



July 2, 2019

Morgan Huber
City of Calgary
Community Planning | Planning & Development
The City of Calgary | Mail Code #8075
P.O. Box 2100, Station M, Calgary, AB, T2P 2M5

Via email: morgan.huber@calgary.ca

Dear Mr. Huber,

RE: West View Area Structure Plan (WVASP) Circulation Response

With respect to the proposed West View ASP, the County offers the following comments for your consideration.

Where the *Rocky View County / City of Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)* provides guidance on the form and nature of consultation for lands identified as having mutual interest, the County requests that the policies outlined therein be utilized with respect to this application. The Interim Growth Plan is considered in review of all intermunicipal circulations, but where a framework for collaboration exists, the County is comfortable to operate within that context at this stage.

The County acknowledges the City's intention to provide for a more detailed planning framework and to undertake more detailed technical studies at outline plan stage. However, this affects the County's ability to fully appreciate and comment on the potential impacts upon its residents and infrastructure within the County. It is noted that the ASP could generally elaborate further on integration with the wider area, especially with respect to land use transition and interface with the County.

Planning:

Firstly, the County appreciates the provision for circulation of all applications within the plan area (Policy 8.5.2). If adjacent landowners within the County have not already been notified of the draft plan, it may be beneficial to seek their input. We are happy to provide contact information for those residents, should City administration require them.

Adjacent lands within the County are currently guided by the Central Springbank Area Structure Plan. These lands are currently identified for country residential development and some country residential uses are already developed in proximity to the ASP. The West View ASP proposes residential land uses along the boundary, which may be compatible with the current land use scenario for County lands if managed appropriately.

Policy 3.5.1 of the draft ASP confirms that interface planning principles should be reflected in all subsequent land use amendment, outline plan, subdivision and development permit applications in the plan area; however, no details are provided in the document as to how this will be achieved.

The County requests that consideration be given to providing more detailed policies within the ASP that guide the appropriate transitioning of land uses between municipalities in accordance with section 6.0 of the *Rocky View County / City of Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)*. Consideration should also be given to appropriate transition tools.

Inclusion of more detailed transition policies within the ASP would further support compliance with Policy 6.1.4 of the IDP. This policy recognises the importance of intermunicipal entranceways that provide access and egress between municipalities and the necessity to provide special consideration for these entranceways.

High-level policies covering transition in terms of land use and building form, subdivision, site and building designs are encouraged within the ASP. Implementation of these policies and the IDP transition and entranceway policies should be included in the interface policies of the future outline plan(s).

In addition, we suggest that the County's Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines be utilized when considering all new developments adjacent to existing agricultural areas within the County until such time as these lands develop. The guidelines are intended to reduce land use conflicts, which is in accordance with the principles of the IDP as noted above.

[Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines](#)

Recreation:

With respect to the proposed recreational amenities in the West View ASP; provision should be given for the following considerations:

- It is recommended that the City of Calgary takes into consideration the Northwest Recreation Study that the City of Calgary and Rocky View County are collaboratively working together on as the proposed site shares limits with the Rocky View West District. The Province of Alberta has mandated the development of shared municipal service agreements (Inter-collaborative Framework Agreements - ICF's) where the potential demand for efficient inter-municipal services exists. To understand the need for inter-municipal services, The City of Calgary (The City) and Rocky View County West Region (The County) are working collaboratively together to complete a regional recreation study.
- It is recommended that the City of Calgary takes into consideration the Rocky View West District plan 2019-2024 ([link](#)), where recreational needs for the County West region are identified, as well as the 2017 Rocky View West State of Recreation where population and demographics analysis for the region are included, as well as catchment area profiles for regionally significant amenities, and demand analysis ([link](#)).

Parks & Active Transportation

With respect to the proposed parks, open space and active transportation network presented in the West View ASP; provision should be given for the following considerations:

- Network alignments identified in the joint 2014 City of Calgary and Rocky View County – “Intermunicipal Pathways and Trails Study” that are located within or intersect with the West View ASP are recommended to be explored with connectivity considered to be high priority.

- Inter-municipal connectivity -- where feasible -- are recommended to be of a design that presents users with a seamless and uninterrupted experience.
- Network alignments identified in Rocky View County's "Active Transportation Plan: South County" are recommended for consideration for provision of regional active transportation network connectivity.
- As per Rocky View County's Parks and Open Space Master Plan; preservation of lands deemed to be of environmental significance should be protected in order to allow for contiguous preservation with similar lands in Rocky View County.

Community Support

Communities that provide a variety of social, cultural and recreational opportunities, a range of housing choices, a mix of land uses and a diversity of transportation choices generally result in an enhanced quality of life. Provision for providing access to healthy choices, social supports and accommodations for safe neighbourhoods should be formally declared via plan policy to ensure any consideration for increased community population receives appropriate resourcing and support to meet future needs.

Engineering:

Transportation (Section 6.3)

The City has indicated that a forecast analysis has been completed but there is no technical study to support the transportation network shown in the proposed ASP. The County requests this information in order to provide a full review of the ASP.

- The County would appreciate receipt of information relating to the proposed land uses and population distributions, so that the information can be added to the County's transportation model. This will also allow the County to coordinate its technical studies and land use strategy within the Springbank ASP review process to better integrate with the West View ASP.
- The County was previously asked to review a number of possible configurations for the half interchange. It is not aware of the final configuration that has been approved. Again, the County would appreciate this information for incorporation into the County transportation model to ensure a proper integrated approach has been taken with respect to these lands and the Springbank ASP lands.
- The County requests clarification on how possible impacts to provincial (HWY 563/HWY 1) and County infrastructure has been considered. Based on traffic generation of the proposal, is there a need for roadways within either provincial or County jurisdiction to be improved as a result of the increased traffic?

Map 5 – The alignment of future County Roads should not be shown within the City ASP unless these have been agreed to and confirmed with the County. Similarly, the future intersections that are not within Calgary's jurisdiction should not be shown. The County would suggest that an alternative approach would be to identify the proposed western connections along the municipal boundary and show only the general direction of transportation/active transportation routes into the County.

Stormwater Management (Section 7.3)

- The County would recommend reference to low impact development strategies and source water protection in this section.
- The County would question how the future pond locations have been established in the absence of an updated Master Drainage Plan (MDP).
- With respect to Policy 5, the County would appreciate some elaboration/clarification on the intent of this policy.

West View MDP Comments

The cover page to this document outlines that updates will be undertaken to this document. The County has therefore only done a high level review of the document considering the document may substantially change at such time when the MDP is updated. We request that the updated MDP is sent to the County for formal comment when it is completed in future (prior to outline plan approval).

Pond C

Pond C appears to be discharging directly onto County lands (p. 61, Figure 4.1). Figure 6.1 (p. 62) indicates that the pond is discharging into the Range Road 30C ravine. However, the ravine and Range Road 30C are not shown in GIS.

- What is the location of the ravine exactly? Is this an existing drainage course?
- What path of travel does the drainage downstream of the ravine take? Is there an existing drainage course that the ravine leads to?
- Where is the ultimate outlet for this drainage course through the County? Does the drainage course have sufficient capacity to accommodate added flows from the pond?

Pond E

Figure 4.1 (p. 61) of the report shows Pond E discharging into an unnamed ravine that ultimately discharges into the river. This unnamed ravine crosses through what appears to be private property within the County. According to our GIS, there is no surface water or riparian setback in the location of the unnamed ravine.

- Is there actually a ravine in this location?
- Has any consideration been given to the land owner that may be impacted by this? Have any discussions or agreements been made (i.e. for storm water easements, etc) with the land owner?
- If there is a ravine in this location, how much flow does it currently accommodate? Does it have enough capacity to accommodate the added flows from the pond?

The County requests further information to understand and comment on the above stormwater and transportation related concerns prior to this plan proceeding.

We look forward to clarification on the items above and are happy to discuss in person or over the phone. Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment and should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Regards,
ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

Jessica Anderson
Planner, Planning and Development Services

CC: Dominic Kazmierczak, Planning Supervisor, Rocky View County
Amy Zaluski, Manager, Intergovernmental Affairs, Rocky View County
Gurbir Nijjar, Engineering Supervisor, Rocky View County

CITY OF CALGARY
RECEIVED
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER

JUL 03 2019

ITEM: 7.2 PUD 2019-0548
Distribution

CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT