should be allowed. We bring the money to town, and just for that the older people are upset about town changing and all certain people do is complain. You know what, grand bend the nicer it gets, the bigger reputation it will hold for years to come. Grand bend needed a face lift and more to do, rentals do amazing, and people love coming here. So why should we tax these people that are just trying to make a living while doing good for the town? Rules implemented are good, but everything like this just isn't fair. Keep everyone happy, don't tax the owners, don't make them have to pay yearly for taxes and inspections and so on. Some houses are bigger then others and families are bigger then other as well. So why have a cap on number of people allowed. If damages happen the owner still has to fix, clean, organize, upgrade etc. Let's end this proposed license program, and get back to living life, enjoying life and keep building this amazing town of ours.

- To believe this is a violation of our rights as property owners. Many of us rent large homes to multi families that are not partying I agree with limits on students but it should be up to us to rent to responsible people especially when we have large homes. How do other vacation destinations manage this ? Have you looked at like destinations for guidance. This impedes our ability to rent out our homes to help offset the rising costs of owning a property
- Congratulations, this seems to be a simple and yet absolutely necessary plan to help residents and landlords keep a system in check without stomping all over homeownership rights. Accountability will be the cornerstone required to move this town forward
- What the municipality are doing is a step in the right direction. Some of the rentals out there should not be in business . We live across the road for a such rental and we have to out up with noise loud music and last year they had over 20 people, they have open fires, and it's every weekend, there is no joy sitting outside and enjoying your property.
- We understand that something needs to be done to address the legitimate concerns being voiced by residents. We have no doubts that there are folks who experience excessive noise, garbage, and safety concerns at the hands of out-of-control short-term rentals. However, our concern with this proposal is staff/Council is trying to create a complex program when the solution can be much simpler. At the heart of this issue, the concerns are: noise, garbage, and parking. The culprit for many of these issues can be short-term rentals, but it can also be permanent residents or long-term rentals. So the solution can be much simpler, and found within the very budget proposed in this licensing program. The program, as proposed, has an expense line of \$130,500. This includes enforcement, a contract coordinator, and the 3rd party company. The total revenue, through licensing fees, equals the same. As a short-term rental owner, I think the \$500 annual fee is reasonable. Why not increase it a bit more and use all of the revenue to beef up enforcement of existing by-laws. Use the \$130,500 (or more if you increase licensing fees a bit) and hire two more dedicated by-law officers. Have a solid shift calendar that includes strong enforcement of by-laws between the hours of 10pm and 7am. Strong fines for those causing the issues (noise, garbage, parking). It sounds simple, but we truly believe this is the fairest, and most effective, approach to actually solving the issues our community faces. Thanks
- I feel this proposed plan doesn't address the issues presented; or at the very least, addresses them in an overly complex way. I think we can solve these issues with a simple, yet effective, by-law enforcement enhancement approach. Instead of spending \$130k on a third party and license coordinator, we could hire two additional by-law officers dedicated to an enhanced overnight enforcement shift.
- Zoning Restrictions: Prohibit STRs in existing R1 areas, NO EXCEPTIONS! STRs are businesses; as such they should be confined to non-residential areas. Application Fee: Increase to \$1500 with non-refundable fee and \$5000 deposit to cover ALL staff costs to administer. Taxpayers should not pay for any shortfalls. If there is a surplus at fiscal yearend, consider distributing surplus funds proportionally among least offending STR owners as an incentive. Enforcement: Increase suspension to one year with re-application fee increase to \$3000 to cover higher risk of non-compliance. Stipulate in contract the process for legal recourse by municipality (including cost recovery of all costs) if non-compliance reoccurs. Maintain record of offences for each STR and charge ALL related costs (including travel, bylaw enforcement and police involvement if called

upon) against annual deposit. Future STRs: Implement policies that encourage redevelopment in traditional STR areas while confining STRs to such areas

- As a cottage owner who has been renting my property [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] for 11 years I am very disappointed with this proposal. I have always rented my property responsibly to mature adults over 25 yrs of age and families. Many of which have been over groups of 8. My property sleeps 13 with five bedrooms.

* There needs to be an option for larger cottage owners to rent to larger groups that have bedroom and sleeping capacity. The current proposal is forcing large groups to rent more than one property which will hurt the tourism industry in GB and force renters to look elsewhere. This proposal is making renting unaffordable for families many of whom come with siblings and parents and grandparents. Most of my groups are over 8 people. This will drastically affect my rental that I have been renting successfully for several years with out noise issues or neighbourhood complaints. I have considered the neighbourhood and direct neighbours with every rental as I'm sure many other property renters do as well.

* This proposal is coming at a time when people are struggling to maintain and hold current properties as a result of the pandemic. Many went without income and lost work due to the pandemic. Limiting rental income at this time with this licensing proposal will hurt tourism by forcing rental prices even higher and potentially jeopardizing owners ability to keep the rentals due to the limitations in the program. Property values have increased to a point in GB where many need rental income to maintain and continue to afford these rental properties and continue to pay property taxes.

* We have a plan to eventually be residents of GB and have decided to rent until retirement when we can live in GB full time similar to many others. This proposal could affect the housing market in GB and retirement plans for many in addition to the tourism industry in a negative way. I hope this feedback is being reviewed and adjustments and changes will be made to the proposal that will help property owners and property tax payers to continue to contribute to the tax revenue of the town and not negatively impact the tourism especially at a time when many people are trying to recover from a pandemic. For this reason this proposal should be put off until such time that the economy and business owners recover from a two year pandemic that affected everyone in some way!

- I am not opposed to the idea of the STR although I do believe the existing proposal needs some tweaking. The 8 person max does not support all STR, this should not be a one size fits all approach. We have a 6 bedroom with 7 beds which can easily and safely house 14 people if you equate 2 persons per bed. All of our beds are a queen size and we can easily support up to 14. I would like to see the max lifted and simply have a 2 persons per bed or bedroom limit put in place. I think this is fair and will still accomplish the same result as the issue is with the smaller STR's in the downtown core who place more people than occupancy which may push safety limits
- I understand the municipality's interest in making STR's safer for the neighbourhood that they're located in but I do not agree with many of proposed rules/actions:
 1. Garbage - to be locked into the bins provided by the municipality, why would STR owners specifically need to provide any other solution for this? Everywhere I've stayed has always had the green and blue bins secured with straps. This is unreasonable to expect a cottage owner to build something to house an already secured container. I rent a cottage every summer and am

always responsible with our waste and make sure we have it packed up and locked up at all times.

2. Demerit Points - This makes absolutely no sense. If a homeowner chooses to rent their property out, that should be their prerogative. They own the property and no one should be allowed to infringe on their right to rent their home out when they aren't using it. Further to that, if guests are causing trouble, it's the guest who should receive a fine, not the homeowner. I can't tell you how many times we've rented a place and the HOMEOWNERS at the cottage beside us are being noisy and loud all night long while we try to keep our kids in bed. Will you also be issuing demerit points to no. STR cottage owners who are loud and unruly? Because that's usually where we see trouble.

3. Dictating the max number of guests allowed to rent a home as 8 - the max number of guests allowed to stay at a home or in an STR should be based on the number of bedrooms or septic capacity, not on an arbitrary number that someone else chooses. We rent cottages in Lambton shores every summer with my brother, his wife and their children. Often times our parents join us for a few days as well. There are 10-14+ of us when we travel together. We would no longer be able to do this without renting 2 or 3 separate cottages and that is extremely unfair.

We would likely have to switch our two week summer vacation to a different area and Lambton shores would potentially be losing out on thousands of our tourist dollars. We won't be the only ones considering this action. I know plenty of families who do the same, bring everyone together for a few weeks in the summertime. It would be a shame for us to have to stay in a different area. As renters, if we wanted to stay in a regulated hotel or motel, we would. But we don't, we want to travel as a family and rent a family cottage together with others in our family. We want to keep our tradition of visiting Lambton shores every summer as our family has been doing so for many years. Please don't take this away from us with your new proposed regulations that make absolutely no sense

- This is just a tax grab we already pay more taxes than Toronto for less services. We already have bylaws that are not enforced. STR have been going on forever my parent use to rent a cottage every summer since the 70's for us to go on a family vacation to the beach. The license is unfair the developers downtown Grand Bend can build condos and pay in lieu of parking fees (where parking is already hard to find) but cottages that rent to families with 2-4 kids need to have 2 parking spaces. And how about the properties that have more than one cottage on the same property it's not fair that they would need more than one license. Stop trying to steal people's hard earned \$\$ everything is so expensive now (gas, food, hydro, heat ect) The old lady beside me does it so she can stay living in her own house because pension hasn't kept up with the inflation rate. I say no to this overreaching tax grab. I know who I am not voting for in the next election
- I own a cottage in Grand Bend and do rent it out for some weeks over the summer. But I don't consider it a business with full staff on hand to take care of things and is mainly for my personal use. I think the proposed licensing is asking too much for small operators who are infrequently renting their home when not in use themselves. My place is also bigger and can accommodate more than the max of 8 ppl. It is convenient for our large family to be able to stay together with kids and grandparents under a single roof. I've hosted families and multi-generational families of 9 or 10 without issues or complaints. With the max of 8, it would be inconvenient for these families to have to find accommodations in 2 or more cottages. I would also think that the supply of accommodations would be greatly reduced not only because of the limitations

proposed/imposed but that many small time operators would not participate. The other effect of low supply is prices for accommodations will go up due to higher demand. This would mean only the privileged few would be able to afford a summer vacation. If the proposal goes through and is adopted as is, it would be difficult for me to continue offering my abode for STR as it would not be worth the time and effort. Thank you for considering my feedback.

- While I understand the need for some regulations on this, the demerit point system is NOT going to work. All it is going to do is create animosity in the community and a league of people who will target individuals/neighbors that they do not like. This is definitely the one piece I STRONGLY disagree with- you are going to see a TONNE of backlash from the community on this- I have already seen it from most people who are for the regulations and not for the regulations. That just isn't going to work. I understand creating limits around how many guests and the amount of bedrooms, please keep in mind though that many cottages in Grand Bend are 5+ bedroom, 3 bathroom! They can accommodate more than 8 people. Now no longer can 2 families share a cottage, its just going to increase the costs of these rentals.... Most, if not all cottages are fully booked for summer 2022, please clarify that you will not be implementing this for summer 2022 because its completely unfair to the families that planned to come as well as the cottage owners. You cant expect them to now change their group sizes....tell grandma she cant come?!
- Hello, we are not agreeing with licensing the short term rentals in Lambton Shores. The owners have been operating and relying on this income to live. This will bring headaches and issues to many owners. Stress that doesn't need to add to the already stressful situations people have been dealing with for the past 2 years due to the pandemic. People have been renting in this area for years and years with no problems and no license needed. We should keep things the same way. No need for change and stress!
- Hello I'm an home owner and full time resident of GrandBend. I have read the new STR licensing program regulation draft and find it well written and a very good program that will make GrandBend a better place for all. Hope it will be implemented soon
- Good day, I am part owner of [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED], a 6 bedroom home that we use a family gathering cottage and rent short term. Our place accommodates 14 people and makes for a lovely gathering spot for larger families to spend much needed time off. Our driveway accommodates parking for our guests and never have any of our guests used the street for parking since we have started managing the property ourselves in February 2021. Our guests have not caused any disturbances to our neighbours or to the city since we began managing. We are extremely strict on accepting only families with children and do not allow parties of any kind. All our guests have been very respectful of the neighbourhood and city. Limiting the short term rentals to 8 person max would be a massive detriment to our short term rental home. Please reconsider this restriction as it would drive so much business out of the Grand Bend area
- Based on the costs of the program I feel this is a money grab. Bylaws and enforcement are already paid for through our taxes. I believe that this is the municipalities way of making money off of others. If there is a fee associated it should only be a one time application fee per person, not per property and not per year. You havent justified the cost per year with a scalable proposal. This licencing program leaves cottages owners at risk of neighbours who dont like short term rentals in general and just complain to have them penalized. This programing could

make short term rentals not happen or worse go under ground. Our community will be greatly impacted negatively if we dont have the short term rentals here to accommodate the tourism. The responsible person clause isnt clear. I live in town and it could be hard to get anywhere wtihin 30 minutes depending on what im doing. I can be available via phone but to respond within 30 minutes isnt even reasonable. What is this person supposed to do that law enforcement cant deal with on their own if the situation is that serious. So to deal with noise complaints why would the short term rental be a different process then any other property? Do we not have by-laws and officers to enforce this? The occupancy limits are not even reasonable. Most private families are bigger then 8 people and when people are vacationing, just 2 families makes up more then 8. If the property is big enough to sleep more then that then each cottage should be individually allowed occupancy limits that represent the size of cottage. Capping this number at 8 for every cottage will only make demand for rentals increase and drive prices up. Expecting people to have secured store for garbage doesnt even make sense. Why do private property owners not require this but rentals do?? I agree with this idea but it should be applied to everybody. This licensing is not reasonable or fair to the STR operators and needs to be re-visited

- I am a member of the LSSTRA and have some concerns about the Proposed Short-Term Rental (STR) Licensing Program. I have rented cottages in Lambton Shores for 4 years now during the summer and feel that this new proposal infringes on the rights of responsible cottage owners. It will discourage responsible STR and make it extremely difficult for them to provide much needed accommodations during the summer months. Grand Bend/Lambton Shores provides amazing rentals and is known as a summer destination. As you know the population is approximately 2000 and can increase at times to 50,000 during the summer months. The town generates much revenue on its tourism and discouraging STR (which I feel this proposal does) just does not make any sense when it is already difficult to find accommodations that must also be booked well in advance of the summer months.

These are my objections:

- 1) The demerit points system punishes cottage owners for the wrong doing of their renters. Most STR owners do not want unruly guests who may potentially cause damage to their property. Owners spend a considerable amount of money to upkeep their properties and also provide revenue to many companies in the area that rely on their business, from real estate and booking agents to electricians and cleaners. It also makes it easy for people to complain and unjust grievances may be easily misdirected at the detriment of responsible property owners. Instead a contract could be established in which the actual rental parties that cause disruption, damage or break any local bylaws should be made to pay and take responsibility for their actions.
- 2) The occupancy limit of 8 is an unreasonable request. When we visit the cottage there are usually 3 families that rent together and it was very comfortable to have 10 individuals share a 4 bedroom cottage. There are sometimes 3 generations of families as well and this would be a definite deterrent for many renters and owners and limit their abilities to find and provide appropriate and available accommodations that would fit their needs.
- 3) This proposal also creates a high potential for disruptions in providing reliable accommodations, the revoking of licenses based on the demerit program poses a threat to bookings that may have been made a year in advance and would be a considerable loss of

revenue for owners and it also jeopardizes renters long term plans for vacationing in Lambton Shores, as they may be suddenly faced with the possibility of cancelled booking contracts. I for one would not appreciate that and it would make me seriously consider renting properties elsewhere.

Thank you for considering my opinions on this matter, I hope that there is a resolution made that will guarantee easier access to STR accommodations that provide a high level of quality cottages in Lambton Shores because it is a beautiful place to visit and a great community to support

- The proposed licensing program will become challenging for tourists to find accommodations within the Grand Bend area. Grand Bend is known for being a tourist town and tourists are who bring money to this town. Without them Grand Bend would not have much to offer for the local residents who live here year round. Imposing restrictions on the number of guests that can stay within one dwelling will prevent large family groups and events from coming to this town. There are many households who can accommodate more than 8 people comfortably, with 2 people per room. Why should these accommodations have to decrease their number of guests and make less money? More bedrooms = larger mortgages, which is why nightly pricing for these homes is more. More expenses to cover! Ultimately it will affect the tourists of GB as less people allowed in a house will increase the per guest amount. With rising prices of everything in the world right now, we shouldn't strip this from the people who make Grand Bend what it is. The demand for larger homes in GB for short term stays is ridiculous right now, there's not enough of them! It doesn't make sense for the town to turn down hundreds of dollars spent by one large family every trip to GB and instead collect \$450 ANNUALLY. That will be huge money losses for the town. The cons listed for STR in this proposal are nearly nonexistent. Never once have I had concerns about garbage and recycling and parking by my guests OR neighbours. Surely terrible hosts should be penalized for these things, but considering how little it comes up, it should be dealt with on a by matter basis. The annual fee is the least of my concerns, but as soon as the licensing affects how I can operate my STR then it will cause many issues. I wouldn't be surprised if it causes hosts to exit the market and put their houses for sale, only for non-revenue generating individuals to buy and live permanently and for GB to no longer be what it is today. A smarter move would be for individuals seeking long term accommodations to NOT move into downtown GB if they don't like the atmosphere of people enjoying their vacations
- As a Short term rental owner, I can understand and appreciate the challenges that comes with hosting short term rentals in the community. I can agree to a licensing process and ensuring that our cottage is safe for guests with appropriate fire safety plans, fire extinguishers etc. We have always wanted to ensure that guests are safe in our space. I am willing to pay a licensing fee and be governed through the same bylaws our neighbours must comply with to ensure its is a well balanced neighbourhood. My agreement to the contents of the proposed licensing process stops at the the proposed demerit point system and capacity enforcement. This proposed demerit point process creates a whole new standard of governing the owners of short term rentals. It is a secondary, two tier system where there would be different standards of governing your tax payers. This comes off as totalitarian and an overt abuse of power. You already have bylaws to manage many of the the issues addressed through your demerit point system. The implementation of the demerit point system will require the development, implementation and maintenance of a whole new administrative system to manage the demerit point tracking,

appeals etc. As a tax payer I think this is misuse of public funds, again since there is already an effective mechanism, a bylaw system, to handle many of these issues. The proposed capacity ceiling is once again an overreach of government. I do not feel it is the governments place to determine how many people I invite into my home. While I can appreciate a standard set for the number of people sleeping in a home based on number of beds, a ceiling of 8 seems to be unfounded and un substantiated as some properties are much larger and can safely hold more than 8 guests. I strongly encourage the municipality of Lambton Shores to re think these design principles of the proposed short term rental licensing process, as without doing so, the economic infrastructure will be placed at significant risk due to the exodus of responsible short term rental owners.

- This is terrible idea. Tourists are essential for this municipality. These restrictions will be hard for the local businesses and will have negative impact. SRT licensing is just a money grab! No benefit to anyone
- The demerit points is unreasonable- if you have a difficult renter this could result in unwarranted penalties. The limit of 8 renters is also an unfair restriction. Many rentals are designed to accommodate more than one family or large groups. It should be up to the owners discretion what number of guests can be accommodated. Possibly 6 guests per bathroom or 1 parking spot per 6 guests
- I agree with a licensing system, but using demerit points on items owners can not control is a power grab. Also, number of guests should be limited based on amount of rooms/beds available. Unless your goal is to drive away investors and in turn hurt all the local businesses, then do what you have proposed
- I am concerned about decks being built at higher elevations where loud voices spread noise. Ban cars parking on lawns of rentals. Fine renters that do not recycle. Ban smoking dope whose smoke goes beyond the rental property line. Music cannot be heard beyond the rental property line. No partying on the streets or adjacent property. No barking dogs. Fires only in one approved and professionally built fire pit
- How is a str or airbnb defined? How do you distinguish between a full time str and the person who occasionally rents out their cottage to help offset some of the costs of maintaining their cottage? A min usage should be allowed before needing to apply for a license.
- Licensing Program and Garbage - what would be considered a "secure area" for garbage and recycling and why would this be any different for an STR as opposed to a single use cottage or residence? We've had issues before with our garbage, ie, another property owner driving into our neighborhood and disposing of thier waste in our garbage can - nothing to do with STR's
- Capacity Limits - if a cottage our home has 4 plus bedrooms and the sq footage to accommodate why the 8 person max? Does not appear to be based on any critieria other than limiting group size which would impact family gatherings negatively. As well, why limit this to STR's, perhaps this should apply to any residential home in Lambton Shores
- I have owned and enjoyed our home in Grand Bend for 15 years and have rented our property to family and friends during the summer In addition to other families. I have never had any issues with my rentals as I have a very strict screening process and only rent to families with children. Most times I have 2 or 3 families staying at our cottage with grandparents etc. I am completely against this obvious money grab as things have been operating within Grand Bend successfully within STR ever since we purchased our home. I understand there may be issues

with certain STR rentals (mostly off the main strip) but that can easily be addressed with bylaw officers without punishing I would say over 90% responsible cottage owners. The proposed maximum 8 occupancy is ridiculous. When my parents and 2 brothers come and spend time with us at our cottage, we are 12 people enjoying time by the fire and making fond family memories. Everyone has a bed (2 per bed). I've had families in the past that live overseas that travel to Grand Bend to visit family and they rent our home so they can spend some quality time together. Again hard to put a restriction of 8 people when clearly this is not a feasible number with extended family. With safety of utmost importance, we already have fire extinguishers and safety measures in place (CO2 detectors and fire alarms etc). I'm not against an annual inspection for this but everything else you are proposing is ridiculous (LOCKED GARBAGE DISPOSAL) not understanding the reasoning for this. You have also failed to mention that in my home what if I want to invite my entire family for a weekend or week at the cottage to spend with us and we are more than 8 people. This whole thing is a waste of resources and time and I believe there is a better solution for the majority of STR owners that have never had any issues and are now at risk with a demerit point system that can fall to some false claims easily by people that have nothing better to do with their time

- Application and Licensing Fees: I think the STR licensing is a great benefit for the rental owners, and the neighbors around knowing that there are regulations in place to protect all parties involved. But I think there should be rules in place for different areas of Lambton Shores, Most of the rental properties and complaints are from Grand Bend, this is a VERY high traffic rental area. I don't believe the small percentage of rentals like Upperwash Beach should be penalized for renting their residence out. I believe the Application fees shouldn't be the same, but the licensing should be on a scale of rentals. Grand Bend should be the highest licensing fees due to more people are renting there (more complaints), Upperwash Beach should be the lowest as there are fewer rentals. Insurance Requirements, I think this should be law, you should have rental insurance, if you don't you lose everything. Conclusion, I don't think that an owner that is renting their residence and doing it the proper way should be penalized with fees. If an owner already has these regulations in place and have NO complaints, shouldn't be obligated to pay these fees, I believe we should have them in place, but when complaints are coming in, the by-law officers should be checking for all the proper items, fire escape route, insurance, etc. then they get charged for breaking them if they are not in place.
- Thanks for all your work on this! Appreciate your time. The total maximum occupancy is too low. Scenario: My brother and I wanted to rent a place together for the week and we each have 3 children, total of 4 adults 6 kids. What if I wanted to invite my parents? Many rental houses in the area can easily accommodate this. I understand the other scenario is 8 people together partying for the weekend... Somehow differentiate between families with children capacity? Many of the houses can easily accommodate family vacations together, don't take away family vacations....
- My feedback is as the following: While I can appreciate the overall goal of peace and harmony amongst the entire county over STRs, it is doubtful that any decision reached will achieve this. I am an STR operator and have always strived to be incredibly picky with our guest choices, I have always run with an 8 person limit other than one or two babies extra. We have all of the required fire safety equipment already in place and enough parking for our guests. Prior to purchasing our home, I did all kinds of research about STR operations, consulted with our real

estate broker about this and researched all by laws. Now, the laws are going to change and problems could arise despite myself being a very responsible operator and doing all research ahead of time. I believe some of this should be grandfathered in such as the 30 minute response time. I think it is fair to say that most operators live an hour or more away and that is just penalizing those that do. Some of us have cranky neighbours that are not in favor of living next to a STR and will do whatever it takes to shut them down. All it take is 2 calls and that operator is done if demerits are handed out. That is not fair in my opinion. All of this has come about so quickly, you cant honestly believe that things are being "considered" when in actual fact, it is ready to be launched this spring. I also think the timing is incredibly coincidental as all of the hotel spaces and rental accomodation from one owner are ready for opening. I cant help but wonder how much push is coming from one person in particular. Instead of a bunch of people making a little bit of money to subsidize their retirement plans.....lets let one company capitalize on peoples vacation plans. There is nothing appealing to my guests about that type of experience, my guests want a home to themselves to make their own memories. They also have access to a hotel should they choose to book it. I think by removing some STRs it forces anyone who wants to travel there to eventually book with them as there is little other options available. My vote is to change the 30 minute on site time to 1.5hrs to give owners a chance to show up and deal with any issues. Also, capacity should be 8 not including children under 10 such as other counties are doing. The hotline is a great idea because if there is an issue i want to know about it and my goal is to fit in with my beautiful neighborhood, not divide it. But i am very skeptical that this will not weed out those frivolous and vexatious calls that have been mentioned in your report. Perhaps the implentation of outdoor security cameras can be enforced as then loud guests can be viewed on screen after a call comes in with a complaint of this. Security cameras are not illegal as long as guests know where they are and they are not in private areas. Installed outside on the property would give some insight into how the guests are behaving or if a neighbor is being vexatious. I would really hope that more consultation and discussion can happen before anything is officially launched. Thank you,

- I am not in favor of the current proposal as it stands. I feel an abuse of the program by those not supporting STR's will be rampant. Who decides whats an infraction? The demerit system is unfair and needs some work
- I wish to commend the Council and staff on what is a serious, thorough, and professional attempt to grapple with this issue. I am sure there will be push back from some running businesses in residential neighborhoods, but assume the rights of permanent residents and second home owners to enjoy their homes will take precedence. While I do not necessarily agree with all conclusions and recommendations, success or failure will hinge on political will and enforcement. I have some issue with the projection of 261 licences . I believe this number is substantially lower than the actual number of units available and rented in 2020. My concern is, wherever this number came from, it indicates a failure to appreciate the extent and size of the problem, or worse still 'the urgency to act in 2022.
- As a home owner in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] I appreciate all of the work done in getting this far. I like what you have proposed. I think it's a good idea to limit occupancy to 8 people (I hope that means all of the time and not just how many are sleeping there) and that there will be a phone number I can call. I hope the responsible person will be able to take care of things. Thanks again and please don't water down the suggestions you have made!

- As a cottage owner I am extremely upset with licensing program proposed. We purchased our property as a young family with the intention of renting the weeks we cannot be there in order to pay off what we hope will be our retirement home. We screen our renters carefully as we care about our home but we do not control them. For a township to take away demerit points and possibly tell us that we can no longer rent OUR property and our investment is not acceptable. People may lose their properties if they do not have the rental income to support their investment. Also, the capacity of a 2 , 3 or 4 bedroom cottage should NOT be the same as a five bedroom! If anything it should be two people per bedroom at least!! You are then disadvantaging those that paid more for a five bedroom cottage as they will have to compete with the prices of a two bedroom! In light of all of the financial hits the pandemic has brought on as well as the increased cost of living, now telling property owners to take a further hit on investments is unfair. Grand Bend is a tourist town. We rely on visitors. The height of the rental season is the summer. It provides the funds for cottage owners to afford upkeep of their properties for the rest of the year. Do not bite the hand that feeds our community businesses and future residents!!
- I have a problem with the whole thing. If the cottage you rent out for the summer is your only rental and your residence during the off-season, then you should not fall under this overreach. Some folks have been doing this for decades to supplement their income. Prior to big developers coming in and air bnb type investors, there were individual cottage owners who do not belong in this group. They should be grandfathered in or exempt under a single principle residence. There are already bylaws for noise and building codes for safety and number of people, garbage containers, parking issues. There no need to waste more money over regulating what is already there. Assigning a Responsible person is ridiculous and not legally binding for legal liability for criminal, fire/building or insurance let alone the added cost to pay someone to do this
- licensing STR should provide a uniform standard to all facilities . Not only will this enable bylaw officers to have a means of enforcing abuse where it occurs by occupants, but to ensure facilities meet a standard regarding safety of occupants , parking, septic capacity.. I strongly support the proposed program
- How will the complaint be monitored and points taken in relation to this. You have several people who are constant complainers that will have power to ruin a season for a landlord. What if same complaint comes in multiple times for same reason before a solution has been implemented?? Who monitors all gf this?? This will b a free for all. I want to know how it is monitored and enforced
- I would have actually like to have seen a system in place that if someone was returning to the area and had rented before with no issues (regardless of whether 3 or 33 people in their family - should the cottage be able to accomodate within fire codes/parking etc.) they are 'screened' to return to the area. If it was someone who caused trouble for the home owner / community - they be put on a 'blocked' list. Have a standardized process that asks "have you rented before and are returning" should it be someone new they are put on 'probation' for the first year until the host vets the individuals renting for future return visits. How are you considering the cottage owners who have rented for years - often times to the same families - or are you not considering them? Are you only targetting those who are advertising on Airbnb in order to market their

properties? Have you considered using the 'fees' to set up a landing page where all short term rentals could advertise for free and guests could be prescreened through that same platform?

- COVID restrictions have all but been lifted - or very soon; will all have been lifted province wide. THIS is a discussion that should have happened in person!!! THIS should be an open forum!! You began investigating this during covid when many were not comfortable (or offered the opportunity) to come in person for a adult conversation. THIS is being pushed through by those with deep pockets at a time when there has been so much unrest in our province/country/world. THIS was NOT an appropriate time to be working through this process. Your community is part of your municipality and deserves more than THIS when they are helping to bring financial rewards to OUR council!
- I do not think this licensing program is a good idea. I think it will create more problems than solutions. I highly recommend that you do NOT do this.
- 8 people max is too restrictive. Families renting are looking to have more people to celebrate and enjoy the summer. 10-12 people is sufficient.
- Think recommendations or a guidance list for new airbnb owners is nice to offer. Although I believe this licensing program to be well intended, it is quite extreme.
 1. Secure Garbage? Our municipality offers great waste program with the bins, airbnbs could upgrade to the large garbage bins, or get second garbage bin & Recycling bin. In rental rules, have guests take the garbage to the curb on garbage day, or cleaning staff remove garbage. Airbnb hosts could provide garbage bags so things are cleaned up
 2. Occupancy Limit. How are families suppose to travel together? only two people per legal room? 1 Bunk beds could sleep 3-4 depending on size. Some families have more then 8 in a single family, understand that may not be the average, some large families are a family of 8-13 children alone with one set of parents- I personally have European friends who have large families of these sizes.
 3. If a property has more then one house, then could legally house more people.
 4. Airbnb, Ontario has penalties if a host cancels on guests. If a neighbour made up complaints against a property just because they don't like short term rental, you could extremely harm short term rental owner.
 5. Are there repercussions for residents if to many unreasonable complaints are made, if short term rental owner has made multiple accommodations to make things better for the neighbours, do the short term rental owners get support from the township? Some people are not happy with anything in life. Demerit points are low for shutting down short term rental. Shut down for 6 months? Most short term rentals work hard to be a positive addition to the community.
 - 6 Realtors should be made aware of these rules and regulations when selling a property so new owners may come in with knowledge.
 - 7 Could be a number limit on younger adults who may tend to not respect property the same way.
 8. A list of guidance questions could be delivered to short term rental hosts to ask guests before they arrive so things can be managed better
 9. Is the township looking at how things are run and grandfathering some things in as lots of short term rentals have been doing great work to benefit everyone as a whole?

10. It is a different time now, the dollar does not go as far, so more people offer short term rental to offset costs to still be able to enjoy a house or cottage in life. Some places do not require carbon monoxide detectors.

11. Noise complaints/ demerit points- at what point are guests of short term rentals not given a fine for loud noise or past 11pm or do not respect the township? Why is all the punishment on short term rental owners and not people who are committing it? Do adult guests not have any responsibility for there actions? Is there a bylaw coming into effect for residents to respect short term rental? To teach neighbours to talk to each other, to be a community again

Benefits Short term rental bring to the community:

Local business,

Dying towns such as Thedford get opportunity to boom again, existing towns that are doing well get to do better.

Fuel stations, golf courses, restaurants, flea markets, local stores, cideries, wineries , Landscape companies, cleaners, construction

For such small communities to thrive and have local work and not have to drive so far to work yet stay in rural areas benefit from these places

Bringing new and young people to a community so it can continue to grow

Sanitation: have short term rentals on septic bed- pump based on size of septic tank size- every two years or every year

Going forward- Have new subdivisions built just for long term residential only, or retirement only to help people be in certain areas?

- I have reviewed the proposed licensing program and would like to express my concerns over several proposed items.
 1. The licensing program proposed occupancy limit does not take into account properties who are much larger than the average rental in Grand Bend, or property owners who have paid to have larger septic systems. The maximum occupancy limit will deter many young families who travel together from renting in our area. For example, a family of 5 (e.g., parents and 3 children) and grandparents may not longer seek rentals in our area, as they cost to rent two cottage would be beyond most families financial limit.
 2. The proposed demerit system - The points per infraction seem arbitrary. What system was used to generate this? The website states, "Demerit points would be applied when a conviction is rendered, or fines are paid, and is not based on complaints to discourage frivolous or vexatious complaints against certain properties.". While I appreciate the proposed licensing program has stated that demerit points will not be based on complaints alone to discourage frivolous or vexatious complaints, what will be the standard for determining when a "conviction is rendered or fines are paid". For example, what is the baseline for a "noise complaint" and how is it determined that one has met that threshold?
 3. Responsible Party - If a responsible party has made attempts to contact their guests within the time frame of 30 minutes and they are unable to make contact (e.g., the guest does not pick up their phone), what mechanism is in place to have that acknowledged through the program? The "Municipality of Lambton Shores has existing by-laws (e.g., Noise By-Law) that could address some concerns related to short-term rentals" and acknowledge that the increase in STR has resulted in an increased need for by-law enforcement. Why is the Municipality not looking into options to hire more officers? Who will be charged by the bylaw officer for a noise

complaint? Under the proposed licensing program, it implies the home owner will be? There is no deterrence for guests to comply under this proposed program.

While I see benefits of a STR licensing program, including fire regulations, parking and a licensing fee to collect money and put back in our community, overall, the proposed restrictions and demerit system will deter property owners from renting and could deter families from vacationing in our area. Grand Bend relies on vacationers. I would encourage the committee to reconsider the maximum number of occupants, the demerit system, and the responsible party points

- I understand the benefits of this; however the demerit point system is a little ridiculous. I've rented STRs in Grand Bend and had no issues with the woman I rented from responding if there was an issue. I don't believe the owners should be on the hook for drunken disorderly behaviour from guests. They also shouldn't have to remain nearby or have someone else remain nearby "just in case". Such [Expletive removed] concept
- It is encouraging that the Municipality is putting rules in place to control short term rentals (STR). However, you are closing your eyes to the long term problem with continued investment into properties for the sole purpose of creating a STR, VRBO or Airbnb. The province of Ontario has a significant housing shortage, and every property that is converted from either long term rental or residential home ownership to a STR, adds to the problem. For Grand Bend specifically for each additional STR added in the community, this means one less additional full time family or long term rental for much needed employees to work at area businesses. If we are truly committed to growing the "Community" of Grand Bend, there must be limitations set on the number of STR's and corporate ownership for the sole purpose of creating a STR. In Grand Bend, there tends to be a focus on STR's that are predominately rented in the summer. This means we don't have residents occupying in the winter to support local businesses. There is a growing trend for families to want to raise their children in Communities like Grand Bend, but these same families don't want to find themselves surrounded by STR's and renters that don't contribute or add long term value of the growing Community. As a Council, you have the obligation to help fix the housing crisis, or you can be not make changes and be contributors to the problem
- 1. Many people who only own 1 cottage and have been renting for years will stop renting due to the added expense. Grand Bend will lose the small cottage owner and all rentals will become businesses, hotels, airbnb. Perhaps licenses should be for more than 1 family cottage.
 2. Yes there is a need for some regulation of people that are running businesses with 2 or more cottages without contact with the renters and self check in leads to large numbers.
 3. Many places in Southcott etc are able to accommodate many more than 8. Is this 8 adults? Are children counted. A family with 5 children, grandparents, and adult children are not going to cause problems. Also different areas have different problems. Perhaps the main village is where you should start licensing. Check where most complaints come from.
 4. Most people already have rentals completed for the summer with deposits a bit late to change numbers etc.
 5. A large number of staff will be needed to administer this. By law officers can't keep up with just the beach.
- Money grab and more policing therefore more administrative work thus you need to hire

- I am a short term rental owner of 2 properties in Grand Bend since 2004. I already have a day and night max of 8 ppl in place and have done so for many years. I think the short term rental program has some benefits but does have areas that have not been fully thought through. 250 licenses is not enough. For people like myself who have been operating responsibly since 2004 ...how do I secure my license as I have a proven history of responsible renting.? Newer owners do not have the experience to run responsible rentals as it is something you learn overtime. These newer owners can often be the ones who are violating the rules. There should be a grandfathered in program for responsible landlords. Payment for the license remains but granting license should be grandfathered in. My properties have always been reported on my tax returns as rentals. The program will cause a divide in the communities. I know first hand from over the years that our full time neighbours make more noise and overcrowding than my rentals do, Full time owners feel entitled to have large family gatherings etc as it is their principal home. I charge a hefty security upfront to my tenants which is to cover an in case noise complaint. My rentals know that if I receive one noise complaint that they lose their entire security deposit. It works because I have never had to implement it. The demerit program is unfair and unrealistic. I agree with septic regulation, fire and safety and occupancy limits.
- I think the limit of 8 people is unreasonable. IE, 5 bedrooms with queen beds should allow 10 people. 4 bedrooms with queen beds and a pullout couch 10 people. Or maybe number of people per bathroom can be considered? 4 people per? Many home in some areas, especially Southcott have larger homes that can accommodate more people. Have owned a summer home in Grand Bend for over 30 years, we do not rent it out, but have had many summers of friends and family visit GB in large groups to stay together
- My wife and I have owned a property in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] for 7 years and have rented it to vacationers each of those 7 years. We have never received a complaint from our neighbours many of whom are year round residents. When our children were young we would rent a home in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] for a week each summer. We were glad that some people were prepared to do so as we could not afford a place of our own. This year, all 10 of our renter families are return guests. They enjoy the beach, sun and town for 7 days and then leave the property and neighbourhood the way they found it. For the next family. There are a lot of changes taking place in Grand Bend these days and I know that it causes a great deal of concern among some of the long time residents. Not all, but some. I understand their trepidation over the changes to what they have known, and enjoyed for years and decades. The strip does look very different. The restaurants and business have changed. Grand Bend has been found. That's okay. Let them come. They are drawn here for the same reasons that we were all drawn here in the first place. Community. I know my close neighbours. I say hi to people as I walk down my street even though I'm meeting them that very moment. It is an easy place to live. I am not aware of any chronic problems with summer renters in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED], or at least in my area of [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMITTED] . From time to time there are some louder get togethers on Canada Day and the like, but those are not renters, they are most often owners. And good for them! It's a pretty fantastic place to live and a celebration is in order. So why is the Municipality of Lambton Shores devoting so much time, energy and resources to a problem that I have not seen in 7 years? Longer if you include the 7 summers we rented. I suspect someone does not care for renters (outsiders) to be in our community. It does not take a groundswell of wide public opinion to

trigger this type of government intervention. It usually takes a small, vocal, properly placed minority. I have seen no map or statistics that support the need for a "licensing program" and all of the administration that it will require. Do we have statistics indicating that the OPP have been called out on an ever increasing basis due to noise complaints? Have we plotted those complaints on a map? We should if we have not. I would never want to simply ignore a real and pressing issue. Similarly, I do not want to go down a path of increased costs and administration simply because someone is scared. People are often scared of change. I am not an expert but it has been my personal experience that what passes as anger and discomfort in our world is, at its heart, fear. We fear change. We fear the unknown. We fear walking next door to our neighbour and letting them know that their campfire songs are a little loud when our bedroom window is only 30 feet away. Perhaps they are younger than we are. Or maybe they have had a couple of drinks. Our fear stops us from taking the actions a neighbour would and should be entitled to take. If you are experiencing short term renters who are colouring outside the lines a bit, take one chance to interact with them and see if they correct their behaviour. Maybe that interaction takes place in the morning and not at night. No need to put your self in danger. If it is a truly bad situation then call the police. Community is built a little piece at a time on a thousand fronts. Building that community can be uncomfortable sometimes. For me too. But developing an elaborate licensing program and all that it takes to maintain it is counterproductive to continuing the place that is Grand Bend. The buildings on the strip and the names of the restaurants are not the keeps of the good feelings we all have about being a part of the Bend. That feeling is distributed evenly throughout our community. It is passed from those who move on to those who move in. For a week every summer it is experienced by families who are fortunate enough to rent here. If they are very lucky one day they too will move in. We don't need a Licencing Program in Grand Bend. Not yet anyway.

- The missing link with the draft by-law is including proof that the visitor who signs the rental contract actually was provided the information on the STR by-law by the Responsible person. There should be a clause included in all Lambton Shores STR rental agreements stating "I acknowledge receipt of the Visitor Guide from the Responsible Person and am aware that I, and my guests, must comply with all regulations contained in said guide". There should also be a requirement that all licensed STR properties must provide all neighbours, within earshot of said STR property, the name, email and 24/7 cell phone number of the Responsible Person connected to the STR property
- As a concept, I have no issue with the program. Frankly, I am glad to see such a program. However, I do have a few concerns:
 1. The licensing fee is way too high. I understand that the fee structure was established to operate on a break-even basis. SRAs have benefits for the municipality and local businesses. Why is it up to the owner to pay 100% of the break-even fee? There are many stakeholder groups that benefit, as such, the municipality should also be covering some of the costs of the program vs. having owners pay the entire expected break-even cost.
 2. The demerit point system is structured so that it will only take 1 rental/person to shut down my entire SRA business for 6 months. The municipality should be looking for patterns of misuse or non-compliance before completing shutting down an SRA for 6 months. I have run an SRA since 2015. I rent to families only, and never exceed 8 people. I post our community etiquette and turn away guests that do not "fit" the expectations. As I reviewed the demerit points, I can

recall one family that could have caused me to receive 7 demerit points, which could, under this new system, result in my SRA being shut down for 6 months. My point is, I have a pattern of positive rentals. Along with the demerit points, you should also consider tracking the history of rentals with no issues. This can be done by having the owners report the # of SRAs they have per month. This data could then be considered should 1 bad renter slip through people's typical vetting systems. All SRA owners should have some sort of proof of each rental that could be reported. Maybe even as an optional part of the program. I believe this would be a balanced approach to the "demerit" system

- My only concern is why owners are made responsible for noise and disturbances. Any other business the person causing the issue is made responsible. Why STR has it the other way around??
- I think this is ridiculous, especially the demerit point system! Owners should not be reprimanded for irresponsible guests! This not only hurts the owners but the local shops who depend on tourism to keep them afloat
- We have previously participated in the offered STR survey to state that we are not in support of STRs within residential areas. Many other cities in many other countries are finding they have become a true detriment to their economy and way of life and are now imposing bans and drastic restrictions to try to correct a huge problem. We are disappointed and fearful about the decisions our council has made thus far regarding STRs in our municipality. In response to the opportunity to now comment on council's proposal regarding a licensing program for STRs, we respectfully submit the following comments:

Definitions: We feel STRs should be permitted only to those persons who are offering up all or part of their 'principal residence' on a short term basis rental, with the actual home owner residing in the property a minimum 50% of the year. Property owners should have a vested interest in our municipality and community for best outcome.

Fees: We feel \$450 annual fee is not adequate to compensate all the following:

- related costs borne by the municipality for things like community services, fire and emergency services, infrastructure improvement, STR 'monitoring service, additional by-law enforcement, etc

- competition to the existing legitimately operated and 'commercially' taxed motels/hotels

- loss of tax revenue to municipality by STR owners not being properly taxed as 'commercial'

Demerit Points: We would suggest, for 7 demerit points, remove the words "up to a maximum of" STR Compliance Committee: Where is the 'non-political' and 'non-STR owner' representation on this committee? This needs to be included. Monitoring STRs: All Lambton Shores property owners must be provided access to the complete list of all licensed STR addresses, to enable proper use of the proposed 24-hr hotline if needed.

- While I agree with licensing program I don't understand penalizing legal 5+ bedroom cottages? These are always on our part, FAMILY ONLY rentals. We are even under priced in order to ensure LARGE FAMILIES can afford a Grand Bend holiday! It makes sense that legal bedrooms, with legal beds be allowed the accommodation safely of larger groups, ie large families. Please take this into consideration. We have had return renters for over 15 years now, what a shame to turn them away from Grand Bend. Thank you
- Re: "Occupancy limits are set based on 2 persons per legal bedroom plus 2 additional persons, up to a maximum capacity of 8 persons." I can't seem to figure this one out. I have a 5 bedroom

cottage, so I should be good for 10 people plus two additional, for a total of 12, right? Then it says maximum 8 - I don't get it. Please help me to understand this, thanks. I also find the \$450.00 fee a little on the outrageous side...

- To paraphrase a very wise man on this subject: I hate that you are targeting owners. If a customer goes to a store and causes disruption, it is the customer who gets in trouble when the police are called, not the store owner. Same with a hotel. An unruly guest is kicked out and or charged if police get involved, not the hotel owner. Your system is all "tax and punish" the cottage owner. Please cancel this unnecessary, costly, and unhelpful proposal. And when I read ALL the documentation provided by the municipality, I see no evidence presented that would suggest there is even an issue. The council seemed committed to doing this from the onset.
- Unfortunately many businesses count on Rentals in this community. If this law is passed. I will terminate my staff. I will then relocate my businesses to our other operating locations in Ontario. How can you cap a 4,5 or 6 bedroom homes with 8 people? How about a proportion of rooms per home to guest count. This is strictly a cash grab. Legal suits will follow in form of class action.
- Thank you very much for taking the time to create a proposed licensing program for short-term rentals. This will be soooo welcomed by many of us living in downtown Grand Bend. The parking chaos is getting worse every year, and this will help to alleviate that a bit. In the last few years, a number of rentals and new Airbnb's have been overflowing with people, being they advertise that they sleep 16. This program would also bring that under control. Sometimes in the past, when a complaint has been made to by-law, it has either been ignored, or we've been told to call the OPP, who tell us to call by-law. Having this in place, and a designated by-law officer to enforce it, would be welcomed by many of us! I assume you will get a lot of push back from the people packing renters into their places for huge rental fees, but those of us who own and live in our places seem to be getting pushed out. Thank you, and good luck!
- I think having a Third Party Monitoring system will provide a necessary buffer to support neighbours reporting breaches of the agreement. It can be awkward to contact a neighbour directly. Many of us avoid this and just put up with unruly renters. I think the maximum occupants could be increased to 10, providing there is bedroom capacity. Many people like to take extended family, like grandparents, on a vacation and this keeps it affordable. I wish there was a way for owners to have more influence on the behaviour of their renters on the beach. I understand this is difficult to control, but that is a place where local residents are impacted. This is particularly felt in Southcott, and other smaller or private beach areas. It doesn't take much for a large crowd to ruin the experience for others. Congratulations on what seems a carefully thought out plan. I don't think the fees are exorbitant. Rental prices have gone up considerably, and some money should be going back to the community impacted by the growing influx of people coming to enjoy our great area. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.
- I object this proposal as it stands. The demerit point system is a massive over reach giving access power to NYMBY neighbours and a guilty until proven innocent philosophy. The lost tourism from a 6 month suspension would cost the local businesses ten of thousands in lost tourism dollars. Fine the guests, increase fines for properties that have issues as deterrent. This proposal has massive gaps in it is going lead to major divide between residents. Operators and bi laws should be allies in solving potential problems guests. This proposal pits operators against enforcement as owners will be concerned to engage enforcement for help at fear of demerit

points . The occupancy limits are not reasonable to enforce and could lead to more drinking and driving as well as for operators to discriminate against families. The responsible person definition is flawed and unreasonable. This need to be deferred for at least another year to adequately form a true guideline for all residents, and a legitimate BALANCED proposal is agreed on. Voting for this proposal as it stands could be devastating to the tourism and businesses in the community! REFUSE this application

- Tourism is a significant contributor to the Lambton Shore, more specifically the Grand Bend economy. It contributes by driving tourists into the area who in turn contribute monetarily to different sectors including hotel, retail, etc. Short term rentals attract longer guests, which increases their guest's chances of spending within our community. Owners of short term accommodations about contribute to the economy of the municipality of Lambton Shores. This is done in was such as purchasing of supplies from local businesses, hiring local companies for upgrades or renovation or employee members of the community for landscaping or cleaning services. This new licensing program will be creating a deterrent for property owners to operate as short term accommodations. It is an extreme stretch to levy fees on these operations and the extreme nature of the proposed regulations does not foster a positive working relationship between short term accommodations owners and the municipality. Moreover, it creates a division within the community. The municipality should not move forwards with this proposal. Or more specific work should be completed to target the most problem some complaints about short term accommodations, if any exist. This current proposal seems to be more punitive rather than cooperative. The municipality should not move forward with current proposed licensing program
- I support the proposed licensing program , as a year round down town resident I have noticed the heavy influx of multiple people rentals and the problem associated with these properties. From the lack of parking , to the late evening party's with the accompanying garbage that is strewn about, I believe this program may hopefully reduce this behaviour and some of the unmentioned problems.
- We are not in favour of the proposed licensing program. As residence of Port Franks for almost 40 years, we have come to know this as cottage country and with that comes an influx of vacationers during the warmer weather. Requiring property owners, who pay taxes to pay additional fees to use their property as they see fit is overstepping. We have police and by-law enforcement in place to handle concerns. If the municipality cannot manage resources, the answer is not adding additional fees to tax payers. This proposal appears to be adding more administration and bureaucracy. There are property owners who do not rent who don't maintain their property, there are property owners who have regular gatherings of friends and family and exceed 2 people per bedroom and there are property owners who don't manage their garbage and we manage them through our existing by-laws. This proposal is unfairly targeting property owners who rent. Once again, we are not in favour of this proposal.
- This feedback is regarding the demerit point system proposed. Ideally, the demerit point system should be removed from the proposed licensing program. Many short term rental owners try consciously to screen guests to ensure they are suitable as their property is being used by guests. No owner wants their property, cottage, decor, etc. damaged or for their guests to cause to disturbance within the community. Keeping this in mind, the owner of a short term accommodation's owner cannot guarantee the behaviors of their guests. Guests conduct

unfortunately, is a factor that cannot be entirely controlled. Specifically, #1, #2, #5, #6, etc do not take this un-controllable factor into consideration. No short term accommodation owner or hotel owner in the community can guarantee the behaviour during their stay. Demerit points are not fair to an owner. Moreover, an owner could have two sets of guests within two years that cause the owner to their business suspended. This is unacceptable, unfair towards owner. Moreover, how can ceasing an operation be based on factor that are not completely controllable. The demerit point system should be removed from the proposed licensing program

- Getting rid of short term rentals will be detrimental to our town. Our great businesses rely on these renters. It is already hard enough for these businesses to survive on two busy months per year. Wasaga beach is not a town I want Grand Bend to look like. I have friends that have a family cottage there and they complain of a ghost town where thriving businesses used to sit. I grew up as a kid in grand bend with my family owning a cottage and now I own my own property and never once have short term renters bothered us. We know our town needs these renters! We beg you to not ban short term rentals.
- I support short term rentals it brings business to all of the local stores and restaurants. They need all the help they can get after the pandemic
- I am of the option the proposed STR licensing is a positive move forward toward achieving a balance between business owners and reseed risk home owners. I particularly like the restriction of number of people per residence. A great deal of problems are the result of too many people showing up to one residence for a weekend of partying.
- waste of resources, time and money and will not generate any revenue. This will be a nightmare to implement and regulate
- Firstly, ideally the demit point system should not be included in the licensing program, it should be removed. The demerit points are much too high and result in a ridiculous expectation placed on owners. If an owner has two incidents of any kind, this triggers a six month shut down, impacting the livelihood and creating far reaching financial impacts. Moreover, this could cause a short term rental to go out of business. By law should handling any of the complaints listed in this demerit points. This is far to much of a punitive strategy being taken by the municipality.
- Current insurance policies allow adhoc rentals of a few weeks for the whole year without listing as a short term rental. The \$500 of fees PLUS the insurance requirement showing an insurance policy as as a short term rental (premiums will increase) will prevent home owners from renting for a few weeks (e.g., while they are on vacation). This will end this practice as you will have to rent your home for several months to cover the costs. Eliminating these homes as part time rentals will place an even greater financial burden on families trying to supplement their income during a period of massive inflation, increasing property taxes and increasing insurance premiums. I don't see provisions to support the infrequent renter trying to supplement their income. In addition, this extra burden will decrease the number of available rooms available for local tourism and the shortage of rooms will further increase skyrocketing rates (supply and demand) for tourists. This is another \$500 government burden per business and kills the infrequent rental business.
- Awful plan. Don't bite the hand that feeds you. Tourism feeds this town
- Secure Garbage. Everyone in the community has efficient and effective roll garbage and recycle bins, which keep garbage and recycling both contained and secure. This section of the proposed

licensing program should be removed unless it implemented to every tax payer in the community. The only possible requirements could be labeling of the bins.

- Occupancy Limit. There should not be a blanket occupancy limit of 8 people per cottage. Often families want to travel together on holidays, this stipulations would not allow two families with three or more children to travel/vacation together. Similarly, many grandparents like to book a time away with their children and their grandchildren. Many short term accommodations can properly accommodation more than 8 guests. This regulation should be removed.
- Bottom line is there are good landlords and bad. I believe this is a good idea to level out the playing field specifically with respect to parking issues that are out of control, safety issues and the number of “tenants” overrunning some rentals. I have questions abt how it will be managed and enforced but I’m sure it will be executed well, This is a good idea!
- Time to respond. Many owners operate short term accommodations in to for the rental income to help pay for the property. Some owner's only own one property in the area. Implementing a 30 minutes reaction time is not realistic or feasible as this is a very short time frame, many owners would react as quickly as possible, as something is occurring on their property. Moreover, there are other factors such as a cell phones being out of range, a work meeting, attending a funeral, etc. which may delay a response. Perhaps two contacts can be listed. Thinking having two people to contact will be very helpful. Short term accommodation owners are not not a large corporation with vast resources and the ability to respond more immediately. Respectfully, there should not be a time-limit to response.
- Don't be swayed by the "Not in my back yard" crowd. They're usually the loudest voices with the least to contribute. Short term rentals are good for our economy, Don't wrap them up in red tape and restrictions.
- Fee should be a lot more than the 500 you are proposing to charge. I am against short term rental but if we are going to have it needs to be controlled.
- Demerit Points should be removed from the proposed licensing program for short-term rentals. Unfortunately, it is based on many variables that are not controllable. If neighbors do not want a short term rental in there area, they will have an opportunity to continuously complain, even though it is not legitimate. This places a lot of power in neighbors hands and unfortunately all they have to do is complain to ruin a short term accommodation rental. Sadly, there are people who do indeed complain unnecessarily. Due to reasons outlined above, demerit points should be eliminated.
- Thank you so much for allowing the opportunity to provide feedback. Overall I am in agreement with a form of licensing and the need for properties to be adequately maintained for and insured; however, based on the draft proposed licensing parameters, I have concerns as follows:
1) The licensing fee unduly penalizes the a single family residence which poses less of a risk than a unit that may be a high volume rental with high levels of occupancy. The proposal does not seem to be risk based as a result. I would suggest that the number of bedrooms (i.e. 1-2 bedrooms, 3-5 bedrooms, etc) be used to properly reflect the burden such higher occupancy units place. I am the owner of a small two bedroom home away from the grand bend centre and situated on an acre of land. I would be responsible to pay the same license fee as one that is 4-6 bedrooms and having 8-10 occupants with little parking in the main area of town. I do not see this as an adequate method of levying the fee. Instead a simple two tier system should be used. It is extremely unreasonable to levy the same fee on a property that generates \$10,000 revenue

as one that is generating \$70,000. Again, where is the risk map to support this? Shouldn't there be a heat map of where violations are occurring or where the burden on the municipality exists and that naturally coincide with higher rates? This blanket approach is not risk-based.

2) The demerit point system in some cases is a matter of one occurrence or 'one and a half' occurrences before you would be suspended. This does not make sense. Those that are not the basis for immediate suspension should be equivalent to a 1/2 suspension so that at least there are two full opportunity, with the third resulting in suspension.

3) The septic system maintenance evidence is unclear. We have minimal use on our property and have it cleaned every 18 months. What would be required as proof that our tank is properly maintained? We have had no claims - no issues and moving to an annual cleaning does not make sense based on volume.

4) The requirements for insurance are odd. The proposal indicates a \$2M commercial liability and a declaration it is a short-term rental. This wording is vague and not consistent. I have from day one, used TD Meloche Monnex, a leader in Canadian home insurance. The property is listed as a rental BUT NOWHERE does it indicate a short term rental. Asking for such verbiage would not be reflective of insurance terminology. They simply classify my rental (which I have declared as an STR with them) as a rental property. I would expect this would suffice. Also I have umbrella coverage across all properties and therefore \$2M commercial liability does not apply specifically to one property. Also AirBnB provides \$1m liability. Is the expectation that if the main insurer provides \$1M and AirBnB provides another \$1M that it would meet requirements?

5) This is a lot at once, just a couple of month before the busy season starts. I would highly recommend a phased in approach. Why not implement some of the key points and then implement the others. To do an immediate implementation across the board of all elements is not wise. Why not refine the details, be sure that there is sufficient criteria (and clarity of that criteria) for the licensing rules to be enforced? I think that the rush will result in either two extremes - the good hosts walking away or workarounds from dishonest hosts. A better defined process with a clear way to enforce will help with a smoother transition. The phased approach will allow for this.

6) There is wording that the owner or a contact must be available within 30 minutes of receiving a call. This is unreasonable if expected to be on site. It would be appropriate to clarify this wording to be available by phone (not on site) within this short timeframe.

7) I don't understand how the inspections will work? Is there a process setup? Ironically enough, I feel extremely vested in this type of process and would also be happy to be part of developing this framework.

If there are any questions on the above comments, please reach out as I am happy to discuss and clarify.

- Carbon Monoxide detectors should only be required when needed. Many short term accommodation properties only have hydro and do not have natural gas. If a natural gas line on the property does not or propane is not used for heating, carbon monoxide detectors should not mandatory.
- Hi there , This licensing program seems like it is in place to punish owners and not the renters. Why not just ticket the renter? Why is the owner being pinkished. We follow the rules all the time and it's the renter that may cause noise ...

- Why does the application have to be renewed annually versus every 2-5 years? It seems like a useless money grab to have people renew annually when nothing would have changed between one year to the next. The initial application should have an application fee, but subsequent years, it should be a renewal included with the \$450. It should just roll over from one year to the next, unless there is a suspension
- STR Owners/Operators must pay an annual \$50 application fee and the \$450 annual licensing fee should be eliminated proposed licensing program. Short term rental owners are tax paying citizens. This is a program being implemented by the Municipality. Many owner's rent out their cottage for short term purposes in order to own and afford a cottage in the area. Expenses are already significantly high for a vacation property. This adds another expense for owners to contend with. It appears as a cash grab and is it disappointing that the municipality is even considering this. Lots of short term accommodation owners are not making a profit on their property as they are also used for their own pleasure. Therefore, this component should be removed.
- I am very concerned over abuse of power. We have a cottage rental and our neighbour and neighborhood is racist. We are a mixed ethnic family and have noticed different treatment when our white family members are out for walks and then different treatment when our non family members are on our own property doing lawn care, or going for a stroll. Our neighbour complains when there are not white people at our rental property and doesn't when there are white people, and the non white people are not causing any trouble, but we get emails that "those people left the deck light on, tell them not to" So with the demerit point system we are concerned there will most definitely be an abuse of power.
- Good evening I am a very frequent visitor to Grand Bend every summer vacation with my extended family. We always rent the same cottage in Southcott and have made THE best family memories there. We do not like the proposed guest limit the STR policy currently has in proposal. 8 maximum? Is this a joke? The house we rent is HUGE and can accommodate 10 people. Do you realize how many cottages accommodate families with grandparents, kids and grandkids? The size of the home NEEDS to be considered if maximum capacity is being regulated. We and many other families will be going elsewhere.
- What does secure garbage mean and why does this only apply to rental properties? It needs to be something that is imposed on all home owners, not just short term rentals. That makes zero sense
- The demerit point system is very harsh and this is coming from a long term resident. The amount of points being distributed and the suspension time and how many points it takes. I've lived in Grand Bend for 20 years and this seems very unfair
- A better way to alleviate parking woes on the strip would be to provide public transportation. Why not provide a beach shuttle during the busy season? A bus that travels up and down the 21 that brings people to and from Grand Bend Beach. As an owner of a STR, I would gladly pay a licensing fee to support this initiative. The municipality could sell passes to make money as well. Would be great if this actually happened. Also, bus stops should have parking for those who are located far from a bus stop. This is a much better use of taxpayer dollars than a redundant snitch line and insulting demerit system.

- Why is there a limit of 2 people per bedroom? A hotel Room can have 4. Airbnb is a business so treat it as such. So many rentals have 2 bunkbeds which sleep usually 4 kids. 8 people maximum doesn't seem logical if the property can accommodate comfortably more people in beds.
- This is creating a bigger divide in this area. There is already a "locals vs out of Towner" mentality with people of Lambton shores and it seems like a way to keep people from coming to "their" beach town.
- Grand Bend's taxes are already high. They are high than Toronto, which offers many more services. Moreover, insurance that included that includes the ability to rent is higher than regular property insurance. Short term owners pay a lot of expenses. Many own a sole cottage and use short term income to help offset costs. There should NOT be extra fees introduced with the licensing program being implemented by the municipality
- Where is the maximum capacity limits coming from? Why is it 2 people per bedroom! Does this include children? Me and my husband have our toddler with us everytime we rent a cottage with our family. We need to sleep in the same room as our child. We can't rent the cottage we already booked this summer if this is a new policy
- Many short term accommodation owners go to great lengths to upkeep their property and do their due diligence. By-laws exists. Guests two break by-laws or the law should be dealt with accordingly. Target guests who are disruptive rather than punish owners through demerit points and extra fees. Fees and demerit points should not be part of the proposed program.
- I feel very strongly, that the proposed STR licensing proposal is strictly a money grab by the municipality. All the issues that are proposed, have got to be covered under current municipal bylaws. The licensing fees are ridiculous! The Bylaw dept., in the Municipality of Lambton Shore is a complete joke! For the last five years they are pretty much none existent in Grand Bend, sure you see them driving around the village, but where are they when people are urinating on our streets, pouring open liquor from trucks on Main Street, throwing garbage on the roads, noisy party's well after 11am. Bylaws presence is no where to be found! There to busy flirting with the female officers or afraid to do there job. A Bylaw vehicle parked on Mainbeach for hours with no one from Bylaw around, and I did search for a good twenty minutes trying to find someone. I have in the past had a former Bylaw officer tell me in mid August that the Bylaw department Held a staff meeting where they were told NOT TO WRITE ANY MORE TICKETS for the summer! Total craziness,! Don't go crating new ways to stick it to people! The problem is Bylaw Dept, they have to be accountable, a presence, no amount of money generated by this proposal will solve most of the proposed issues. The municipality has to get control of this dept., all talk and no action, and I believe our council is responsible,, the Covid issue has been tough, but how many months, years can the laws be broken, fluffed off as a learning lesson, Bylaw says call the OPP, there presence is less than that of Bylaw. This is strictly a money grab by Lambton Shores Council. Hire more Bylaw officers! Make them accountable, the tickets will offset your payroll!
- Me and my wife are residents in the area and investors in business in grand bend- not rental properties. We are very concerned about these new rules and regulations for tourism and what financial support to such a small town vacationers bring . Lots of people coming to GB stay in STR and we are so scared with such nonsensical rules, people will choose to go to the other spots like essays beach, muskoka, blue mountain. We need these visitors to survive and to put

money on the table. GB is turning into such a fantastic spot for Ontario getaways and these new rules will turn families away

- Who will be the third party contract? This smells of corruption
- Agree
- I am a resident in (Grand Bend) and I actually am not in favour of the rules that are being proposed as per the new licensing program. I've lived in the community for over 25 years and many of my neighbours are short term rentals (ie. Airbnbs) and I've seen it as a great way to bring tourism to the area. In the winter time, our economy slows down completely but remains afloat because of the people coming into our great city. I've also seen how it helps people come to the area as a family and it's very harsh to have an 8 person limit. I see many multi generational families coming together to experience the beach and I know I'd also want to go away with my kids and grand kids and we are more than 8 people. I am a person of fairness and while some rules are important to maintain a peaceful and civil community, I do think these rules are penalizing hard working business owners who are trying to help subsidize their mortgages. I think these rules need to be amended.
- Unfortunately, this licensing program is painting all short term rental owners with the same brush and this is not equitable. As the municipal government, we urge you to consider multiple situations where these rules would not apply. Many owners take extreme time and care of their property and exercises due diligence when renting to guests. Problem property should be dealt with appropriately by the municipality, by-law and/or OPP. There are certain circumstances where repercussions would be crippling financially to an owner. I am an owner of a short term accommodation cottage property in the area. I am a single widowed mother with a daughter. I purchased this property for family experiences and memories, but it essential for me to rent it out to assist with expenses. I take exceptional pride in my property and select guests accordingly. Having said this, I cannot predict and control guest's behavior while they stay. For example, if they choose to set off fireworks or ignore by-laws or ignore the number the guest allowance rules. The demerit point system is unfair to us owners as a result. There are multiple factors that an owner cannot control. This is like saying a teacher should be penalized for their student misbehaving. It is very unrealistic and place an extremely unreasonable onus on the owner. If my property had two unruly guests in two years (which is possible), I could lose the ability to rent, thus significantly impacting my ability to financially afford the cottage. This would push or force dedicated and hard-working members of the community to sell their property. Is this fair? Should an owner be penalized because of a guest's behaviour? Should the operation of a rental be reliant on guest behaviour which is not controllable? The answer is no. Demerit points are simply unfair. By-law officers, police and OPP should be utilized in dealing with unlawful citizens and guests alike
- I'm so grateful that this short term rental situation is finally being addressed. Thank you for trying to get a proposed licensing program put into place! As you well know, over the past few years many cottages and homes have been purchased exclusively for this use without much thought going into controlling all that is involved. My main concern is the number of people that are being crammed into these rentals. More often than not many of these renters have total disregard for full time residents, or places that have been rented to families with children. Their main objective is to party which disrupts those with small children trying to sleep that may be next door or close by. Parking becomes a premium as it rarely coincides with what is required

for the number of people housed in the various rentals. The amount of garbage generated at some of these places occupied by upwards of a dozen people is at times appalling and it would be interesting to see the increased strain on the sewage system as the summer population continues to grow! The introduction of a designated by-law officer to deal with complaints would be quite advantageous over what is currently in place, which is more of a "passing of the buck" system. Thank you again and best of luck as you move forward with this endeavour!!

- I agree that it is important to have a responsible person to contact if situations arise at a short term accommodation. Having a name of a responsible contact can be include, however; the time frame should be removed. Many short term rentals are owned by individuals out of town who also use their property as a cottage escape. Moreover, most do have support in place within the local community. It is very unrealistic to expect a situation to be resolved within 30 minutes. Does by-law respond or the police respond and resolve non-urgent matters within 2 hours? No. The focus should be on having the owners contact information and a secondary support person to call. Most owners will exercise timeliness to respond to any situation that may arise as it impacts their property and communication with guests is essential to be a contributing member of the community.
- Hello Lambton Shores counsel. I'm writing to you with several concerns regarding your STR program. As a cottage owner, we only rent our cottage approximately 10-12 times a year and use it as a family making memories for the other 40 weeks of the year. These rentals are key for us to help with some of the cost for repairs and maintenance around our property. I really hope that you consider my thoughts and concerns. My biggest complaint and concern has to do with your demerit points system. This demerit point program has extremely harsh punishments. The smallest infraction on the list comes with a 4 demerit point punishment and they go up from there. After you get only 2 infractions you as counsel think it's okay to take control of our properties. I don't think that it's okay for you to stop our right to rent out our investment property. We have a really big issue with the Responsible Person. Making it mandatory for the Responsible Person to be at the property within a half hour is not reasonable. There are all kinds of different reasons that this doesn't work. I understand if you wanted to implement some strict guidelines and rules to follow. However many of the infractions on the list are because of something that is not controlled by the owner. As the owner I can tell someone that we have a max of 8 people in our three bedroom cottage. They then could say no problem and sign the agreement. Then one night they had a couple stop in for a visit (unknown to me the owner) and there is a complaint made on my cottage about our guest. Because of this I would be over capacity and subject to a fine and/or 4 demerit points. When the call comes regarding a complaint and the Responsible Person isn't able to get there in a half hour, we would receive another fine and/or get another 4 demerit points. Now totalling up to 8 demerit points. Two simple infractions and you feel that gives you the right to determine if I rent it or not for 6 weeks. That's completely ridiculous to think that's okay. I think the demerit point system needs to be completely removed from the STR program. I think that the counsel should have serious fines for the rule you put in place. \$300 for first offence, \$400 for second and \$500 for every fine for 2 years from the date of the first fine. Fines reset to \$300 after the two year period. Owners have their lives invested in these cottages. *Demerit points must go*. Timeline for Responsible Renter needs to be a min of 24 hours to respond.

- Firstly I am in support of licensing of homes and enforcement of standards and rules. However the timing is horrible. After 2 years of pandemic isolation, quarantines, shutdowns, cancellations, injections of vaccines, masking and following all rules presented to us- why do this now? Families and friend have done their time. Why penalize them more. Families can't gather over 8 people in a home? Heck. My family alone is 6 people. The people are tired. And mentally deflated. Regulating the number of people renting doesn't appear democratic! How on earth would you even regulate this? Invade the guests space and count them? This regulation doesn't even seem like a rational thing to enforce, especially in a westernized society. There fore, I strongly oppose this idea overall.
- Do demerit points disappear over time like they do for drivers? In my opinion they should drop from your record after 2 years. 7 points for a suspension is too low in my opinion. 8 as the maximum people you can rent to is unreasonable. Our rental has beds for 10 guests so why can't we cater to 10 guests? Possible the wording needs to be amended to not include children under 13. However, I would still recommend changing it to a maximum of about 10 adults.
- The licence program could be beneficial if it guarantees the current right of use that all residents currently have to do short term rentals and long term rentals. Ok with mild regulation for safety and fire. The proposed system with 24 hr hotline and demerit points go way too far. Creating a whole new branch of enforcement makes no sense as vacation rentals have existed in Lambton Shores for a hundred years. The 24 hr hotline gives opportunity for discrimination as it can be abused. it also opens Lambton Shores up to possible lawsuits. For example 2am hotline call requiring STR owner to deal with matters that might escalate to a really bad situation. These incidents should be handled the same way they are with home owners that have a party. They should be handled by trained professionals by Law Enforcement not a young woman or old man the potential STR owner. The proposed Licence fees are way too much and will result in many not having the ability to operate a STR. Its prejudicial to low income people. It favours large operators.
- Problems With the Whole Program. The License Process and Fees is not reasonable at all. For the person that wants to supplement their income for 2 months of the year, \$450 is way too much, some people only rent their home out 10 weekends of the year to supplement their income while they are gone. Some people to supplement their income, rent out a bedroom for a few weekends during the summer to help them afford their apartment and you are taking the money away from them. Some people that share their home on Airbnb/ VRBO do it so they can afford to stay in their home or apartment. The Complaint Monitoring Program is flawed in so many ways, giving the person a half hour to solve the problem is not the right solution. The Complaint Hotline is Guilt without a trial, if a person does not want an STR as a neighbour, they can take advantage of this system very easily by calling in complaints over anything. They can also use the system to harass the STR owner thru complaints that he has to reply to at all hours of the night.
- This Program is affecting Lambton Shores owners zoning rights that they have enjoyed for generations. Renting out your Cottage or family home in Lambton Shores is nothing new. You can't bring in a Zoning By-Law that takes away someone's right that they have enjoyed for generations and certainly without personally and legally notifying them of your intentions. It's fine to ask for a reasonable License Fee for something, but to implement a demerit system that could take away their existing rights is going too far!

- I think the amount of occupancy should be raised from 8 to 10 as long as there is enough bedrooms in the bigger houses. I am also concerned that unhappy neighbors may call frequently when there isn't even a problem. Thirty minutes is not a lot of time for landlord to get a call and contact and deal with the situation and have the tenants quiet down 45min would be better.
Thanks
- Good day, I am a local and I like this program. I think it will keep people from Toronto away from our beaches. They come to my beach and patty and garbage is always on all the beaches. There's no parking at Main Beach. I think now people won't be coming in large groups. Thank you
- I think this would have negative affect on local business and tourism it is already very difficult to find rentals here people will go elsewhere
- Groups of 8 needs to be looked at. Doesn't make sense for large homes with 4 + bedrooms. Why can smaller homes have 2 additional guests not staying in a legal bedroom but a cottage with 5 bedrooms still can't have 2 people per room with max of 10. How come they can't also have an additional 2 guests
- Thank you very much for taking the time to create a proposed licensing program for short-term rentals. This will be so welcomed by many of us living in Grand Bend, especially year round. The parking chaos is getting worse every year. Renters of short term accommodations are overflowing with people, sometimes renting upwards of 15 people. This program would bring that under control. Complaints are sometimes ignored or we r urged to call OPP and they in turn tell us to call bylaw. In the summer, there is limited space for my family to park at my own house. I also believe there is a safety factor, ambulance, fire, so many people and cars. I think it is a good idea to have the licensing program with bylaw assigned to checking closely to violations. Thank You and good luck.
- The ongoing License Fee of \$450 is excessive. The bad actors should be gone in the first year so there would be no need for such a large expense going forward. License Renewal Fee for surviving STRs should be reduced to \$50 as they are good operators benefiting the community. What exact perceived offenses can i call the hotline about? Who determines if they are real or that they actually occurred? What about at 3 in the morning? How do you prove something at 3 in the morning? How does this ByLaw help low income people in the community? What if even stricter standards or requirements are brought in later through this ByLaw, for example size requirements, restricted neighborhoods instead of 2 million in insurance coverage, 5 million in insurance coverage. (2 million in insurance is too much already unless you are a big time STR)
- We own a cottage in [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] and our family spends the summers in Grand Bend. We love how short term rentals have put our city on the map. We enjoy seeing families enjoy our town and bring tons of business especially during the summer. A lot of that is due to cottage rentals. I feel like this program will shy away renters. We have a few in our neighborhood and never have had a problem. We do know some neighbors don't like renters but that's from very old school mentality. I think they will always complain. And I think this program gives them false sense of authority. It can become a slippery slope
- As a frequent user of short term rentals, hearing about the proposed planning from a third party is very disappointing and concerning indeed. The notice given on this new Bylaw is insufficient. I would have expected the city to have thoroughly informed the public about their intentions. I just bought a property a year ago and are currently going through the process of getting permits

to begin building our dream home as a main residence with a secondary building in the back yard as an STR to subsidize the build and help the rental shortage in the area. Many cottage rental owners and the rest of the residents of Lambton Shores are unaware of the new regulation and the effects this will have on them.

If the Municipality is looking to address the housing shortage, it should not prohibit Vacation Rentals.

*VR's increase employment.

*VR's as a secondary unit help subsidize new home builds to make it affordable which is in line with the OFFICIAL CITY PLANS as stated....."To guide the policies", so its fine to regulate VR's for safety purposes but NOT to prohibit.

All properties should have that right with minimal requirements. If I own my property I should be able to do as I please so long as it doesn't impede on my neighbors rights or impede on reasonable city Bylaws. Our decision to purchase the land and build was solely based on being able to build the secondary unit. I believe this will discourage the small investors and homeowners that are looking to make Lambton Shores/Grand Bend their home. I understand that there will also be a yearly fee which to me would seem to be another revenue generator for the Municipality. STR is a confusing term. "Vacation Rentals" would be a more appropriate term. The 24HR hotline is not a good idea for so many reasons. Many people are intimidated by this process and afraid to speak out against it. They feel it will make them targets and that they will be viewed unfavorably

This new Bylaw could be used adversely

*For example limiting how many Short term rentals are allowed in neighborhoods,

*whether or not a specific individual will be allowed a secondary unit as a vacation rental or not.

*Hotline could be used against those who have them.

This is Extremely Concerning and I would advise you re-examine your proposal

- White people getting their say on who can and can't come to a predominantly white town. While lots of tourists are coloured
- Abuse of power coming with locals
- A cottage owner that has a 4 bedroom cottage can have more than 8 people staying the summer with them but someone that rents off Airbnb can have maximum 8. Where's the sense in that?
- The point system is ridiculous. Owners are responsible and if a tenant does something like make noise etc. They will be fined. That is punishment enough. Everyone is responsible enough and do not need to walk on egg shells worrying about a point system being held against them. Fines are appropriate for someone whom does not want to follow the rules
- 2 people per bedroom plus additional 2 guests should be maximum
- What's the deal with the garbage? Why does it only apply to rentals? So nonsense
- The proposed program is supposed to address concerns of noise, parking, excess garbage, and safety. However, the proposed program has a number of flaws in its design that make it not only onerous and expensive to comply with, but at its heart, is counterproductive toward the program's goals. The region is well served with bylaws for noise, maintenance of property, parking and conformance with the building code. There is a statement in the program's rationale that the region does not have the staff resources to support bylaw enforcement; which is an issue of budgeting and providing adequate staff and tools. It does not seem that a region,

which seems to be saying that it is unable to manage its bylaws, would be more successful in managing a complex program that will require a good deal of court time to enforce. In our experience as a short term rental property owner for several years now, the way to achieve the goals of the program is through encouraging multi-generational family rentals. We have had the same renters year after year. These are groups that for the most part, comprise a set of grandparents in their 70's, 2-3 sets of parents in their 40's and a number of grandchildren of all ages. Typically, it is a group of twelve. Our rental property is a legal five-bedroom home in compliance with the provincial code, as per the link provided in the proposed program's definition. We have found that multi-generational groups are quiet, tidy, respectful toward the neighborhood and community and easy to work with. Our renters are generally from smaller communities across Southern Ontario. Some of them have bought cottages (houses really) in the region, based on their experience. We believe that the proposed program will force multi-generational families out of the Grand Bend area and will force us into having to offer accommodation to smaller groups at higher prices to make ends meet, which in our experience will force us to rent to the large urban AirBnB-youth renters. In our experience, and our opinion, this is counterproductive for the proposed program's goals, and both our values and the values of the community here. I would add that we are full time residents of [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] ourselves, and are stakeholders in the ability of the region to continue to offer rental accommodation to larger family groups.

The following are the main problems with the proposed program

- Maximum occupancy of 8 persons. We have a legal 5 bedroom house, with beds for 12 people and ample parking for 6-8 vehicles depending on vehicle size. We have, for years, rented solely to multi-generational families. These are typically, a set of grandparents in their 70's, 2-3 sets of parents in their 40's and 4-6 children depending on the mix. We have rented to the same families year after year, and we are booked a year in advance. In our experience, and based on feedback from our neighbours, this profile of renter is quiet, well behaved and takes care of the property. Key questions:

Why does this proposed bylaw seek to discriminate against such multi-generational families?

Why is the limit not based on actual legal bedrooms, actual beds, and/or square footage.

We use our property ourselves over the course of the year to host our extended family, and routinely have 10-12 guests when we are onsite. The house is comfortable with that number and everyone has a bed. How will Lambton differentiate between renters that exceed an arbitrary 8 guest limit, and when we are using the property ourselves?

Recommendation: Adopt Collingwood's short term rental program design, which places the limit on the basis of two persons per bedroom plus 4 additional people.

- Responsible person and 30 minute response time. We use a property management firm for our rentals. We also use the property ourselves. It does not appear that adequate thought has been given to mixed use cases; which the region should be encouraging, rather than assuming all short term rental properties are for that single purpose. Key questions, as follows:

Is the 30 minute response time consistent with the response time of bylaw officers?

Does the 30 minute response time apply equally to all home owners in the region?

How will the 30 mins response time be measured for the purposes of court records?

What investigative work will be done on the part of the Lambton Shores hotline to validate that the complaint is for the appropriate address, and that the complainant is of standing to make such a complaint?

What proof of response time will be used to determine compliance?

What happens if a complaint, such as too many people, were to be registered while we are using the premises ourselves? Suppose the property manager is offline because he/she is aware that the property is set aside for personal use. What is the notification process to set aside the responsible person and 30 minute response time, if the 30 minute response time is not planned to be applied equally to all home owners in the region?

Is there a risk that this may be misinterpreted as 30 minute resolution time, on the part of the complainant, which is very different? Resolutions can be very subjective. Will it result in repetitive and nuisance calling on the part of complainants?

Recommendation: For noise, parking, open fires, etc., nothing is more effective than a uniformed officer at the door. Place the onus on resolving the infraction on the renter, and in the moment. Most rental agreements stipulate that if a noise complaint has been received and verified by bylaw enforcement, the agreement is terminated and the party evicted without refund. That will be far more effective at dealing with the issue, than dispatching a text message, email or phone call to an out-of-town property owner, or overwhelmed property manager and then depriving the property owner of their income through a demit point system. Staff the region's bylaw enforcement department to the needs of the problem and provide the communication and CCTV tools be efficient at enforcement. An occupancy tax, similar to the Barrie, Brockville, Cornwall, Mississauga, Ottawa, Sudbury, Waterloo and Windsor can be more easily passed through to renters and used to fund the necessary bylaw enforcement and perhaps more family friendly amenities.

- Garbage/recycling storage. For the most part, homes in the region are served by Bluewater Recycling Agency and are supplied by BRA with secured containers. The vast majority of home owners in the region park these bins in front of their houses or beside their garage. The requirement for secured garbage/recycle storage needs to be consistent. We cannot have a situation where the region is ok with the average homeowner parking their bins in front of their homes, while a rental property is held to a higher standard. Key questions:

What is the definition of secured storage?

Does Lambton plan to regulate all homeowners with consistent requirements.

Recommendation: Clarify the proposed requirement to indicate that a large sized BRA bin in good working order, neatly parked nearby the house, with no visible excess garbage meets the definition.

- Demerit point system. Our property is rented at least a year in advance by families that expect to come to Grand Bend for their vacation; which they have been doing so for years. Suppose that the first rental of the season results in a number of nuisance complaints from a Facebook group or a commercial hotel operation that decides to interfere with short term rentals. Or, suppose that when the booking was made, there were 8 persons in the family, and then someone has a newborn and they assume that a babe in arms is not a problem; and then responsible person is a minute overdue in responding to a complaint about the extra person. This could result in an onerous over-reach of regulation that unfairly penalizes the balance of renters for the season, as well as affecting our retirement income dramatically. Key questions:

How will the demerit points be adjudicated and allocated on a fair and equitable basis, that does not result in an arbitrary and damaging action that affects the balance of families that are expecting to have their vacation?

Will the demerit points be adjudicated through the court system?

Will Lambton reimburse short term rental operators for legal cost and loss of business costs if they lose the case?

Will Lambton reimburse the families or find suitable alternative accommodation for them on short notice?

Has anyone considered whether this would play well on national headlines if this demerit program were poorly thought out and poorly administered?

Recommendation. Scrap the demerit program, and staff and operate an efficient and effective bylaw enforcement. Or, develop a more equitable approach, such as reduce the points per infraction, incorporate warning letters, increase the number of points for a suspension, and that suspensions are adjudicated at end of the summer rental season. Using the Ontario driver licensing demerit point system as a model, as follows. 6-8 pts, you receive a warning letter. 9-14 pts, you receive a second warning letter. 15+ points, your license is suspended for 30 days. A noise complaint, an additional person onsite, or a late response seems to be the equivalent of a 2 demerit point highway infraction, such as an improper left hand turn, failing to obey a sign, or failing to ensure than infant is properly secured (all of which can result in serious vehicle damage and injury).

- Hello I'm writing today as a short term rental owner and don't agree with this new proposed rules the biggest problem I see with this is the demerit point system how can this be fair to someone if they have a Neighbour that complains about music in the middle of the day or even a kid crying to load these are the problems I deal with on a regular basic from my neighbour that is known complainer [PERSONAL INFORMATION OMMITTED] these people that have been pushing for these hush new bylaws do not bring money to this town remember we the short term rentals owners brings hundreds of people to grand bend every summer please do not punish us owners that love this town and just want to see it grow we can not have 100 percent control over every renter but myself I live 4 mins away and do not leave grand bend from May 1 to October not even for 1 weekend and drive or walk by my propertys every couple hours and all renter are always screened before rentals and strict contracts filled out I think this would cause lot of damage and losses to the town please if you can reconsider this and let's keep grand bend growing and keep the revenue coming in for the town!! Thank you for your time
- I have studied your documents at length. They are a good start but I believe they need to address additional points. Grand Bend is a wonderful, diverse community which is why we purchased our home here 4 ½ years ago. The diversity can be seen by identifying the different neighbourhoods.
 1. Downtown: from the county border in the north to Lake Street in the south, from Lake Huron in the west to the Grand Bend Community Health Centre in the east. This area encompasses commercial, high density downtown residential and urban residential areas. This area has easy access to the Grand Bend Public Beach.
 2. Suburban A: from Lake Street in the north to the town limit in the south, from Highway 21 in the west to the town limit in the east. This area encompasses commercial along the highway

and residential. The southern residential area is heavily forested. This area does not have access to Lake Huron.

3. Suburban B: from Lake Street in the north to The Pinery Provincial Park in the south, from Highway 21 in the east to Lake Huron in the west. This area encompasses commercial along the highway and rural or estate residential in a very heavily forested area. Southcott Pines and Beach O' Pines both have private beaches that are only for use by their residents. Huron Woods residents do have access to the Beach O' Pines beach to allow walking along the shoreline, but access does not mean they may use the beach. STR customers do not qualify as residents and should not be accessing or using these private beaches at all.

I strongly urge this Committee to consider developing different licensing requirements by area / zone. Climate change means our rainfall patterns are inconsistent (last summer was quite dry) and prolonged windy days are becoming the norm. We do not want a fire situation, like our western provinces have undergone the past few years, here in Grand Bend. My biggest concern is the use of fireworks in areas Suburban A and B. Bylaw 16-2008 Section 6. K) states "No person shall set off any fireworks in the Municipality with 500' of any woodlands." I urge the Committee to develop a different document citing this restriction for STR's in these two areas. I am also concerned about Social Family Campfires in Suburban A and B. The lush undergrowth in the heavily forested areas means there is a lack of areas clear of vegetation to safely have even a social family campfire. Many of these campfires are held close to structures as a result. Many are held in firepits that exceed the recommended size stated in Bylaw 60-2009. I urge the Committee to make an inspection of the Social Family Campfire area by the Fire Department and Bylaw Enforcement Officer mandatory before an STR is permitted to have one. This should be noted on their application, stated on their license, posted in their house / cottage and a record of this be held at the Fire Station. I urge the Committee to develop a different document citing this restriction for STR's in these two areas. There has not been a limit as to the number of rentals an STR may have during the calendar year. Why not? Licence fees should be based upon the number of rentals during the calendar year to compensate for the extra burden placed on our Municipality as stated in your document. Soon after our move to Grand Bend, Short Term Rentals began to infiltrate our neighbourhood much to our dismay. Our quiet peaceful neighbourhood was no more, especially from the May long weekend until Thanksgiving in October. Loud outdoor music (including live performers at high volume), loud foul language, campfire smoke blowing directly at our home along with negligent smokers dropping their cigarette and cigar butts at the side of the road near the dry underbrush. These incidents occurred from dawn to midnight, often at times when the Bylaw Enforcement Officers were not on duty / unavailable. Fall and winter rentals also included loud outdoor music and blowing campfire smoke. These issues, especially the loud music and campfire smoke, occur our neighbouring community and impact us. Ideally STRs, which are COMMERCIAL ENTERPRISES, should only be in the Downtown area where guests would have easy access to both the Public Beach and the core commercial area. Please consider restricting the areas where STRs may be located.

- I have concerns about two issues:

1: the definition of STR has the phrase "...by way of a rental agreement or similar commercial transaction for a period of less than 30 consecutive nights" and this seems to be causing some confusion as it is being interpreted 2 ways. Some immediately see 30 consecutive nights and

think one month with a single rental agreement for ONE renter. Others are interpreting this phrase as 30 consecutive nights with several rental agreements (i.e., weekly rental sat to sun, one renter leaves in the am and another renter starts in the pm, but you have rented like that for 30 consecutive nights and thus should be exempt. I believe the phrase is intended to be only for one renter for 30 nights or more not several but I think you need to define it slightly to remove any ambiguity that can be challenged

2: it is imperative that if the responsible person doesn't solve the problem that a system of escalating by-law fines need to be applied or the whole thing is toothless. Residents will be stuck with the crazies and you will achieve no redress for staff. Please apply the by-laws and fines or we will be arguing over this again and people will be outraged.

I am also concerned about STR for this season as many bookings are already made and it seems unfair to expect them to follow all rules and only exempt them on numbers in the rental number