Smith, Theresa L.

From: dianne kohli [diannekohli@hotmail.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, September 23, 2015 6:28 PM

To: Albrecht, Linda

Cc: ckrups@shaw.ca; marcello.rapini@perpetualenergyinc.com

Subject: re By law 161D2015 (Loc 2015-0090

Importance: High

Lam the owner of the property at 8 Rockcliff Pt NW which will be directly adjacent to the development purposed by the Decker Development for Rock Lake. In speaking with the owners of 4 and 12 Rockcliff Pt, we would like to comment on the purposed development behind our properties. The present development plan was inherited from the previous owners of the land (Home Run) with some adjustments. We understand that some development will take place on this area but would like to suggest the following restrictions.

At present my property descriptions for the tax roles state that there is green space behind my house. I and my neighbours have been faithfully paying this premium and will happily countinue to pay that extra amount to maintain the current vegetation. In an area where there are so few standing forested areas, our worry is that the lot sizes behind our properties will result in the removal of all the trees due to the small size. I spoke with Michael at Decker a couple of weeks ago. He agreed that the trees on this land add value to both our properties and the new lots they are going to sell. I would like to purpose that a buffer of trees be left between our houses and the new development area, this land should not be owned by any residents but remain as a permanent space between the properties. Just such an area has already been used between the lots on Rockborough Pk and Rockford Ter. These trees allow the owners on both sides privacy and allow for animals to travel along this path (believe it or not we still have a moose that likes to hang out around the lakes!). Although we would love to see all the trees remain, we feel that leaving 4-5 meters would go a long way to keeping the beauty of this land.

Secondly, we feel, the two lots behind 12 Rockcliff pt are so small that without a mandatory buffer zone between the lots that the developer will completely strip the trees. We would ask the council to re evaluate these lots to determine if the size meets the requirements both for city codes and the esthetics of the neighbourhood. With a required buffer we would at least not have these houses so close to our back fences.

Third, we would like to know what the elevations for the new lots will be. We would prefer that the new development not be the same as the elevation level on our houses to increase every ones privacy.

Finally, despite all the houses that are built by Decker Development in this area, there are no play structures nearby for young families to enjoy. The closest is across rocky ridge road or at the community center (which can only be used by members). We would feel that a play structure for the enjoyment of all the residents nearby is long overdue, especially because the lots in the newer phases make it difficult to fit a deck and a personal play structure. Although this play area could be in many places, we purpose that the lots behind 12 be considered if they are found to be inappropriate to single house dwellings. This location would be central to all the different streets nearby and can be accessed easily by parents and children with disabilities. If this area is not approved, we would strongly recommend that another spot be set aside for a play area.

Thank you on behalf of: Dianne and Jagdeep Kohli Christopher and Christine Krupa Marcello Rapini

