



Project:	Sturgeon Lake ASP Review	Project No.:	15216
Client:	MD of Greenview No. 16	Meeting Date:	December 4, 2018
Location:	DeBolt Public Service Building (Fire Hall)	Meeting Time:	6:00 pm
Purpose:	Citizens' Panel Meeting	Meeting No.:	2

1. CP Meeting #1 Record of Meeting (attached)
2. Community Engagement
 - October 29 Open House debrief
 - Online Survey Summary results (attached)
3. Issue Discussion (follow up to input received at open house)
 - Density
 - Environmental Protection
 - Narrows Development
4. Mapping Exercise
 - Exploration of Potential Land Use Options
5. Round Table/Additional Discussion
6. Next Meeting
 - TBD



#202, 10537 – 98 Avenue, Grande Prairie, AB T8V 4L1 T: 780.532.4002 F: 780.539.1656

Project: **Sturgeon Lake ASP Review** Project No.: **15216**
 Client: **MD of Greenview No. 16** Meeting Date: **October 22, 2018**
 Location: **Sturgeon Heights Community Hall** Meeting Time: **6:00 pm**
 Purpose: **Citizens’ Panel Meeting** Meeting No.: **1**
 In Attendance: **CP Members: L. Burnside, E. Langenecker, D. Gorman, L. Newman, H. McKinnon, K. Johnson, A. Clarkson, B. Edgerton**
MD: S. Rosson, L. Dixon
ISL: D. McRae
 Distribution: **Attendees, D. Schoor (ISL), T. Olsen (ISL)**

The subjects discussed and decisions reached are summarized in the following record. Please notify the author of any errors or omissions. If no comments are received within 7 days this record is considered correct.

Item	Description	Action By
1	Introductions	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All members introduced themselves and outlined their interests in sitting on the Panel. 	Info
2	What is an ASP	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dave McRae provided a brief overview on the history of the project and what an ASP is intended to achieve 	Info
3	Review of Background Reports	
	<p>Background Report (ISL)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dave McRae provided an overview of the Background Report prepared by ISL that outlines the legislative and policy framework that will inform the ASP. Error in Page 7 density table – should be a total of 81 units, not 118 units. <p>Environmental Background Report (Spencer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dave McRae provided an overview of the key findings of the Spencer report (Spencer representative could not be contacted due to connectivity issues). If questions, members requested to provide to Sally/Leona for forwarding to Spencer. 	Info ISL Info
4	Issue Identification/Discussion	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An initial roundtable discussion of issues was held to inform the first stages of the review. Issues/considerations raised include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Captains Cove – owned by Sturgeon Lake Dev Co. but not part of the First Nation’s land. 	Info



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Erosion as a result of agriculture cultivation. - Erosion due to bank cleared between cabin (red roof) and lakefront (land north of Boyd's Lakeshore). Enforcement by AEP non-existent. - Clearing deadfall on ER – is it possible? County of Big Lakes does Firesmart at Winagami Lake. - ER – should be able to remove deadfall if it poses a risk to person or property (Eagle Bay and Narrows areas). - Beavers have cleared in MR behind Narrows properties. - Historical Resources / Wetland Referral Notices required on subdivision applications, possibly some development permit apps. - Weir – who owns it, why, who, what? Subsequent research shows it to be on the First Nation's lands, no disposition. Access appears to be on Greenview's 'undeveloped' road allowance, doing further research. - Historical air photos should be accessed (if available) to confirm changes in lake levels over time. ISL to check with Spencer. - Boyd's Lakeshore – report that some of the new development had placed their holding tank between residence and lake versus rear of lot for access by pump truck. - Panel member suggested that more public education would be beneficial for development and preservation of the lake. - Grazing reserves affect the lake due to large amount of cattle. - Changes to Land Use Bylaw respecting subdivision densities and camp/RV sites will need to be reconciled with ASP density allowances. - No facilities such as dump stations, water points, waste management. - Enforcement of septic standards. 	<p style="text-align: center;">MD</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ISL</p>
5	Community Engagement	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open House scheduled for Monday, October 29 • Panel members encouraged to attend if possible to get a sense of issues. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Info</p>
6	Next Meeting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD • Purpose of meeting will be to review outcomes of Open House and discussion/review of key issues/approaches. 	

**Sturgeon Lake Area Structure Plan Survey
Summary of Responses
(47 total)**

Q1 What is your interest in the lake?

Agricultural Operator	6 (13%)	Recreational/Casual User	19 (40%)
Permanent Resident	19 (40%)	Cottage Owner	10 (21%)
Seasonal Resident	15 (32%)	User Group Representative	0 (0%)
Other	7 (15%)		

- Other – Environmental stewardship
- Other – Resort campground golf course
- Other – Work life
- Other – Soon to be permanent resident
- Have been a permanent resident since 1999.
- More camping sites at Greenview golf course
- Other – Business owner Sturgeon Lake Storage

Q2 The current ASP allows for a maximum density of 13 recreation units per quarter section in designated Development Areas (1 recreation unit equals 1 residence/cabin of 4 campsites/RV sites). Should this limit be increased?

Yes 25 (53%) No 22 (47%)

- Arbitrary numbers assigned to density cause nothing but frustration. Allow the market and location to determine density.
- Don't need more!
- The location and potential for development should drive the density decision. Market forces should prevail outside of better Ag land and protected areas.
- Based on revenue.
- Lake only has limited capacity to deal with cumulative effects. Current development limits is about achieving balance for development but at same time ensuring environmental stewardship.
- The increase of recreation on residential property has already been increased from 50 to 100% depending on size of property.
- I feel like the line between farmable and non farmable land that is being subdivided is becoming quite fuzzy. We are losing good farm land in the past few subdivisions in an area that can't really afford to lose the Ag land.
- Seasonal camping is a great way for Families to stay connected. There are not enough lots available however for our adult children to have their own sites.
- I don't think the golf course area should have to take any sites away.
- Yes, because the demand for country residence has much increased since 1986. We own 49 acres and we are allowed the same density as a 3 ac. parcel. we are part of the community of the Narrows with this large parcel among parcels of 3 or less acre. There is a demand for more residences in this community and we have the land to partially address that. Apart from us the biggest parcels in the community are 3 acres. 33 years ago the density was set...which was ok at the time. But the population of the MD has increased, therefore so the demand. We are much more aware and conscious of the preservation of our lake. But, because of the location of our parcel in relation to the lake, the density on this parcel could be increased with no impact whatsoever on the lake.
- Depends on circumstances where full time residents any more means more noise and trouble. As for proper campgrounds we could use more in our area the need just gets bigger and will continue to do so, campers buy in our town and spend on other items.
- Less lots on lake makes nicer frontage more natural

Q3 Lands outside the Development Areas may be subdivided to create a single parcel (maximum 20 acres). More subdivision may be allowed (subject to rezoning) if the development is not on Better Agricultural Land. Should this limit be increased?

Yes 27 (57%) No 20 (43%)

- Let the market / location dictate what is reasonable and take a proactive approach in helping potential developers identify the number and size of lots that may be appropriate instead of pointing to a document and saying this is all you can do.
- Same as above. Market forces should largely prevail.
- Area already fragmented. Lack of compliance monitoring and enforcement of existing standards. Wetland and Water policy are not being followed as well on all land classifications within planning area.
- Same as previous comment.
- By not increasing density we can keep the desire for these lots and prices healthy.
- Develop land setback from lake to leave frontage uncrowded/cleaner.

Q4 Based on existing densities, the current Plan allows for a maximum of 81 additional recreation units in the Development Areas as shown below. Please rate your level of agreement or disagreement on the following statements:

Additional lands should be made available for more intensive types of development.

Agree	16 (35%)	Neutral	6 (13%)	Disagree	6 (13%)
Somewhat Agree	11 (24%)			Somewhat Disagree	7 (15%)

- No comments

Development should be limited to a smaller area.

Agree	5 (13%)	Neutral	7 (18%)	Disagree	12 (31%)
Somewhat Agree	11 (24%)			Somewhat Disagree	4 (10%)

- There seems to be an increasing demand for units for recreation / residential use and by denying that demand by pointing to a document the unauthorized use of land is increasing and will do so to the detriment of the environment. By allowing development and working with the people a much large degree of control can be maintained with respect to standards and services.
- Density transfer should be used as method to concentrate development (Sale or transfer between land owners).
- I do not agree with the existing maximum. To build a resort takes a lot of dollars to build and maintain the existing number of left over density of 81 is the residential capacity 324 recreation non resident. In order for a resort to prosper is for it to grow. For a developer it is a one time cost input with all other cost put on owner.
- I think an effort should be made to allow for lower density development with direct access to the lake shore and include amenities/services. Higher density development could be made further from the lake without direct lake access. These users can then access the lake through more public amenities.
- We approve of the boundaries as they are. However, the density within the boundaries could be increased.
- Keep development in currently busy areas buiuld on existing popular spots.

Q5 After learning about the potential for development in the area, please rate your level of agreement or disagreement on the following statements:

There should be additional development opportunities near the lake.

Agree	15 (32%)	Neutral	6 (13%)	Disagree	13 (27%)
Somewhat Agree	9 (19%)			Somewhat Disagree	4 (9%)

- No comments

There should be additional development opportunities further away from the lake.

Agree	16 (35%)	Neutral	6 (13%)	Disagree	6 (13%)
Somewhat Agree	11 (24%)			Somewhat Disagree	7 (15%)

- No comments

There should be additional opportunities for public access to the lake.

Agree	20 (44%)	Neutral	5 (11%)	Disagree	11 (24%)
Somewhat Agree	6 (13%)			Somewhat Disagree	3 (7%)

Q6 If there is any particular type of development that you do not support, please share.

- Lots for RV use that do not have to install or provide approved septic system.
- All new developments
- Industrial or Intense Livestock developments would not likely be compatible with the lake.
- Development that has major impact on watershed particularly riparian and littoral zones except if in public interest. Parks, beaches, boat launches and docks that are publicly accessible should be expanded.
- Over the last few years I have seen a # of things that concern me regarding local bylaws, provincial and federal laws being broke and nothing being done about it. The problem I see with more development and access to the lake, no one is policing what is happening. If the MD has all these grand plans in place then they better start thinking about policing and enforcing what is currently happening before they develop anything.
- RV parking, private campsite. We have enough of those already.
- Commercial, oil field
- No
- I don't want cabins taking up all the areas and no seasonal camping left
- I live at the Narrows. I don't support the thought of a public boat launch in the area due to increased traffic and no room to park. I feel upgrading and expanding the current public boat launches would be ideal.
- I do not support intensive livestock operations within the watershed, or further golf courses that rely on fertilizers within the watershed.
- I do not support intensive campgrounds that do not keep with the aesthetic of the surrounding area.
- We would like to see MORE development in the Narrows. Residents should be able to access the lake for pleasure. i.e. a beach, playground, boat launch and docks, all to be up-kept by the MD. At the moment the only people that can enjoy the lake are those with lake front property...we call them lake front, but in reality there is a large buffer that is public land that could be enjoyed responsibly if it was properly developed.
- Industrial (x2)
- Greenview golf course needs better management before any developments happen or there won't be many customers
- Further study is required in this entire area, Development that affects the environment negatively or raw sewer dumping into the watershed that affects lake quality.
- A new campground Another boat launch
- I don't want cabins taking up all the areas and no seasonal camping left
- I wouldn't support noise pollution growth, more congestions, atv pollution, and any development that isn't healthy for the lake
- [There should be additional opportunities for public access to the lake] but not where there is private subdivisions. Further development should not include the water shed!

Q7 The current Plan includes environmental protection measures such as development setbacks (60m from main body of lake, 90m from West Bay), limits on vegetation removal, and requirements for sealed holding tanks for sewage. Do you believe these measures are sufficient to protect the lake?

Yes	40 (85%)	No	72 (15%)
-----	----------	----	----------

- The setbacks are fine and may be excessive in some locations, but with increased development a municipal type sewage system should be in place to ensure that all sewage goes to treatment and not into the lake. Trucking sewage is not convenient and increases heavy traffic and can become costly, thereby increasing the likelihood that some may try and circumvent this by simply pumping out there tank into the bush.
- Do better
- For the current densities, probably. However, if additional development is to be considered (as it should be) the MD should consider added protections for the lake and surrounding infrastructure. Water and sewer services

would protect the lake and the roads, proper road and ditch maintenance would help with contamination, and a potable water point and RV sewage dump will help with all environmental factors.

- Requires compliance monitoring plus enforcement. Assumption is however that plan will not see further expansion of development opportunity (recreation, industry, forestry, oil and gas) or agricultural expansion than currently possible within watershed.
- Yes protect the shores, environmental reserve and enforce the rules. Let nature do its thing.
- Erosion from spring runoff and heavy rain can turn the lake brown.
- The MD should pursue an agreement to have jurisdiction over this area and be able to enforce it. (Ex. MD of Big Lakes around Winagami Lake around the Prov Park).
- Should have better enforcement on all protection measures.
- I hope so.
- Vegetation and root mass is an effective buffer for removing sediment and harmful substances from the lake.
- There should be measures taken to responsibly develop a beach and playground area where there is a population cluster such as the Narrows.
- Why are some allowed vegetation removal on lakefront and others not?
- What else could be done to make it any better?
- Activities on lakefront operations should be monitored closely and any modifications.

Q8 If you have additional comments and concerns, please share:

- With the allowance of many RV's per lot or unit a system needs to be in place to control sewage management for those units as well. Currently there is nothing available. The MD has significant land holdings via MR, ER and does nothing to maintain it. Most of that land is a big fire hazard waiting to happen. Some type of maintenance program is needed or turn those areas over to the adjacent landowners with an environmental easement attached. At least that way some basic preventative maintenance might take place.
- Go build in Snipe Lake ??
- I believe that, if the MD believes, as it publishes in its literature, that Sturgeon Lake is an asset to be promoted, it should make the necessary investment in the area to make this happen in a sustainable fashion. There also needs to be a recognition of the changing dynamics of the area and the growth in permanent resident. This will help in the provision of services provided in other areas of the municipality.
- The MD needs to start policing and enforcing what happens at the subdivisions.
- Recreation and lake access done in a responsible way without taking away habitat.
- Conditions on development permits are useless without having any enforcement.
- We have a seasonal site at Greenview golf course and hope they can have approval to add more seasonal campsites as there is a strong need in the area. Having more seasonal sites brings more revenue to Valleyview. We have enjoyed one full season at Greenview golf course and have made multiple trips into Valleyview for items forgotten. Then of course once you're there it's easy to pop by Tim Hortons or A&W etc. We've invited people from Grande Prairie out to golf with us instead of their usual at the Dunes in Grande Prairie. Like any great advertising best is word of mouth. We sure would love to get a permanent seasonal and not see this great area cut short. Thank you
- I would like to see a little more tax dollars reinvested into our community at the Narrows. Better drainage in some of the ditches. Finish paving the area. A few street lights. And a potable water supply for the public to access rather than having to go to Valleyview.
- More space for permanent camping is needed. Greenview golf has plenty in the back that won't affect the lake.
- Do not think more stringent restrictions should be put on remaining quarters than have been placed on already developed ones.
- his little survey is not enough to provide an informed response. I was extremely disappointed in the Open House, there was simply not enough information.