

## Community Association Letters



April 12, 2017

Planning, Development & Assessment #8201  
P.O. Box 2100 Station M  
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

Attention: Peter Shryvers, File Manager

Reference: LOC2017-0015 5 Rockcliff Ht NW

On behalf of the RRROCA I offer the following comments on this Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan application:

1. Density: The proposed 5.88 units per acre is not appropriate for this site given that this density exceeds the 4 units per acre proscribed in the ASP, and the site is bounded on all sides by development in the range of 3.5 UPA including large estate lots. In addition, this development is on a collector road and would be out of place in this context. In the applicant's submission it states that "the area adjacent and close to the subject site consists of lands that are zoned, Residential Narrow parcel one dwelling (R-1N)" however I am not aware of any lots with this zoning in the neighbourhood. Clearly this proposed development is not consistent with the surrounding area.
2. The overall quality of this submission is very poor. The written description is not consistent with the plans and graphics and the written statements are not reflected in the drawings provided. From what has been provided my opinion is that the streetscape facing Rock Lake Drive will have a negative impact on the community. The statement by the proponent that the site arrangement will highlight privacy of the lots like gated communities may or may not be true but gated communities are neither desirable or supported by the community.
3. Given the grades and the impact of roadway locations it is doubtful that the S-SPR and S-UN parcels will retain any natural qualities and appear to be more of a benefit to future homeowners, and not to the community. These parcels will be heavily impacted, requiring restoration that will likely never be fully integrated with the existing natural area.
4. It is clear that the proponent does not understand the ecology of the natural features. His letter states that he will "protect aspen tree stands (bark size greater than 10" diameter)". This approach is not a sound ecological strategy and furthermore, nobody can plant new knob and kettle terrain as he promises. The reasoning behind the ASP Special Study policy is to maximize density at 3-4 UPA so that the unique natural features can be preserved. The proposed density and site planning cannot support preservation of one of the last remaining pockets of knob and kettle.
5. A shadow plan for the lands north of the subject site has not been provided. This is essential for a proper review and comments.

## Community Association Letters

2

6. The proposed plan does nothing to contribute to the community in a positive way. The proponent's statements about maintaining existing site character and that the proposed development is complimentary to the established land use pattern are not reflected in the outline plan.
7. Seika Architecture letter dated March 6, 2017, last page, Item #2: this item refers to Map 3 "Wetlands identified on Map 3 shall, wherever possible be dedicated as voluntary Environmental Reserve" – this is the Key Plan – Context, and is a very poor quality google map. It fails to identify the wetland or the wetland quality/function and there is no explanation as to why it should be dedicated or how it would be preserved. A detailed study of the natural area should be conducted prior to any decision on land use.

The proponent has not consulted with the community association and we have had no other communications from him.

In summary, this proposed development has no redeeming qualities and we oppose this application.






Please accept these revised comments and responses to the application.

Sincerely,



Dave Spencer,  
Director of Planning and Development RRROCA  
403-716-8206  
[planning@rrroca.org](mailto:planning@rrroca.org)  
cc: Tessa Sakamoto, President RRROCA, Councillor Ward Sutherland,

## Community Association Letters

 Wed 8/5/2020 3:21 PM  
Planning, RRROCA <planning@rrroca.org>  
[EXT] Re: LOC2017-0015 - Circulation  
To  de Jong, Joshua A.;  President;  Co-Vice President;  Communications

Joshua:

I apologize I did not see the first email circulation. I have been stuck out of country and just returned to Canada 3 weeks ago so I have notified the board.

### Comments on application **LOC2017-0015**

1. Sections A, B and C: non-credit MR is labelled as RC-1, not S-SPR as indicated on plan view
2. The culvert symbol in plan view at back of lots, adjacent to section B-B: assume the culvert is under granular path. Also, the grade in section B-B appears to rise in elevation to the north, whereas in the plan view new contours are shown to direct overland drainage to the pond. Section should be revised. No "shared vegetated swale" shown in the section. Avoid regrading (as indicated by contours) in the area labelled as "existing trees to be retained".
3. We request that no rear yard gates be a condition of approval, in order to allow natural vegetation to thrive. Other older developments with gates into natural areas have tended to be degraded over time.
4. Section C-C standard residential street section: Street lights are indicated, lighting which could interfere with natural wildlife in the S-Sun natural area. Lighting levels on Rock Lake Drive are more than adequate for visibility, and we hereby we request NO new streetlights in accordance with Dark Sky principles.
5. Some existing trees on Rock Lake Drive may be removed for development construction. WE request that new street trees with a maximum spacing of 8 meters O.C. be provided as a condition of approval.

This property is one of the last undeveloped parcels in Rocky Ridge and many of our residents are aware of past applications, are concerned over the loss of nature and are very interested in the quality of any development of the subject lands. Due to this high profile, we need to get it right. Speaking on behalf of the Community Association, this application has considered our past concerns, is technically good, and we support the application provided that the items above are addressed.

**Dave Spencer**

*Director of Planning & Development  
Rocky Ridge Royal Oak Community Association*



**Dave Spencer**  
*Director of Planning & Development  
Rocky Ridge Royal Oak Community*