

Dana Jennings

From: Jennifer Murphy
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 1:10 PM
To: Carl Kaddatz
Cc: Dana Jennings
Subject: Re: L.C.P.O.A. RV /Tailer proposal

Thank you, Mr. Kaddatz. Your written submission will be part of the package.

Sincerely,

Jennifer

Sent from my iPad

On Mar 27, 2018, at 1:08 PM, Carl Kaddatz <carlkaddatz@gmail.com> wrote:

Bonnechere Valley Council.

The LCPOA land use committee has based their R.V / trailer proposal on open ended questions and what if accusations.

They talk about "potential " and ask questions like, just where does the waste go? If council were to entertain such open ended questions, they then must be applied equally to all land owners around Lake Clear, after all - how do we know if any of the LCPOA executives are disposing of their waste properly, or if their septic (presuming they have one), which may or may not be within the 100 ft set back , is functioning to acceptable standards?

The answer is -- we don't.

Catering to a small group of individuals has caused a lot of conflict in previous lake matters.

Before council looks into what other municipalities have done for by laws they should decide if one is really needed based on "facts" and what the majority of people want.

So rather than discuss suppositions and false accusations lets discuss facts.

Fact: The presentation that was made to council was made by the LCPOA land use committee, a small group of individuals (possibly 5 or 6). It was never voted on at the LCPOA AGM nor was it ever voted on by the members at large. Respectfully I would suggest to B.V.T council that the Land use committee cannot claim to be representing the majority of L.C.P.O.A members.

At the June meeting with B.V.T. Council we will be presenting a petition with many more names than the L.C.P.O.A. land use committee represent.

Fact: The land use committee has stated that the lake is at its capacity for septic. This not true. I contacted the M.N.R., and they confirmed that they have never done a septic study. I do recognize the "at capacity" nature of phosphates as determined by the M.N.R., but it is important to note that the M.N.R. and B.V.T. enacted policies such that land development of existing properties is still authorized, subject to conditions, and further subdivisions of lots is prohibited. These measures suffice to control water quality and mitigate against potential future negative effects.

Fact: The water quality study done on behalf of the L.C.P.O.A. and the L.C.C. in 2017 concluded the following, as quoted from their own study:

QUOTE

Total phosphorous "IDEAL"

Total P.H. "IDEAL"

Total E Coli. "IDEAL"

Mercury. "IDEAL"

Lead. "IDEAL"

Overall results--an exceptionally pristine lake !!!!

END-QUOTE

Fact: If we are to be concerned with the quality of water we must ensure all of these properties are treated equally and with the same concern. This would include the 7 camp sites on the islands that use simple privies, have cooking facilities and dispose of grey water with out any means other than a hole in the ground. This also includes monitoring all year-round residences and part-time cottages to verify that septic and holding systems are functioning properly, not leaking, and adequately sized for sleep cabin or bunkie that has been added since originally installed.

Fact : A trailer is a completely self sufficient mobile unit. It has the means to store both grey water and sewage, and the means to be emptied in a environmentally safe manner. I have never witnessed or heard of any one of these trailers doing otherwise. If we are to be concerned in this regard we should then be concerned with pontoon boats as many of these come equipped with portable toilets and sinks as well.

In the L.C.P.O.A presentation under the heading "RVs and Lake Clear- The Issue" they make the following statements:

"In 2013 ,estimated at 12 to 20 " This is a complete guess. There was never a count, making their % increase totally invalid and a useless piece of information.

"Potentially adding to phosphate levels". Their water study proves other wise.

Potentially, older less efficient systems may be adding more detriment to the lake.

"Not subject to MPAC assessments". This is not true . The assessment for a vacant or lot being used already is evaluated on the potential use of that lot.

"Putting an extra load on other municipal resources ". Of no significance ,these resources are all ready in place, in fact enforcing another bylaw would probably cost more. Most communities welcome and try to entice people to their area to reap the economic spin offs from people spending money in our area.

The very title "L.C.P.O.A. Land use committee" suggests they will have other motives to control what other people can do on their property. Lets not forget they do not own these properties they are trying to control. I would be appalled to see BVT council use this as some other municipalities have to impose another tax on a already heavily taxed portion of the township. I have been told trailers would decrease property values. For some this might be what they can afford. Large homes and cottages have increased property values and taxes making it very hard or impossible for some on fixed or low income or possibly retired to afford to continue to stay on the lake. No one talks about if this is acceptable.

What will the L.C.P.O.A. "Land use committee " target next , clothes lines? ,Dusk till dawn lights? , boat-horse power restrictions?, restrictions on parking boats in your lane? All of these and many more were asked on a previous questionnaire that the L.C.P.O.A circulated.

In conclusion It is my belief after seeing the water study that the safeguards already in place are working very well . The lake has survived P.C.Bs , water clarity issues and more , this thanks to B.V.T. ,M.O.E. & M.N.R. , all of which have the resources to know how to handle a threat to the lake when there is an actual threat.

My family has been on Lake Clear for many years and the water quality has never been better. I would only hope that we don't let a few dictate who can use their property and for what.

Sincerely. Carl Kaddatz.