

Huntsville Planning Department  
Huntsville Town Council:  
Skulety : rezoning application.

In 1953 the Hall family severed the lots on the east side of Jingo lake. None of these lots meet the current lot size restrictions or minimum setbacks.

Because this was allowed to take place at the time it was decided that the minimum lot size should be increased to 400ft, You cannot change the past but you can lessen the impact or right the wrong by limiting future development of this nature.

The said property was originally not accessible but with the towns guidance Ken Earl brought the road up to municipal standards. I visited the planning department last year to see what my options were in regards to the property in question. I was informed at the time that there was a potential for two lots if all current zoning restrictions and setbacks were adhered to. An application for severance was not filed and the property was listed for sale.

What takes place in Jingo Lake effects everyone else downstream. This lake is spring fed, it runs into Waseosa lk. To Jessops creek then down to Vernon lk. The town has a morale obligation not to repeat the mistakes made in the past.

The septic inspections carried out on behalf of the town recently will not in any way aid in determining the impact of development on our water systems. Without following proper inspection techniques there is no way of determining what problems do exist. So determining the impact of any existing development becomes questionable. How can the town planning department determine what impact future development will have on the water quality in the area. without accurate information.

The property in question is low lying area with NR zoning immediately to the south. With a unopen road allowance along the southern border. The back bay borders on a large bog which provides and excellent spawning area for bass. All elevations on the lake are considerably higher than the area in question. The water level increases considerably in the spring and is most noticeable in the low lying areas.

We currently own 50 acres with approx 2000 ft of undeveloped shoreline. Our neighbour to the west owns 25 acres with approx 2000 ft of undeveloped shoreline. It is imperative that all existing zoning and setbacks be adhered to so that the lake and the existing ecosystem can maintain its integrity. We have a moral obligation to future generations not to repeat the narrow minded decisions made in the past.

Mrs. Skulety knew that there was a potential for two building lots. if current guidelines were respected. We have seen other lakes of this size in the area that have been subjected to high density building due to poor planning by uninformed individuals.

The Town council & the Planning department have an obligation to balance the rights of landowners with what is best for the area.

Having said that it is my responsibility as a resident of the lake to provide you with any information to help you determine the impact of a development like this. You do not have and obligation to Mrs Skulety to help her maximize her profit margin on her recent purchase. But you do have an obligation to the residents of the lake to make well informed decisions that will not have a negative impact on the lake. Mrs Skulety paid fair market value for the property she purchased. She will have the opportunity to make a reasonable return on her investment by creating two lots. Do you have a legal obligation to allow variances to developers who have one goal (making money)?

Sincerely Yours,

Jim Logagianes (789-3899-W)  
1479 S Waseosa Lk Rd. box 5474  
Huntsville, On P1H 2K8