

June 14th, 2017

Parkland County
53109A Hwy 779
Parkland County, Alberta T7Z 1R1

TO: Counselor John McNab, Director of Planning Carol Bergum, Planner Duncan Martin.

FROM: Jackfish Lake Management Association (JLMA)

- President
- Vice President
 - Treasurer
- Secretary
- Director Communications



RE: **WEST POINT ESTATES REDISTRICTING AND OUTLINE PLAN JLMA FEEDBACK**

Thank you for meeting with a few of us from the JLMA board on June 5th, 2017 to discuss the planning process and the best way to present the comments of the Board of JLMA.

Thank you also for allowing JLMA to provide our feedback on both the redistricting and outline plan as presented.

We have prepared our response as two separate sections the first responding to the redistricting and the second section responding to the outline plan which we have been informed is the second item to be reviewed by the County Planners and then Council.

History / Background:

The Jackfish Lake Area Structure Plan (ASP) was originally produced in 1997 and updated in 2002, although not formally accepted as a land use by-law; it has been referenced in recent submissions to the County. On March 13th, 2014, the JMLA requested that a moratorium be placed on all planning around Jackfish Lake in our response to the 2014 Parkland County Environmental Conservation Master Plan (ECMP) Environmental Significant Areas (ESA). The reasons given to place a moratorium on all planning around Jackfish Lake were as follows:

- Water quality is the JLMA's and JLMA's Environmental Committee's (EC) primary focus. Due to the ECMP being a mapping tool to identify ESA's in Parkland County overall, we believe that the WMP's will create meaningful restrictions on a particular area in a Watershed Management Plan with legislatively enforceable bylaws.
- Given the high environmental sensitivity rating due to high groundwater sensitivity and our concern to protect water quality, JLMA recommended that Jackfish Lake be designated as Provincial ESA significance.

As previously stated, JLMA asked that a moratorium be placed on all future subdivision development. The moratorium would continue until the completion of a State of the Watershed report, the Watershed Management Plan and our current ASP are updated and incorporated in the Municipal District Plan (MDP) and land-use bylaws. This would allow time to facilitate a collaborative approach with stakeholder consultations.

This request for a moratorium was not enacted upon by the County, however Martin Frigo, County Planner did attend our annual general meeting in May 2016 and made a presentation which supported the placement of a moratorium until many planning exercises referred to had been accomplished.

Section 1 – Redistricting Concerns

1.1 The JLMA has the following concerns with the redistricting of West Point Estates:

Overall, the primary local concern with the proposed development relates to its scale relative to the scale of Jackfish Lake and its small watershed. Jackfish Lake is a relatively small (239 hectare [ha]), shallow lake with a correspondingly small watershed (1665 ha). The proposed development consists of 57 residential lots encompassing approximately 100 ha or an area equivalent to 42% of the total lake area. Approximately 30 of the proposed lots are lakefront properties and all lots are well within the immediate watershed of the lake.

The 2009 Municipal Census for the area indicates that there are at least 378 properties with 391 permanent residents in the Jackfish Lake watershed. The proposed development would result in another approx. 75 properties and associated residences, which would increase the number of residences in the watershed by 19%, and assuming at least 2 people per residence, it could increase the permanent resident population in the watershed by at least 38%. These are very significant increases and given poor servicing opportunity for a development of this scale (e.g., fire protection and ambulance services), this significant population increase should be of considerable concern to the County.

1.2 Water-based concerns with the proposed development:

Water quality concerns should be considered a primary limiting factor for development proposals in the Jackfish Lake Watershed. The flushing rate in this relatively closed and naturally eutrophic lake basin is in excess of 100 years. The SOW Report indicates that the annual flushing rate is estimated at only 1.3 % of the lake volume making it very susceptible to pollution effects from increased nutrient or other contaminant input from surrounding developments. This means that what goes into the lake stays there for a very long time. Additional residential development immediately adjacent to the lake, particularly projects on the scale of the proposed development will further degrade the lake's water quality in a number of ways including increased use of fertilizers and pesticides on adjacent lands, increased storm water production and runoff from the increase in impervious surfaces (e.g., roads and homes), loss of natural wetland functions immediately adjacent to the lake, increased domestic animal waste production, increased boating traffic suspending sediment-based nutrients and other contaminants, and numerous other sources.

It is important to recognize that the proposed development area is currently dominated by perennial vegetation including a mosaic of grassland and forest stands, which has been instrumental in reducing nutrient input into the lake in recent years. Loss of this natural vegetation cover to impervious surfaces will certainly have a marked effect on surface flow of nutrients and other contaminants into Jackfish Lake.

It is also important to recognize that the long term mean depth of Jackfish Lake is only 3.3 metres (m) (SOW Report 2016). By fall 2015, the mean depth of the lake was estimated at only 2.8 m, the lowest recorded for the past half century (SOW Report 2016). This extremely low water level likely led to the fish kill during the winter of 2016 (SOW Report 2016). An even more important recognition for planners is that the water level in the lake has declined by 1.69 m between 1983 and 2015 (SOW Report 2016) indicating that the lake is in a long-term drawdown phase, which will make lake water quality even more challenging to maintain as the existing nutrient levels in the basin are further concentrated by less water volume. Given this fact alone, rezoning the land

identified for a large-scale development like West Point Estates would be not be sensible at this time.

Increasing regional water use and land cover changes are also altering surface flow and infiltration to groundwater, which may be affecting lake water levels. Because Jackfish is located in a groundwater recharge zone, it may be actively losing water to diminishing underlying aquifers (SOW Report 2016). To add further support to this concern, test well data indicate that groundwater is in long term decline throughout Parkland County, declining by 0.8 to 2.5 m in all test wells from 1990 to 2010.

As could be predicted by declining lake water levels and increasing nutrient concentrations, Alberta Health Services issued its first blue green algae advisory for Jackfish Lake in summer of 2015 and again in June 2016. If water levels continue to decline and/or nutrient input is increased from surrounding developments, it should be expected that the occurrence of such events will become more frequent. Simply put, because of its naturally eutrophic status, control of external phosphorus input will be essential to help prevent future algal blooms in Jackfish Lake. The ASP states that "if the nutrient input into the lake is any greater than it was in the late 1990s, that increased phosphorus levels would eventually degrade the lake's water quality". Similarly, the SOW Report states that "ongoing recreational, development and agricultural pressures on this lake must be managed in a way to reduce watershed phosphorus loads". It goes on to say, "that current total phosphorus levels of approximately 35 µg/L should be rigorously protected". It would be impossible to imagine how this key objective could be achieved if West Point Estates is approved given the diverse and difficult-to-control mechanisms for increased nutrient input associated with a residential development of this scale.

Worth identifying, that due to the current low lake levels, JLMA has also been pursuing a temporary diversion license to draw water from the North Saskatchewan River. We have also had discussions with the G of A for diverting water from ground water wells, which we may have to pursue if we do not receive approval on the river source.

1.3 Land-based concerns with the proposed development:

The 2014 Parkland County Environmental Conservation Master Plan, Phase I ESA indicates that the parcels of land proposed to be developed for West Point Estates are recognized as Environmentally Significant Areas (ESA) of regional significance. These lands and other ESA surrounding Jackfish Lake were considered of regional significance due to high groundwater sensitivity, high surface water quality and aspects of the lake basin and depth that make it highly susceptible to water quality degradation. Approving an extensive housing development on this site is inconsistent with the 2015 Parkland County Municipal Development Plan (MDP), which indicates that the County supports protecting ESAs. Specifically, the policy section of the MDP states "land deemed to be ecologically significant will be protected with particular emphasis on the protection of lakes, streams, and rivers within the county".

Interestingly, the current Jackfish Lake ASP acknowledges that its greatest deficiency is its lack of site specific analysis on land-based limiting factors for development. This key information need should be addressed before any further residential development is considered in the Jackfish Lake Watershed. The ASP goes on to state that "further research will be required to determine the specific capability of individual sites to accommodate multi-parcel country residential subdivision". We suggest that this important information gap should be filled by the County rather than by a developer's consultants to ensure an unbiased assessment.

From a fish and wildlife perspective, the ASP indicates that it is critical to protect the remaining shoreline areas at Jackfish Lake that remain in a natural state. This simply cannot be achieved by means of a relatively narrow shoreline buffer that is unlikely to maintain important wildlife corridors. West Point Estates will result in significant degradation to one of the last remaining native shoreline areas along the eastern side of the lake.

Terrestrial land use and impacts have a clear connection to water quality in the lake. In particular, phosphorus input from cleared land will be high. As clearly stated in the ASP, any large-scale disruption of natural vegetation surrounding the lake will increase nutrient input into the lake. This is the primary reason that we believe that the Agricultural Restricted zoning should remain in place in the proposed development area. If any changes were considered, we suggest that the Agricultural Restricted zoning should be extended throughout the proposed development area and the County should work with the current or future landowners to encourage that the land is retained as hay land or natural cover to maintain the significant nutrient reducing capacity of this land cover type.

Finally, under the currently proposed development scenario, nutrient input into the lake will be even further exacerbated by loss and degradation of wetlands within the development area. The natural water quality improvement functions of wetlands will be significantly degraded or lost as they are converted in to storm water management infrastructure for the development. Under this suggested approach, the water quality improvement functions of these wetlands will be largely converted to a water storage function and lead to further reduction in lake water quality.

1.4 Social-based concerns with the proposed development:

The primary social concerns with the West Point Estates Development include reduced community safety and increased noise production. Community safety concerns include both road-related and boating safety issues.

The ASP defines the boating carrying capacity of a lake as “the level or type of use beyond which impacts to the visitor experience exceeds acceptable levels”. By 1996, virtually all measures of boating carrying capacity indicated that Jackfish Lake had reached or grossly exceeded its carrying capacity at that time. In fact, most estimates suggest that its carrying capacity has been exceeded by 2 to 17 times (ASP 2002), which clearly represents an unacceptable level of lake use. The additional boating traffic this development will bring will further exacerbate exceedances in the carrying capacity of the lake.

While Jackfish Lake covers 239 ha, the estimated surface area for boating is only 124 ha (SOW Report 2016). A previous Jackfish Lake property owner survey conducted in 1996 suggests mean boat ownership per household in the area is 1.9 boats. In addition, a volunteer boat count in 2014 found 144 power boats, 48 fishing boats, 52 pontoon boats, 86 personal watercraft and 171 non-motorized boats on adjacent lakefront properties. Virtually none of these estimates account for day use boating at Jackfish Lake by non-residents, but assuming the 1.9 boats per household average estimate for local residents, the proposed West Point Estates development would add at least an additional 142 boats to the lake contributing to further exceedances of the lake’s carrying capacity.

The ASP indicates that escalation in boating use of the lake should be considered a key limiting factor for future development. The ASP instructs the County that no development of marina facilities that would encourage additional boating traffic should be approved. We believe that a similar directive should be extended to this large scale residential development that by current

estimates could result in an additional 108 boats on the lake. Again, this estimate does not even consider the additional boating traffic resulting from the guests of those additional households.

Furthermore, the SOW Report indicates that motor boats can influence lake water quality by disturbing lakebed sediments thereby increasing turbidity and nutrient suspension, which leads to increased algal production and direct damage to submersed aquatic plants. These disturbance effects can extend to 10 feet below the surface for engines greater than 100 HP (SOW Report 2016). Boat traffic can increase turbidity by up to 50 % and suspension of sediment can contribute to suppression of fish populations by smothering eggs and disrupting spawning areas (SOW Report 2016). The lake basin area near the proposed development shoreline is actually a shallow neck between deeper basin areas, which will further exacerbate boat disturbance of sediment and suspend even more nutrients. The SOW Report indicates that “innovative approaches to managing boat traffic will be required, particularly at the low mean depth currently observed at the lake”. However, it is difficult to imagine how this would be achieved by approving a large scale residential development adjacent to one of the shallower regions of the lake.

Additionally, there is no current discussion on the lake bathymetry – the entire west shoreline is very gently sloping out in the water and docks would need to be 30 to 40 metres projecting into the water at current elevations. If the water recession continues as indicated in the Watershed Report without water supplementation any lakeshore lots along this proposed development docks would need to be twice that length.

From a noise perspective, the increasing traffic noise on Highway 770 is already a significant issue for local residents. For many, this has been one of the most significant reductions in the quality of living in the area in recent years. Urban Systems has indicated that based on the scale of this development at full build, that the currently high traffic levels will be increased by up to 35%, which will further exacerbate traffic noise-related concerns and will likely represent a significant safety risk to the residents in the area. In particular, those residents living along TWP 522 and parts of RR 22 may be put at significant risk from increased traffic on these small, winding roads that were never built to handle the scale of traffic that will be generated by this development. Increased traffic could also escalate the risk of automobile collisions.

The proposed road widening and straightening would result in loss of protective forest cover, negative hydrological impacts to Crown-owned wetlands, and by increasing traffic would result in loss of recreational value and increased risk of injury to children playing in the area. Furthermore, the ASP states that “where possible, additional traffic should not be routed on to existing developed local roads”. Based on this direction and the desire of local residents, it is unacceptable to use TWP 522 as the sole entrance and exit to this proposed development.

Residents are also very concerned about the effects this development could have on their groundwater wells. The SOW Report indicates that there are over 150 wells immediately surrounding Jackfish Lake and even more in the watershed. Most concerning is recent test well data that suggest that groundwater is in long term decline throughout the County, including the closest test well to Jackfish Lake. Of greater concern, is the poor understanding of groundwater connectivity to surface waters in the Jackfish Lake area. This economically and ecologically important topic should be much better understood before considering an extensive development that could bring increasing demand on groundwater supplies in the area. It is currently recognized that because Jackfish Lake occurs in a groundwater recharge zone, the groundwater contamination risk is considered moderate to high based on water quality in the lake. In addition,

low availability and poor groundwater quality east and south of Jackfish Lake are acknowledged by the ASP as having high potential for limiting development in this area.

Finally, from an economic perspective, local residents are particularly concerned that property and home values will be significantly diminished if the County approves the West Point Estates development that will essentially lead to the loss of our rural and cottage lifestyles and the likely collapse in lake water quality. For many members of the Jackfish Lake community, our home and property are our primary assets and approval of this development could significantly affect our economic security and the municipal taxes generated by diminishing home and property values.

1.5 Recent Activities:

JLMA board members attended a briefing session with the Developer of West Pointe Estates and his consultants last summer 2016 and were led to believe that the outline for the south portion of the property already zoned had been adopted and approved by the County.

According to Duncan Martin, County Planner the outline plan was approved but the subdivision was never pursued, in part because they did not own the other three parcels. The consultants also informed us that the layout they were presenting was in keeping with the 2001 Area Structure Plan – in our opinion it is not in keeping with the ASP.

It is the JLMA's opinion that regardless of the various bylaws, rules or regulations in place the lack of any enforcement is an ongoing issue.

Section 2 Outline Plan Concerns

JLMA board members attended a briefing session with the Developer of West Pointe Estates and his consultants last summer 2016 and were lead to believe that the outline for the south portion of the property already zoned had been adopted and approved by the County. According to Duncan Martin, County Planner the outline plan was approved but the subdivision was never pursued, in part because they did not own the other three parcels. The consultants also informed us that the layout they were presenting was in keeping with the 2001 Area Structure Plan – in our opinion it is not in keeping.

JLMA has learned a lot over its' existence in the last 20 years, including but not limited to:

- No agency is taking responsibility for water boating capacity guidelines.
- No agency is taking responsibility for determining and enforcing proper sewage systems.
- No agency is monitoring the width of lakeshore access on individual lots as prescribed in the ASP.
- No agency is monitoring the harrowing of beach front lots on the Big Island and the Edwards leased lots.
- Backshore lots are accessing the water and installing temporary docks through MR and ER reserves and this is perfectly legal if the docks are removable.
- Caveats on individual lots do not work such as at Two Island Point and the restriction to the amount of area being cleared (25% of the lot) have to be enforced by one neighbour suing his neighbour.

The JLMA position is very clear:

- We understand that all of the environmentally capable/suitable lake shore areas around Jackfish Lake will be built out overtime.
- We believe the more recent subdivisions since 1990 have now set a precedent as you can see detailed in this appended table.
- We do not think backshore lots similar to the backshore lots that we have now at Evergreen, Paramac Cove and Amity Bay are acceptable in any future subdivisions.
- We do not think MR parcels that can provide access through new subdivisions is acceptable.
- We want future subdivisions to be limited to large lakeshore lots with a minimum frontage of 105 lineal metres, with 100 metre ER setbacks (ECMP) from the high water mark and maximum 5 m wide walking trail access only through the ER, and no backshore lots.
- If and when the north shore leased lots (Steven's Lease 10 + Edwards Lease 40) are subdivided - that the same large lots at 105 metres, with 100 m setback and 5 metre walking trail access be adhered to.

However if the County cannot feel comfortable in recommending a moratorium on the redistricting at this time we have reviewed the proponent's current outline plan and offer the following comments related to the Area Structure Plan by section numbering in the ASP:

2.2.1 Land-Based Limiting Factors

The proponent did not include topo mapping in the presentation to the Board in the summer of 2016 – the comments related to the capability discussed by Thurber are related to 20% slopes – if 15% was utilized the developable area would be significantly reduced.

Similarly the biophysical section in the proponents submission does not adequately address other development constraints in a mapping and scientific format. There is no permanently high water table and temporarily high water table map, no areas subject to flooding map, no soil instability map, no topography greater than 15% slope map.

2.2.2 Water-Based Limiting Factors

The State of the Watershed Report prepared by NSWA was released last summer with some very disturbing observations – our lake levels are in a 25 year state of decline. The proponents submission recognizes the State of the Water Shed Report but does very little to work with it and improve our water quality except to state that the lake phosphorus levels will be reduced with no agriculture – as we all know poor lawn maintenance and fertilizer applications can have far more loading implications per hectare of land than a well-managed agriculture operation. We have been preaching no lawn fertilizing around the lake for years with very little impact.

There is no discussion on the impact of shoreline modifications on fish spawning capability. There is no discussion on the lake bathymetry – the entire west shoreline is very gently sloping out in the water and docks will need to be 30 to 40 metres projecting into the water at current elevations. If the water recession continues as indicated in the Watershed Report without water supplementation any lakeshore lots along this development will need twice that much dock length.

2.2.3 Social Limiting Factors

Twenty years ago in 1997 when the ASP was prepared with intensive input from the JLMA bullet one under Land Use Future Development related to the perception of lake property owners see the lake being at or beyond its development capacity. Don't forget this an adopted ASP with that statement holding even more support now that 42 additional lots have been developed since 1997 including, Amity, Two Island Point and Rainbow Beach Estates. The proponent has not addressed social limiting factors and now wants more than a fair share of the pie in terms of the future shoreline that would be developed at total build-out.

The proponent has not addressed the Environmental and Recreation concerns except related to sanitary and storm sewage handling.

2.2.4 Boating Carrying Capacity

Perhaps the Lake Wabamun Toolkit has an effective method of determining boating capacity? Based on our experience as related to you in our recent discussion – residents fear for their safety on hot long weekends when out on the water, the day use launching exceeds capacity

Several years ago a resident coordinated an annual jet-ski race event off Paramac Point where all or most of the participants were not local. The police were called to determine a course of action to limit the noise and duration of the event from dawn to dusk – but there was not a legal solution. Neighbours had to resort to creating a flotilla of boats to float within the layed out race course area of the lake – “not a good situation”.

With continued education of day-users (23 at one time per day) (we left you some of the printed hand-outs for residents and day users) at the boat launch, and build out capped at 350 as per the table included in this submission JLMA will be able to safely manage the boating on Jackfish Lake. We do NOT need any more pressure with increased lakeshore lots beyond the 350 and backshore lots with individual docks accessed through public reserve parcels.

The ASP in 1997 calculated that there was 1.86 boats per lakefront lot (owned/leased). Say 350 X 1.86 boats = 651 boats + 23 day-use could navigate on the water. Therefore boating water $123.8\text{h}/674\text{boats} = .184\text{ h/boat} = 1,837\text{ m}^2\text{ per boat}$ – not much room – especially if you are a sailboat.

It is important to recognize that Jackfish Lake is not a similar lake at all to Wabamun in terms of the shape of the shoreline – Jackfish has many bays and islands – whereas Wabamun’s shoreline is not as articulated.

The ratio of boating water to shoreline for Jackfish Lake is $123.8\text{h}:18.1\text{km}$ (6.84:1) and Wabamun Lake is approximately $8,200\text{h}:57.3\text{km}$ (143:1) (these need to be verified). The ratio comparison for boating capacity for Wabamun is 20.9 times higher than Jackfish Lake.

If Wabamun builds-out to the same extent as Jackfish for lakeshore lots $18,100\text{m}/350\text{lots} = 1\text{ lot per }52\text{ m}$ the calculation will be $57,300\text{m}/52\text{m/lot} = 1102\text{ lots}$. If 1102 lots have 1.86 boats per lot the boats = $2050 + 50\text{ day-use} + 100\text{ marinas} = 2200\text{ total boats}$. Therefore boating water $8,200\text{h}/2200\text{boats} = 3.72\text{h/boat} = 37,273\text{ m}^2\text{ per boat}$. If Wabamun is at $37,273\text{ m}^2\text{boat}/1,837\text{ m}^2\text{boat} = 20.3$ more boating area at Wabamun. It is likely more safe for the public to be boating on Wabamun Lake.

4.2 Plan Goals

Last Bullet - To monitor the cumulative effects of lake development and use upon the environment and social fabric of Jackfish Lake.

The State of the Watershed addresses many of the environmental effects which we are addressing as best we can with the assistance of the County and Province related to possible supplementary water supply, planning prescriptions, enforcement of edge alterations, etc.

No one is monitoring the cumulative effects on the social fabric – JLMA knows the feel of the locals and it is deteriorating. Volunteer organizations like ours need continued new energy – we are losing the will of the residents to be involved - they are upset on many fronts – as evidenced by the support for the petition related to this development. The largest turn-out we ever had was

at our AGM three or four years ago when the proposal at the north end with the marina was being presented and discussed. We used to have a full Saturday of Jackfish Lake Days and we are now down to fireworks and if the donations do not increase this year then this will be the last year on July 15th.

I am sure the County Enforcement personnel can substantiate that the County is recently receiving more complaints between neighbours who are not respecting the lake and shoreline – if this intensive lakeshore development is approved and a precedent set then it is probable that the complaints will increase exponentially. The long time issues of numbers of trailer units, sewage compliance and beach harrowing are most notable.

As well as we can determine through the County there is a disproportionate tax assessment system between those that have significant investments in lakeshore properties and those that lease. This leads to a divide in the mentality of the Owners. If I can't own the land why would I invest more – something needs to be decided and it needs to be equitable.

4.4 Jurisdiction

Caveats between neighbours don't work – they haven't in Two Island Point and they won't in this new subdivision. Caveats have to be acted upon legally with one neighbour suing the other. The shorefront ER should be a minimum of 50 m (reduced from 100 m) in any new subdivisions and this should only have an access trail a maximum of 5 m wide through it. The trail should not be a straight line it should meander to minimize the visual impact.

4.5.2 Shoreline Protections and Enhancement Policies Buffers

The original ASP in 1997 prescribed 5 m maximum and this should be re-instated immediately.

4.7 Additional Lake Development

This proposed redistricting and outline plan is in direct conflict with this section of the ASP.

The County provided reasonable planning input to all of the subdivisions since 1990 including Bayshore, Amity, Two Island Point and Rainbow Beach. Only Bayshore has a few backshore lots – backshore lots should not be approved in this West Point Development. All of the post 1990 subdivision layouts have the land base integrated into large lakeshore lots and more importantly with high frontage ratios with an average of 105 m per lot.

Applying this length 105 m to all future subdivision as illustrated in the table would yield 14 for Highland Developments for the West Point Estates subdivision.

4.10 Recreation Open Space

Recreation open space which has been cleared of trees and is not visually accessible from the adjacent roadway such as Two Island Point Lot 2MR will only become local dumping sites of cut branches and will become a fire safety concern. In most old subdivisions around the Lake the MR lots remain treed and not suitable for public access to the lake edge – but these are not monitored and can be cleared to allow foot or quad access and a private dock can be installed by any person.

All future MR dedications in our opinion should not be included in the subdivision plans and should be taken as a cash equivalent including this future subdivision plan for West Point Estates.

JLMA's Position Summary:

Until there is a clear, acceptable, comprehensive development plan for the entire lake, the JLMA again requests a moratorium on all planning applications including this re-zoning and the proposed outline plan.

Much research and detail does exist for the majority of points referred to in this document. They have not been included, however, they are available upon request if required by council.

In conclusion, JLMA represented by the Board who are volunteers, wishes to work with the County to realize a mutually acceptable future build-out plan which is sensitive to the condition of our lake and our overall community.

APPENDICES

Table – Jackfish Lake Lakefront Lot Summary

JACKFISH LAKE SUBDIVISION NAME/LEGAL	LENGTH OF SHORELINE (M)	LAKEFRONT LOTS	RATIO SHORELINE: LOTS (M/LOTS)	NEW LAKEFRONT LOTS (Average Ratio/Shoreline Length)	ROUND UP LAKEFRONT LOT TOTALS	TOTAL ORIGINAL LAKEFRONT LOTS	TOTAL LAKEFRONT LOTS AT BUILD OUT
ORIGINAL PRE-1990 / LAKEFRONT LOTS ONLY							
KENLEND						25	
PARAMAC POINT						30	
PARAMAC COVE						21	
LUTZ AVENUE NE 9-52-2-W5						19	
LAKE SHORE ESTATES						41	
LAKE DRIVE						9	
LAKE AVENUE						9	
McNAB LAKESHORE						2	
BIG ISLAND LEASED						35	
CHURCH ISLAND LEASED						1	
TWO ISLAND POINT ISLAND LEASED						1	
STEVEN LEASE						10	
EDWARDS LEASE						40	
Lot 1 and Lot 2 SE 17-52-2-W5						2	
PRE 1990 LAKEFRONT LOTS						245	245
MORE RECENT SUBDIVISIONS SINCE 1990 LAKEFRONT LOTS							
BAYSHORE	440.95	5	88.19				5
AMITY	795.39	6	132.565				6
TWO ISLAND POINT Portion SE 17-52-2-W5	1359.40	14	97.1				14
RAINBOW BEACH ESTATES	2277.55	22	103.525				22
AVERAGE SHORELINE PER LOT			105.345	105.345			
FUTURE LAKEFRONT LOTS TO BUILD OUT							
HIGHLAND DEVELOPMENTS (LUTZ)/ NW 9-52-2-W5, North Road							
Allowance and SW 15-52-2-W5	1475.83			14.01	14		14
NW 16-52-2-W5 NORTH	1509.25			14.33	15		15
NW 16-52-2-W5 SOUTH	226.57			2.15	3		3
SW 21-52-2-W5	1131.14			10.74	11		11
NE 16-52-2-W5	812.97			7.72	8		8
PARAMAC COVE REMAINING	166.55			1.58	2		2
PARAMAC POINT REMAINING	313.26			2.97	3		3
LOT 1 SE 17-52-2-W5 (One lot existing in pre 1990)	161.23			1.53	2 - 1 Existing		1
LOT 2 SE 17-52-2-W5 (One lot existing in Pre 1990)	144.88			1.38	2 - 1 Existing		1
TOTAL LAKEFRONT LOTS AT BUILD OUT							350
REVISED TO 2017 06 14							

Sample feedback JLMA received regarding proposed subdivision

From:

Date: May 27, 2017 at 6:51:56 PM MDT

To: <jackfishlakemgmtassoc@gmail.com>

Subject: West Point Estates Proposed Development

Comments re: proposed West Point Estates Development

The proposal adds 31 lake front properties to the lake plus numerous back lots.

This could add a minimum of 31 watercraft to the lake, plus many others from back lots.

This development will place unreasonable load on the lake.

Safety on the lake is already a concern with the number of large, powerful boats.

I assume that this proposal does not meet the criteria for the Area Structure Plan.

If not, it should be rejected without further discussion.

We strongly oppose approval of this development as proposed.

From:

Date: June 13, 2017 at 5:21:07 PM MDT

To: Jackfish Lake <jackfishlakemgmtassoc@gmail.com>

Subject: West point Development feedback from

Hello,

We are categorically against that huge development. We think it will DESTROY our lake and it is CRIME to allow somebody to make it happen.. In our current Jackfish lake community we all are trying to save this clean rare no algae lake, to use for generations to come here and for outside visitors. Is that somebody, with wasted interests, business decision?

Any lake has its own capacity to function properly and to exist in healthy way. It is easy to overload and destroy it.

We, who live here are not allowed to alter restricted front lake land at each property in purpose to save environment there and we are agree with that.

Now we are talking to build whole village over 200 houses destroying wetlands and its habitat. How that even came to somebody mind to do such a thing? Very angry about all this. Are they going to be any public discussions about this matter?

If anyone want to contact me please to reply to this e-mail, or call:

Thank you, Regards,

From:

Date: May 29, 2017 at 7:39:55 PM MDT

To: jackfishlakemgmtassoc@gmail.com

Subject: Do NOT rezone West Point Estates Proposal

RE: Jackfish Lake –Proposal West Point Estates Outline Plan & Land Use Bylaw
Amendment Application, Legal Description NW & NE-9-52-2-W5M File # PD-
Î7-015 & PD-Î7-016

My family and I have owned property on Jackfish Lake since 1968. Municipal
Address

I am very opposed to this proposed new Subdivision. If this subdivision of 75 new lots go through it would put a very big pressure on Jackfish Lake that could possible kill the lake. The lake has a very sensitive eco-system. There will be more pollution and human activity that the lake can sustain, causing a further increase in **Blue-Green Algae**. The lake is already threatened by algae.

An environmental study done in 2004 needs to be redone if a proposal is within 100 meters of the lake. The current plan is to have development only 60 meters from the lake. They are proposing to have 30 lots on the lake itself, with each owner being allowed to clear a 10 meter path or 10% width swath down to the lake. We already know that this was a restriction placed on former new owners for new lots on the lake, but it never happened that way, many trees were removed!— nobody enforced this, and nobody followed up! This will happen again with this development!

If the property is rezoned there will be at least 30 more additional docks in the lake, with no restrictions on how many water crafts are going to be added to our already busy lake. It will impede the pleasure we currently have on Jackfish Lake. The lake will be over crowded!

30 additional new lake front lots will bring lawn fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and damaging products from normal household use. The loss on the current vegetation from the lake front will further cause the health of the lake to deteriorate. The squiggly ditch they will create will not keep our lake clean.

The only power I have to prevent the death of our lake is to convince you to PREVENT RE_ZONING of this property

Yours truly

From:

Date: June 13, 2017 at 11:53:10 AM MDT

To:

["jackfishlakemgmtassoc@gmail.com"](mailto:jackfishlakemgmtassoc@gmail.com)

Subject: FW: File No. PD-17-015 and PD16-016 West Point estates

File # error sorry.

Reference File No. PD-17-015, and PD-17-016 West Point Estates Outline Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment application. Legal description NW & NE-9-52-2-W5M

Good morning.

I am strongly opposed to this proposed development. Being a long term resident of jackfish Lake (1967), I see a significant change in the water quality and already overpopulation of people and boat traffic.

This is a tiny lake in comparison to say, Wabamun, Pidgeon, or Sylvan Lakes, with a large shoreline in comparison to actual lake surface.

There have not been any long term testing and studies done to give any significant data to indicate changes the lake is undergoing.

If a development of this magnitude is allowed, it would cause irreparable damage to the existing ecosystem. Wildlife would be non existent , and, a beautiful lake will become a waste ground.

Ground water would be exasperated with the number of wells needed to supply these sites, plus adding more waste, be it human, or pollution from boats etc...

The large Wakeboard boats have already caused widespread damage to shorelines, plant and wildlife, and the general ecosystem of the lake.

Being here for 50 years we have seen water levels both higher and lower than today, as these patterns are cyclic. The last few years however have shown to be the worst ever as we now have had blue algae, large foam deposits building up on shorelines all around the lake, plant life dying, and winter kill of fish last year from depleting oxygen levels in the water.

How many other species have to disappear before we decide maybe we shouldn't have allowed things like this to happen, for the sake of large profits, and general greed.

Please don't allow this development to happen. You can contact me anytime,

Regards

On Jun 13, 2017, at 12:02 PM,

To Whom it May Concern:

Reference File No. PD-I7-015 & PD-I7-016 West Point Estates Outline Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment Application, Legal Description NW & NE-9-52-2-W5M

I understand that there are plans to develop 75 more lots just off Jack Fish Lake with 30 of them proposed as lake-front lots on this piece of land.

I believe that this will be detrimental to the survival of Jack Fish Lake and I strongly object to this request for a Land Use Bylaw Amendment.

I would be pleased to discuss further.

Yours truly