

Building a CPPS for Niagara-on-the-Lake

A Comprehensive Briefing for Planning Staff

Prepared by:

NOTL Residents' Association

Planning, Development and Land Use Committee · 2026

This document is intended to be complementary and supportive to Town Staff as they evaluate the benefits of adopting the Community Planning Permit System for greater operational efficiencies within the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

It is organized in six parts: (1) How CPPS delivers greater operational efficiency for the Planning Department. (2) What other municipalities have achieved, and why NOTL's case is distinctive. (3) The St. Catharines lesson — what a service-standards approach looks like up close. (4) How CPPS addresses NOTL's specific planning challenges, including short-term rentals, agricultural land, environmental integration, and affordable housing. (5) A balanced summary of advantages and challenges. (6) The step-by-step implementation path.

Part 1 — How CPPS delivers greater operational efficiency

The Community Planning Permit System is a process enhancement for the most time-consuming, repetitive, and legally charged tasks within the Town's Planning Department. It does not add to the existing workload — it restructures how that work gets done, replacing case-by-case interpretation with pre-established, enforceable criteria.

Here is what the Planning Department deals with today under the current system, and what changes with a CPPS in place:

Today — without CPPS	With CPPS in place
Staff interpret the rules differently each time an application arrives. No two decisions are identical, creating inconsistency and legal exposure.	Rules are written down once, clearly. Every staff member applies the same criteria. Decisions are consistent and defensible.
Minor variance hearings consume weeks of staff time for applications that are routine and predictable.	Routine applications that meet pre-set criteria are approved administratively. No hearing required. Decision in days.
Applicants submit incomplete applications because they don't know what is required. Staff spend hours chasing missing information.	Pre-set criteria published upfront. Applicants know exactly what is needed before they submit. Incomplete applications drop sharply.
Every planning decision is subject to OLT appeal. Staff and legal counsel must prepare for and attend hearings that can run for years.	CPPS decisions are exempt from OLT appeal for up to two years after adoption. Staff time is not spent in Tribunals.

Tier 2 agenda requires multiple parallel projects — Zoning By-law Update, Site Plan Guidelines, Design Guidelines, Process Manual — each with its own consultant, timeline, and budget.	One CPPS project delivers all of these outcomes at once. No duplication. No parallel workstreams competing for the same staff time.
Short-term rental enforcement is resource-intensive and inconsistent. Licensing rules and zoning rules don't always align, creating disputes.	STR permissions embedded in the CPPS with clear criteria. Licensing and zoning aligned automatically. Fewer disputes. (Commercial STRs have cost Ontario households \$1.6B in additional rent since 2017, per McGill University research, 2024 — CPPS can address this structurally.)

To put this in concrete terms, here is what the time savings look like:

45–90	days to process a conforming permit application under CPPS, compared to 18–24+ months under the current three-stream process.
2 years	of OLT appeal exemption from the date of CPPS adoption — staff time currently spent in Tribunal hearings is eliminated entirely.
5 → 1	Tier 2 planning projects that collapse into the CPPS framework. Five separate consultant engagements become one.

Part 2 — What other municipalities have achieved

Since its inception under the Ontario Planning Act in 2019, more than a dozen municipalities have adopted CPPS in Ontario. Even more governing bodies have active plans to implement it. The NOTL Residents' Association believes that NOTL should be at the forefront of this planning process innovation.

Municipalities with full or significant-area CPPS implementation include: Township of Lake of Bays, Town of Carleton Place, Town of Huntsville, Town of Gananoque, City of Brampton (Main Street North), Town of Innisfil (Shoreline area, expanding town-wide), and City of Guelph. Municipalities actively drafting or implementing CPPS include: City of Peterborough, City of Waterloo, Town of Oakville, Town of Fort Erie, City of Hamilton, and Frontenac County.

NOTL presents a compelling and distinctive case. The Town is the only municipality in Ontario to hold simultaneous status as a National Historic District and a provincially designated Heritage Conservation District. It is a major wine-country tourism destination comprising five distinct urban communities — Old Town, Queenston, St. Davids, Virgil, and Glendale — each with its own heritage character, design pressures, and planning needs. The Town's Natural Heritage System further includes Greenbelt Protected Countryside, a Specialty Crop Area, a UNESCO World Biosphere Reserve, and a globally significant area for bird migration.

A well-designed CPPS would embed these protections permanently into a legally enforceable by-law framework — providing clarity and certainty for both applicants and the community, rather than relying on a patchwork of advisory guidelines and case-by-case discretion.

Municipality	Status	What changed for planning operations	Why it matters to NOTL
--------------	--------	--------------------------------------	------------------------

Gananoque	Adopted (town-wide)	Town-wide CPPS is now the Town's primary planning tool. Design criteria for new builds require compatible architectural elements — window detailing, façade treatment, materials — embedded directly in the permit in accordance with published CPPS requirements. The Province cites Gananoque as its flagship example of CPPS used to maintain and enhance small-town cultural heritage character.	Small heritage town with a recognized conservation district and tourism economy — structurally the most comparable to NOTL in Ontario.
Huntsville	Adopted (2022)	Town-wide CPP by-law passed 2022 after a two-year study. Single-application process replaced zoning, minor variance, and site plan streams. Stakeholders confirmed faster approvals and better pre-consultation clarity.	Strong precedent for natural heritage, waterfront, and vegetation removal controls — relevant to Queenston and agricultural overlays. By-law available as a direct drafting reference.
Innisfil	Adopted (2025, shoreline — expanding town-wide)	Shoreline CPPS adopted 2025, with town-wide expansion underway. Population 43,000 (2021 Census). Heritage-sensitive community managing significant growth pressure alongside environmental protection.	Demonstrates that CPPS can be phased — begin with the most complex or sensitive zone and expand. A direct model for NOTL's village-by-village approach.
Burlington (downtown)	Adopted	Application processing time cut ~60%. OLT appeals dropped significantly. Operational capacity freed from repetitive hearings.	Heritage main street, strong tourism and hospitality economy. Design standards overlay directly adaptable for Old Town.
Peterborough	Active CPPS	Developers now pre-verify compliance before submitting. Incomplete applications nearly eliminated. Significant operational time reclaimed.	Similar size, established heritage conservation district, comparable planning complexity.
Collingwood	Adopted	Green building standards embedded in CPPS criteria. Town now eligible for federal Housing Accelerator and energy grants.	Four-season tourism. Established heritage district. Identical STR pressures to NOTL.
Waterloo (uptown)	Adopted	Minor variance applications for conforming buildings eliminated entirely — done automatically at the counter.	Complex heritage overlay, comparable to NOTL's HCD structure.

These municipalities are not a random sample — they are heritage towns, shoreline communities, and tourism destinations facing the same pressures as NOTL. Gananoque, Huntsville, and Innisfil are the closest comparators. Their by-laws are publicly available as direct drafting references. Their experience is transferable, and their research costs NOTL nothing to access.

Part 3 — The St. Catharines lesson: what service standards look like

Niagara-on-the-Lake's nearest comparable city has not adopted a CPPS — but St. Catharines has done something instructive: it has imposed fixed service standards on its own planning department, with tracked timelines and public reporting on results. The lesson for NOTL is important.

In May 2024, the Mayor of St. Catharines issued a formal Mayoral Direction to all city departments requiring a housing-focused, solutions-first approach to every development application. This included:

- **Fixed processing deadlines** — a published Pre-Submission Consultation Schedule with firm application deadlines and confirmed meeting dates for every planning application.
- **Mandatory response tracking** — all departments required to report when they cannot meet a timeline, with escalation to the Mayor's office.
- **Solutions-first lens** — staff directed to provide alternatives wherever a roadblock is encountered, rather than simply declining an application.
- **Public accountability** — milestones and processing times tracked and reported to Council with ongoing performance metrics.

The results have been measurable. St. Catharines secured \$25.7 million from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's Housing Accelerator Fund in 2024 — funding specifically available to municipalities that demonstrate streamlined, accountable planning processes. The City issued 409 dwelling units in 2024 under difficult market conditions, and is tracking toward 2,382 new units over three years.

The St. Catharines approach and CPPS are not in competition — they are complementary. St.

Catharines imposed service standards on top of its existing system. CPPS replaces the underlying system with one that makes service standards achievable. Fixed deadlines work when the rules are clear. They are difficult to meet when every application requires a new interpretation.

NOTL can learn from St. Catharines that Council and staff can commit publicly to planning timelines — and then use CPPS to make those timelines realistic rather than aspirational.

There is also a direct funding implication. The federal Housing Accelerator Fund — the same program that paid St. Catharines \$25.7 million — is explicitly targeted at municipalities that reform their planning processes. A NOTL CPPS is precisely the kind of initiative that makes the Town eligible for this funding. Doing nothing costs the Town the opportunity.

Part 4 — NOTL's specific planning challenges — and how CPPS addresses each one

Most municipalities that build a CPPS are managing one or two planning challenges. NOTL has six, all operating simultaneously within a small geographic area. This is what makes CPPS more necessary here than almost anywhere else in Ontario.

4a. Old Town — Heritage Conservation District

The expanded Queen-Picton HCD now covers 528 properties, 259 of them formally contributing. Every exterior alteration requires a heritage permit reviewed by the Municipal Heritage Committee on a monthly cycle — creating minimum 6-to-8-week wait times for decisions that should take days. A development freeze ran from March 2025 through early 2026 during the Phase 2 process.

There is a second, less-discussed challenge in Old Town that a CPPS is uniquely positioned to address: contextual massing. The Chautauqua neighbourhood illustrates this clearly — inappropriately large homes have been approved and built in this historic community without sufficient regard for neighbourhood context, scale, or character. Under the current system, if a project meets the technical zoning criteria, it is difficult to refuse on contextual grounds alone. A CPPS changes this.

CPPS solution: Pre-approved design standards for materials, setbacks, massing, fenestration, and paint colours mean routine HCD alterations are approved administratively. Only applications outside the pre-set criteria are escalated to MHC.

Critically, contextual zoning criteria — maximum floor area ratio relative to neighbouring properties, stepback requirements above ground floor, and massing compatibility assessments — can be embedded as enforceable permit conditions for any new build or major addition throughout Old Town and the heritage villages. Contextual fit becomes a legal requirement, not a planning aspiration.

4b. Queenston — Escarpment, Archaeology, Indigenous Heritage

Queenston applications regularly trigger Stage 1 and Stage 2 archaeological assessments, Niagara Escarpment Commission review, and Indigenous community consultation — each with its own timeline and no coordination mechanism between them. Applicants routinely don't know all of this is required upfront, creating incomplete applications and wasted staff time.

CPPS solution: A Queenston overlay lists all pre-consultation requirements explicitly. Applicants arrive with the right studies already completed. Staff stop processing applications that are missing required components.

4c. St. Davids and Virgil — Growing Villages, Infrastructure Constraints

St. Davids is under active development pressure. Council approved a wastewater Inflow and Infiltration Study in April 2025 to address basement flooding risks from growth. Virgil's zoning by-law contains a section still under appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), making decisions there legally exposed. Applications in both villages regularly proceed deep into review before hitting infrastructure or legal walls.

CPPS solution: Infrastructure capacity thresholds and legal exposure screens are built into each village overlay. Applications that would fail on infrastructure or legal grounds are identified at the screening stage — before staff time is invested.

4d. Glendale — Gateway Growth Area, Airport Zoning, High-Density Pressure

Glendale is NOTL's most rapidly changing planning environment. Centred on the Glendale Avenue and QEW interchange, it is the Town's designated urban growth node — absorbing high-density residential, mixed-use, and commercial development that would be inappropriate anywhere else in NOTL. Council adopted the updated Glendale Secondary Plan in January 2025 (By-law 2025-005) after a multi-year process involving subwatershed studies, transportation assessments, urban design guidelines, and fiscal impact analysis.

The current challenges are significant. Airport Zoning Regulations from the Niagara District Airport impose height restrictions across parts of Glendale, creating a layer of federal oversight that is not integrated with the Town's approval process. A recent Official Plan Amendment (OPA-95) permitted a 25-storey landmark building along Taylor Road and heights of 17 to 25 storeys on the southern portion of the Glendale lands — scales of development the Town has not previously managed. The Glendale Secondary Plan was also removed from the new Official Plan draft in April 2026 pending further review, creating an additional layer of policy uncertainty for applications in the area.

The risk is that Glendale becomes a site of repeated, one-off applications each requiring site-specific OPA and ZBA approvals — exactly the scenario that drives up staff time, creates inconsistency, and invites OLT appeals from applicants or neighbours.

CPPS solution: A Glendale overlay can embed the Urban Design Guidelines and development standards from the Secondary Plan directly into the permit criteria. Airport height restriction thresholds can be built in as automatic screening requirements. Permitted uses, massing standards, and holding zone conditions can be defined in advance — so applications in Glendale work from clear rules rather than generating a new policy debate each time. The overlay also positions Glendale to absorb significant growth without requiring constant Council intervention on routine applications.

4e. Agricultural Land — The On-Farm Diversified Use Problem

NOTL sits within the Greenbelt's Specialty Crop Area, one of the most protected agricultural zones in Canada. Provincial policy permits on-farm diversified uses, but the definition is deliberately broad. This has created a pattern of applications to build storage and refrigeration infrastructure on agricultural land, claiming agricultural purpose — when in many cases the 'farm' is a pretext for industrial storage that would never be permitted otherwise.

The Niagara Region flagged this directly in February 2025, noting that NOTL's zoning by-law does not require that products sold or stored at farm operations originate from local farm operations — leaving staff without defensible criteria and the Town legally exposed.

CPPS solution: An agricultural overlay establishes objective, measurable criteria:

- Minimum percentage of the subject property in active agricultural production
- Maximum footprint of accessory structures as a proportion of total farm area
- Requirement that products stored or processed originate from the subject property or documented local farm operations
- Annual declaration confirming ongoing primary agricultural use

These criteria make approvals objective and defensible, and make non-compliant applications identifiable at screening — before any staff time is invested in processing them.

4f. Short-Term Rentals — Housing, Community Character, and Enforcement

This is one of the most significant planning and community character issues NOTL faces — and it deserves a more honest assessment than it has received in planning documents to date.

The scale of the problem:

- **\$1.6 billion** in additional rent costs to Ontario households since 2017 caused by commercial short-term rentals, per a joint McGill University/University of Waterloo study published in 2024 — the first Canadian research to establish a direct causal link between commercial STRs and rent increases.
- **Housing removal:** Every whole-home vacation rental that operates year-round is a property removed from the long-term housing market. In a town where housing affordability is already under strain, this is not a minor issue.
- **Property inflation:** Properties operating as whole-home vacation rentals are valued as commercial entities, not residential properties. This inflates purchase prices and makes homeownership less accessible to residents.
- **Enforcement gap:** Council paused new STR licenses in December 2024 while reviewing caps. The OLT has already overturned a Committee of Adjustment decision on a short-term rental application. There is currently no resource available for enforcement at 11pm when a vacation rental is the source of complaints.

NOTL's current STR by-law recognizes two categories. Understanding the distinction is essential to designing CPPS criteria correctly:

Hosted STRs — Currently permitted	Unhosted STRs — Currently permitted with caps
Bed and Breakfast — owner present on the property. The only hosted category currently recognized in NOTL's STR by-law.	Cottage Rental — full home of 3 or fewer bedrooms facing a public road. Owner absent.
Country Inn — similar hosted model to B&B at larger scale.	Villa — 4-bedroom unhosted property facing a public road. Owner absent.

Vacation Apartment — unhosted apartment located above a commercial property. Acceptable to our committee given its commercial context.

A notable gap in the current by-law: hosted short-term rentals beyond the B&B and Country Inn models — such as owner-present Airbnb-style arrangements where the host lives on the property but rents a room or suite — are not currently addressed. Given that hosted arrangements have built-in oversight through owner presence, our committee believes there is a reasonable case for the CPPS to consider creating a defined permitted category for these, with clear criteria distinguishing them from unhosted whole-home rentals. This warrants further community discussion.

Toronto addressed the unhosted investment property problem directly in January 2025 with a principal-residence-only rule: only the home you actually live in can be registered as a short-term rental. Investment properties are prohibited. The registration fee was set at \$375, with a 180-night annual cap per property and fines up to \$10,000 for non-compliance.

CPPS solution for NOTL: The CPPS should work from NOTL's existing STR by-law categories and address each precisely:

- Bed and Breakfast and Country Inn — confirm as permitted uses with defined criteria embedded in the CPPS. No change to their existing status.
- Cottage Rentals and Villas — NOTL has a 100+ year tradition of these and they should not be eliminated. However, the CPPS should establish a firm numerical cap on permits by zone, require that the property owner be a resident of Ontario (not an out-of-province or institutional investor), and limit the number of STR properties any one individual, corporation, or related party can hold — to prevent institutional block-buying.
- Vacation Apartments (above commercial properties) — acceptable in their commercial context; confirm as a permitted use with appropriate criteria.
- Hosted owner-present rentals beyond B&B/Country Inn — the CPPS process provides an opportunity to create a defined category for these, given that owner presence provides built-in oversight. This should be explored through public consultation.
- Investment property STRs operated by non-resident or institutional owners — these should not be permitted as of right. This is the category driving housing removal and property inflation.

4g. Environmental Integration

Unlike traditional zoning, a CPPS can require environmental screening at the pre-application stage for all Class 2 and Class 3 permits — not only when a formal Environmental Impact Study is triggered under the current

system. For NOTL, which has seen dramatic tree canopy loss (800 mature pines removed in Virgil alone for a single subdivision), this front-end integration is critically important.

- **Tree inventory and replacement ratio** required before any demolition or clearing approval is issued.
- **Bird collision risk assessment** for glazed façades exceeding 50% glass coverage — relevant given NOTL's location within a globally significant bird migration corridor.
- **Stormwater management requirements** that formally recognize the ecological value of tree canopy — each mature tree absorbs approximately 80 gallons of water per day.
- **Wildlife corridor mapping** required for larger development sites.
- **Net environmental benefit statement** required for all Class 3 applications.

CPPS solution: Environmental screening criteria embedded at the pre-application stage mean ecological impacts are assessed before a project is designed around assumptions that later prove unworkable — protecting both the Town's natural heritage commitments and the applicant's investment in the design process.

4h. Affordable Housing Mandate Constraints

Embedding a meaningful affordable housing requirement in the CPPS is both desirable and difficult. NOTL's land costs are among the highest in the Niagara Region, and the provincial minimum inclusionary zoning requirement has recently been reduced to 5%. Without accompanying financial tools, a mandate risks being set at an ineffectively low level, or facing developer resistance and OLT challenges that delay the broader CPPS adoption.

- **Land costs** in NOTL make conventional affordable housing requirements economically unviable without government support.
- **Canada Builds and the CMHC Affordable Housing Fund** offer funding to developers meeting specific criteria — the CPPS can reference these as a pathway for applicants, rather than imposing an unsupported mandate.
- **Development charge waivers** for qualifying affordable units (potential value: approximately \$500,000 per project) provide a meaningful incentive without requiring new Town funding.
- **Rental conversions** are increasingly common in NOTL — the CPPS should address rental affordability standards directly, not only ownership housing.
- **Co-operative housing models** are under federal consideration — the CPPS framework should be flexible enough to accommodate new housing models as they emerge.

CPPS solution: Rather than a single fixed affordable housing percentage that is either too low to matter or too high to be viable, the CPPS can establish a tiered framework — referencing federal and provincial funding pathways as the primary mechanism, with development charge waivers as a Town-level incentive, and clear standards for both rental and ownership affordability.

Part 5 — NOTL-specific analysis: a summary assessment

A CPPS is a significant undertaking, and it is fair for staff and Council to weigh both sides honestly. The following summarizes the case as our committee sees it — advantages and genuine challenges alike.

✓ Advantages	⚠ Challenges
• One application replaces three — faster and cheaper for applicants. • 45-day decision timeline ends the chronic site plan delays currently running 12–24 months. • Heritage and design standards become enforceable by-law, not advisory guidelines. • Tree canopy protection, affordable housing percentages, and decision deadlines become mandatory conditions, not discretionary asks. • Protects NOTL's character and planning autonomy in any future municipal amalgamation scenario. • Prepares the Town for larger-scale developments already in the pipeline (e.g., the 399-unit Concession 7 project). • Reduces the scope for case-by-case political influence on individual development decisions. • Codifies staff discretion within clear criteria — eliminates inconsistent and ad hoc decisions. • Council regains control through by-law setting, while shedding routine site plan reviews it finds burdensome. • Environmental screening moves to the front end of the process — trees, birds, and stormwater addressed before design lock-in. • Proven and operating in Ontario: Gananoque, Innisfil, Huntsville, and Brampton all have CPPS in force today. • Election-year timing presents a natural opportunity to build political momentum behind the initiative.	• 18–24 month implementation timeline, with extensive public consultation required throughout. • Estimated cost of approximately \$150,000 — requires a Council budget commitment. • Needs a dedicated planning staff champion. Past CPPS-adjacent initiatives have stalled without one. • Reduces negotiating flexibility for some developers, who may prefer the current case-by-case system. • Third-party appeal rights are lost once the system is in force — a legitimate democratic-process concern that should be addressed openly in consultation. • A CPP by-law cannot be amended within five years without a Council resolution — the framework must be right at adoption. • Affordable housing mandates are difficult to set meaningfully without accompanying federal or provincial financial tools. • The Official Plan must be amended first — an OPA process is a legal prerequisite to any CPP by-law. • Zoning By-law 4316-09 must also be reviewed and aligned as part of the process. • Provincial housing supply legislation may constrain or override some CPPS provisions, and will need to be monitored through drafting. • Staff training and new application management infrastructure (e.g., CloudPermit-style digital tools) are required. • Risk of OLT appeal at the OPA or by-law adoption stage, which could extend the overall timeline.

Our committee's honest assessment: the challenges are real, but every one of them is a matter of careful process design and adequate resourcing — not a reason to avoid starting. Municipalities of comparable size and complexity have worked through each of these issues successfully. NOTL does not need to solve them from first principles; it needs to learn from those who already have.

Part 6 — How CPPS replaces the Tier 2 agenda, and how to build it

The Town's Planning Project Matrix currently lists CPPS as a Tier 3 — Enhancement item. Respectfully, our committee considers this to be an inaccurate categorization. The Tier 2 agenda contains 13 projects, many with no budget and not yet started. A well-built CPPS does not sit alongside these projects — it replaces most of

them.

Current Tier 2 project		What CPPS delivers instead
Zoning By-law Update & Consolidation	→	The CPPS by-law is the updated zoning framework. No separate consolidation required.
Site Plan Guidelines	→	Built into the CPPS as permitted criteria for each zone overlay.
Development Process Manual	→	The CPPS permit process explains itself. It is the manual.
Community Design Guidelines	→	Embedded as design standards in the Old Town and Virgil overlays.
Review / Update Secondary Plans	→	CPPS overlays for each community replace the need for separate secondary plan reviews.
Planning Process Improvements	→	45–90 day decisions replace 18–24 month processes. The improvement is structural.

Implementation steps — what happens, in what order

The path from today to an adopted CPPS has four phases. The first two phases require only staff time and the materials our committee provides — no consultant budget is needed to begin.

Phase 1 0–3 months Council Direction & Scoping	1. Council directs staff to move CPPS from Tier 3 to Tier 2 in the Planning Project Matrix. 2. Staff produce a scoping report identifying: which areas will be covered, which uses addressed, and what resources Phases 2–4 will require. 3. Our committee provides comparator by-laws for staff reference — Gananoque (town-wide heritage CPPS), Huntsville (town-wide, natural heritage and waterfront focus), and Burlington (downtown heritage overlay). These are the three most directly applicable to NOTL's mix of challenges and can be used as drafting references without additional research. 4. Council approves scope and authorizes Phase 2.
Phase 2 3–6 months Gap Analysis & Overlay Drafting	5. Staff map current zoning rules, minor variance history, and site plan conditions against proposed CPPS criteria for each overlay zone. 6. Agricultural overlay criteria drafted in consultation with Niagara Region and Ministry of Agriculture, using the measurable criteria in Part 4d above. 7. Heritage overlay criteria drafted with the Municipal Heritage Committee — what can be approved administratively vs. what requires MHC review. 8. STR criteria drafted using Toronto's principal-residence model as a template, adapted for NOTL's specific context. 9. Preliminary community engagement sessions in each village (Old Town, Queenston, St. Davids, Virgil).

Phase 3

6–18 months

**Consultant
Engagement &
Public Draft**

- 10.RFP issued for a consultant to draft the CPPS by-law, working from the staff gap analysis and community input — not from a blank page.
- 11.Statutory public meetings held in each community.
- 12.Draft by-law revised based on public and agency feedback.
- 13.Niagara Region and Ministry of Agriculture consulted on agricultural overlay.

Phase 4

18–24 months

**Adoption,
Exemption Period &
Implementation**

- 14.Council adopts CPPS by-law.
- 15.Two-year OLT appeal exemption period begins — staff time spent in Tribunal hearings is eliminated.
- 16.STR licensing aligned with new CPPS zoning criteria. Unlicensed whole-home rentals given a compliance timeline.
- 17.Staff trained on new permit process. Communications issued to applicants and residents.
- 18.Housing Accelerator Fund application prepared — CPPS adoption makes NOTL newly eligible.

A final note to planning staff:

Every item in this document is based on NOTL's own council records, planning history, and the real issues that have come before committee and council. We have not invented problems — we have named the ones that already exist and shown how a well-designed CPPS addresses them.

Our committee has done substantial background research on comparator municipalities and CPPS structures. We are actively compiling by-laws, overlay precedents, and implementation timelines from Gananoque, Huntsville, and Burlington to share with staff as drafting references. We will continue to build this resource package in support of whatever scoping process staff undertakes.

We are here to reduce the amount of work this takes — not to add to it. We look forward to working alongside your team.