

HAMLET OF MOUNT LORNE TITLED PROPERTY OWNER OPINION SURVEY JUNE 2011- COMMENTS RECEIVED

QUESTION 1:

- [Opposed] until the Local Area Plan and Dev. Area Regs. are changed
- Oppose as presented. This does not take into account that there are other options for development of the McGowan lots - ie do not need to accept this plan as it was only a feasibility study!!
- too many lots!
- too many lots. Instead create parkland in meadow and only then look at other development options
- We would support this initiative if it was on a much smaller scale.
- Not less than 6 ha lots
- providing habitat and environmental values are protected

QUESTION 2:

- [oppose] until the Local Area Plan and Dev. Area Regs. are changed
- I think a full review will cost a lot of money and take a long time. However I do think that a biologist should do a review of the Southern Lakes Caribou herd and make recommendations if the herd could sustain potential development on the Annie Lake Road ward.
- No 3 ha lots until plan undergoes full review; can already subdivide if lot is greater than 12 ha / min 6 ha lots.
- [support] but I still won't split up my property
- Does not consider how to deal with "offsite" impacts of increased development / settlement.
- [support] but leaning to "oppose". I know I might need the \$\$ some day and want to sell a portion. However, I have lived in the hamlet for 25 years and wish to keep the values and solitude I sought.

QUESTION 3:

- Only if a time limit is set to do this eg. One year
- minor plan amendment and amend regulations
- A good plan is essential to any land development currently or planned. This should be a "recommendation" rather than advice.
- Depends on who's doing the review.
- opposed for subdivision of existing lots only, but support full review of Area Plan before developing McGowan Lands.
- would like to add ability of subdivision of lots to amendment to current plan

GENERAL:

- Your survey does not represent a neutral opinion of the private subdivision existing lots process...Are you suppose to represent us or to give us your opinion? You're not a political party.

October 16, 2010: From Diane Parenti and Rick Macdonald

There are a couple of things that Rick and I would like to see added to the Hamlet of Mount Lorne Proposal to Allow Subdivision of Rural Residential Lots document.

In the section titled Effect of Subdivision, we would like to see some mention of the effect of increased traffic on the road and road deterioration. This is a big issue on the Annie Lake Road already, with the amount of traffic we have at present.

In the section titled Rate of Growth, we would like to see the grid extended to include minimum lot size of 6 hectares. This was mentioned at the meeting on Oct 13, but I just want to get our input in.

Thanks,
Diane and Rick

November 3, 2010: From Lisa Chevalier

RE: Re-Subdivision of Rural Residential Lots in Mt. Lorne

Our community history is important—we need to acknowledge our community plan

In 1995 the Mt. Lorne and Carcross Road Area Plan was adopted by the government.

Starting in 1992, the Mt. Lorne community undertook an extensive planning process guided by a community based Steering Committee. Steering Committee and community members put in generous amounts of volunteer time to bring the plan to fruition.

It was a lot of hard work. There was discussion, there was compromise, there was consensus and slowly a vision for the community developed and took shape—a community with its own unique, rural character.

The Hamlet of Mt. Lorne has a community plan—this plan needs to be acknowledged and it should be our starting point for any discussions this community has on development and land disposition issues.

Objectives in the community plan that relate to the: Rural Lifestyle and Pattern of Development and Land Use

2.4.1

- A. Preserve and enhance the rural lifestyle and amenities of the Planning Area
- B. Recognize and protect wildlife habitat and wilderness resources throughout the Planning Area
- C. Maintain a low density development pattern throughout the Planning Area

D. Prevent the development of small acreage Country Residential subdivisions throughout the Planning Area

G. Ensure that new development is carefully phased to avoid disrupting the rural lifestyle and amenities of the Planning Area

Two options for land development/disposition in the hamlet have come forward recently. One was proposed by the government: McGowan Subdivision, the other by community members: re-subdivision of rural residential lots. Both of these proposals are a contradiction to the objectives of our community plan. Both would dramatically increase the density with the potential to do so in a very short period of time.

Neither of these two proposals should be dealt with in isolation. To implement either of these proposals simply with an amendment to our community plan is irresponsible. They both have major implications for the community and negate key objectives of the plan as it now stands. We might as well just burn the plan, as it will no longer be the guiding vision for our community. The sensible, rational thing to do at this time is to consider these proposals within the context of a full plan review.

The Process- A Full Plan Review

It is time. It has been 15 years since our community plan was adopted. There are many issues to bring to the table at this time for a plan review, to name a few:

- there is demand for land in the hamlet from outside our community (from YTG) and demand for change from inside the community (re-subdivision) with potential for major environmental, social and economic impacts;
- there is new knowledge of caribou habitat;
- the First Nations Land Claims have been settled with potential for development on their lands;
- new global environmental concerns have come to the forefront;
- the territorial government is promoting local agriculture;
- community members have concerns over firewood;
- with increased density it may be beneficial to have some commercial lands designated;
- Yukonners have begun the discussion on how best to deal with off-road vehicles, an issue that will increase in the hamlet with increased density;
- the inconsistencies between our Community Plan and the Land Use Regulations;
- the list goes on.

It is only with a full plan review that we can create a vision for this community. It is through discussion, compromise and consensus that we will continue to be the special community that we are. To simply amend the plan to allow development will not create community but will divide it. "Real estate" will rule the day, instead of community vision.

Yes, there is change in the air, but I believe change should happen within the context of a full plan review. **The community discussion that should be happening now is not about the 'Backgrounder', but it should be about the best process for this community to follow in response to the re-subdivision**

petition. My vote is for a full plan review which will require greater consultation with all stakeholders and will take a comprehensive look at the issues.

(Council needs to speak directly to the Minister responsible, and convince the minister that there are many issues that this community needs to deal with at this time and that they should be dealt with in the context of a full plan review. As Judy Linton (Subdivision Land Use Planner, YTG) said at the October 13th meeting, the minister needs to be asked directly by council to budget funds for a plan review).

Some Specific Issues

Inconsistencies with the council's approach/process

1.

- In response to the McGowan Option Lands development proposal from YTG, council requested a comprehensive plan review, due to "the short and long term environmental, social and economic impacts on the community will be far too great and far too fast."

- In response to the petition for re-subdivision (which could have more lots develop than the first stage of the McGowan development in a shorter period of time) council in its letter to YTG dated May 18, is proposing a referendum ballot with a two page backgrounder for community members to use to make its decision.

- There is a major inconsistency in council's response and approach to dealing with these two proposals for land development, both of which will have major impacts on the community.

2.

- In council's letter to YTG dated May 18, council states: ... "Council and the Yukon Government would then prepare a referendum ballot that would seek approval for or rejection of subdivision of existing lots."... "Should approval be achieved then amendments to the existing Hamlet Plan and Zoning Regulations would be required to facilitate such subdivision."

- In the Letter from the Hamlet Council Chair in the Winter 2010 Community Newsletter, it states: "...a formal survey questionnaire seeking approval or rejection of subdivision of existing lots would be mailed out to all titled land owners." The letter does not explain the rest of the process.

- At the October 13th council meeting Peter Percival (Council Chair) stated that a survey would be sent out to determine community support for re-subdivision. If there was enough support, then we would continue with a full plan review. Judy Linton (Subdivision Land Use Planner, YTG) corrected Peter and

said that a full plan review has not been budgeted for and that if there is enough support the government sees the next step as initiating a plan amendment.

- This is all very confusing. Which is it, a ballot, a survey? What is the process following the results of the ballot/survey? A full plan review? Moving right to an amendment? Whatever process is decided on, it should be very clearly laid out for the community members. We should slow down and really look at the best process to follow.

3.

- When does the council see the community having opportunities for discussion of these issues? We were told that the October 13th meeting was an information session rather than a forum for discussion.

4.

- In council's letter to YTG dated May 18th, council requested the establishment of a broad-based steering committee of lot owners in the Hamlet with a specific mandate to deal with the re-subdivision issue. This was also stated in the Letter from the Hamlet Council Chair in the Winter 2010 Community Newsletter.

- What happened to formation of this Steering Committee? If this is what council has requested, why has this not happened? Is YTG ignoring council and taking the path of least resistance, circumventing real community discussion, and not following through with a social-environmental-economic assessment of re-subdivision?

- YTG prepared a costly, comprehensive feasibility study for their development proposal (McGowan Option Lands) but they seem to be ignoring council's request for a thorough assessment of the impacts of re-subdivision.

5.

- It is important to consult with Carcross/Tagish and Kwanlin Dun First Nations with respect to what our community is doing re development. But, it is also just as important to know what development plans the First Nations have for this area. Decisions on development and land disposition for our community should not be made until there is some understanding of First Nation development plans.