

Candice and Tiffany Edgecombe - Speaking in Opposition to the Proposed
Re-districting and West Point Estates Outline Plan



Good afternoon Council, my name is Tiffany Edgecombe, and I am here also representing my sister, Candice Edgecombe, to speak in opposition to both the proposed redistricting and West Point Estates outline plan. We are third generation weekend residents at Jackfish Lake, and consider this small lake our home away from home. As kids we slept in bunk beds in my grandparents leased cabin on Edwards' land at the NE corner of the lake. Here, at age 5, I learned to water ski with my grandpa driving the boat, and fell in love with lake life. We spent summers here, and braved the coldest Edmonton winters to spend every weekend possible at the lake. We would swim off our dock into the middle of the narrow for days on end. This is now a one-way narrow that swimmers rarely brave. As our family grew, our love for the lake did too. My grandparents bought a double wide lot in Kenglened with two small cabins and amazing south-facing beach access to the big bay. We never knew how amazing lake life could be. We spent our summers at the lake with our grandparents, and our mom would find us in the water, on the boat, canoeing, or running cabin to cabin with our lake friends all along Kenglened beach when she came out at the end of the work week.

Summers at Jackfish look a lot different today. Candice and I are both moms of two, and we are the ones doing the cooking, boat driving, untangling of fishing lines, and fire building. But our family's love for the lake remains steadfast. We still spend nearly every summer weekend at the lake, although now we sleep at my parents new house at Two Island Point, and spend a lot of our days at my grandparents for easy lake access. We host birthday parties and spend Christmas and Easter at the lake. And we have hopes and dreams for our futures at Jackfish. I hope it is obvious to you that we adore Jackfish, have grown up there and now raise our children there, and have witnessed all of the changes in Jackfish over the last 35 years.

There is no denying that we have also benefited from development at Jackfish. Our parents bought a lot in Two Island Point when we were teenagers. We were opposed to that development too, for the record. After all, it would take away the forests we used to hike through, the open field we played baseball in, and the solitary bay we used to canoe through looking for beavers and loons. But our parents assured us that the development would be responsible, respecting the sensitive needs of the lake and shore health. They have been true to *their* word, respecting the restrictions of the Municipal Reserve, minimizing impact of development to natural vegetation and wetlands, incorporating green development features, and preserving the overall health of the property, shoreline, and lake during continued use. But we have also seen in the development of Two Island Point and other new subdivisions that mitigating factors such as environmental reserve areas are very difficult to maintain and enforce. We see clear-cut beaches and beautiful green lawns from the top to bottom of lots. We see signs in response to this activity at the entrance to the subdivision, but no corrective action. We have seen first hand the deterioration in lake health, having to stop our kids from swimming in the bay due to blue-green algae. I will never forget 2015, the first time in my 35 years at Jackfish, having our beloved lake fall victim to poor environmental practices by residents and users of the lake. The appearance of blue-green algae is an undeniable indication that the health of our lake is unstable.

Section 10 of the Biophysical and Wetland Assessment report submitted by the applicant speaks to many suggested mitigating factors to reduce the impact of development and lake use on the environment. However, there are no policies in place to compel the developer or future landowners to implement these recommendations. The report recommends that a Residents Code of Environmental Conduct **could** be developed, however, development, implementation, and enforcement of anything to this effect would be precedent setting. Is Council, and Parkland County willing to set the bar for Environmental stewardship with this development? Is there even a mechanism in place to do so?

The Jackfish Lake Area Structure Plan explicitly states that “it is important to protect the remaining undisturbed shoreline”, but goes on to say that “it is not logical to require new developments... to meet stringent guidelines to protect the water quality if existing shoreline developments are permitted to continue to violate all accepted guidelines of proper lake management”. The ASP outlines a Policy stating that the County “shall require the removal of all existing private developments... located on existing reserve lands”, yet I have seen no sign of effective implementation of this policy at the lake. So I have to scratch my head when I read that the current proposal is supposedly supported by the ASP. The current proposal suggests the use of environmental reserve areas to mitigate the environmental impact; however, the ASP itself states that these features are not implicitly effective. Council needs to consider the lake health in a responsible and realistic way. Development of these shorelines will impact the health of the lake if there is not a sustainable policy in place to manage the detrimental effects. If we can't swim in the lake because it becomes toxic, will the increased tax base from the proposed development justify plummeting property values for the landowners at Jackfish today?

In the lake as a whole, we have witnessed the transition from weekenders to full-time residents. From water skiing and knee boarding to wake boarding and now wake surfing. From small outboard motors to huge surfing wakes. As kids we used to flip our canoe in the middle of the lake so we could paddle it, submersed, back to shore. Now we can't let our kids paddle canoes or kayaks on a summer weekend. It is plain and simply too dangerous. We used to drive each other tubing and water skiing all day. As a past competitive water skier and highly experienced boat driver, I now restrict even my time behind the wheel for early mornings and week day fun on the water. We used to drive to the middle of the lake and swim from the boat for hours. Today we don't feel comfortable letting our kids swim beyond the end of our dock because boat traffic and inexperience of drivers has reached unacceptable levels. It can even be dangerous to sit ON our grandparents' dock, as the huge wakes thrown by boats travelling a few

meters from the end of our dock shake our dock violently. And no, we do not have a floating dock.

The ASP outlines a policy that both Parkland County and the Jackfish Lake Management Association “shall implement an ongoing education program on... all aspects of watercraft safety... and user rules/regulations”. But an education program does not elicit behavioural changes unless reinforced and managed on an on-going basis. We used to regularly see enforcement of boating regulations on the lake, and now it is a rare sighting. Respect of rules and regulations, and general public safety has noticeably declined over the last 10+ years. The ASP is lacking in Policy to enforce boating safety. Public access to Jackfish shall be maintained, and while we aren't here to dispute that, I am asking ask how the current development aligns with the ASP and the statement that “Jackfish Lake has exceeded its carrying capacity for additional boating activity”. How is it that adding 30 additional lake front lots, with an expected average of 1.86 boats/household and likely 56 additional boats on the lake, can be supported by an ASP that explicitly states there is no additional capacity. And those numbers don't consider the likelihood of cluster piers for those residents at West Point without lakefront access. We strongly believe this deficiency must be acknowledged by Council, and addressed **before** approving additional developments, and especially this current application.

There was a near **death** accident on Jackfish lake last year. There could have been a boating **fatality**. Sending out flyers on boating safety does not address this issue, and Council needs to consider the seriousness of adding 60 or more boats to a relatively small lake that has been acknowledged as being over capacity. The current and future landowners do not want to see full boating restriction on this lake. If we can't boat on the lake because increased boat density renders the lake over capacity and unsafe for boating, will the increased tax base from the proposed development justify plummeting

property values for the landowners at Jackfish today? We need to proceed with smart development that has the lake health, and the safety and usability of the lake, in mind.

I work on a daily basis championing for public safety as an Engineer with the City of Edmonton's Fire Rescue Service. I see on a daily basis that the impact of public safety policy is only as great as the ability to implement and enforce it. By approving the West Point Estates Redistricting and Outline Plan, Council would be knowingly approving a development whose sustainability depends largely on Policies that do not exist or are not easily enforceable. You would be approving a development knowing it will have a negative impact on lake health and safety, despite claims by the applicant. The justification for this plan lies solely on recommended 'good practices' with no mechanisms in place to ensure those practices become reality moving forward. This is irresponsible development.

On behalf of my sister, our children, and our extended family who have called Jackfish our home away from home for over 36 years, please do NOT support the West Point Estates application, or ANY development application at Jackfish, until sustainable, enforceable, and effective policies are in place to protect the health of our lake, and every person using it.

