

Fawn Meadows Development Inc.

January 18, 2012

Dear Sir:

Re: Fawn Meadows, Pt. E1/2 4-53-2 W5M

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the recent discussions that have been held regarding the Fawn Meadows proposal. Administration will be bringing the amendment applications to the February 14, 2012 Council meeting for First Reading. I must note that the required supporting documentation (Outline Plan and supporting reports) remain deficient in their information. That being said, Administration is in favour of moving Bylaws 33-2010, 34-2010, and 35-2010 forward for First Reading consideration by Council. A list of these deficiencies has been compiled for your reference and are listed below:

- 1) Revised Outline Plan
 - a. A revised Outline Plan would go a long way in allowing Administration to review the proposed project more effectively. The resubmitted Outline Plan from July 2010 did not address the issues previously raised by Administration. It was essentially the original document with some minor spelling corrections.
 - b. A revised Outline Plan would assist when reviewing the amendment applications along with the proposed Bylaws that were drafted by the consultant and received by the County March 29, 2011.
 - c. Administration would then attempt to review all materials as submitted to date in order to bring the application forward to the February 14, 2012 Council meeting for First Reading.
- 2) Fire Protection Plan
 - a. This plan must be prepared to Parkland County's satisfaction and include the entire development in its scope.
 - b. Was deficient in the February 2010 Outline Plan.
 - c. This plan was entirely missing from the resubmitted July 2010 Outline Plan.
- 3) Servicing Design Brief
 - a. February 2010 Outline Plan includes a small section called "Engineered Utilities and Services Brief" that included policies that would guide servicing. It is noted in the brief

that Altime Engineering Ltd. had prepared a preliminary Stormwater Management Report. This report has never been submitted to Parkland County.

- b. A majority of the remainder of the brief in the February 2010 Outline Plan was simply copied from elsewhere and was not been tailored to address the specifics of the proposed Fawn Meadows development.
- c. This brief was entirely missing from the resubmitted July 2010 Outline Plan.
- d. To date, no additional engineering or servicing briefs have been submitted to Parkland County.

4) Geotechnical Reports

a. Waste Water Analysis

- i. Discussions with Alberta Environment have confirmed that provincial approval for a communal system may be granted by Alberta Environment upon the developer's application. This approval will be a requirement of Parkland County.
- ii. As has been previously discussed the responsibility of ownership, operation, maintenance, and replacement of the waste water system will not fall under the jurisdiction of Parkland County, but will be the responsibility of Alberta Environment and the Condominium Association.
- iii. Further correspondence and approvals from Alberta Environment will be required through the subdivision and endorsement processes.

b. Groundwater Supply Analysis

- i. Revised June 9, 2011 report does not make accommodations for Fire Protection needs.
- ii. Conclusion Section 6.0 requires a statement saying that the entire project (Residential, Commercial, Service) water demands would meet the Water Act. (for example residential demands must be less than 1250 m³/year/household)
- iii. The entire report is required to be completed, signed, and stamped by a professional Engineer registered with APPEGA (not just the cover letter).

5) Traffic Impact Assessment

a. Comments are based on revised September 8, 2010 TIA report and are as follows:

- i. On page 23, Section 6.1 Conclusions and Recommendations, the TIA indicates that the interior intersection of Fawn Meadows entrance and Parkland Drive does not require an intersection treatment as the traffic volumes on Parkland Drive presently are less than 200 AADT.
- ii. However, on page 10, Section 2.4 Adjacent Developments, the 2010 AADT indicated for Parkland Drive is already at 208. Therefore and based on Figure D-7.4, "Traffic Volume Warrant Chart for At-Grade Intersection Treatment on Two-Lane Rural Highways", a Type II intersection treatment with three point curve radius design of the intersection with the Fawn Meadows entrance and Parkland Drive will be required prior to endorsement of Phase 1.
- iii. No concerns were noted with the proposed simple Type I intersection treatment with appropriate access control to restrict access to emergency use only pending approval of the design from both Alberta Transportation and the County's Engineering Services Department.

- iv. The TIA recommends that Type III intersection treatments are required for both the east access and Parkland Drive intersections on Highway 770 by 2020 or soon thereafter. It is recommended that prior to endorsement of Phase 3 that both intersections be upgraded to Type III intersection treatment and the east access intersection be fully paved and all mitigation measures installed at Phase 1 be removed, converting it to a full, all-directional access.

6) Amendment Applications

- a. A detailed review of the proposed amending Bylaws for the MDP, ASP and LUB will be completed in preparation for the February 14, 2012 Council meeting.

Should you wish to submit any additional information/updated reports in support of the amendments for the Fawn Meadows project, I respectfully request that the information be submitted to me **no later than January 30, 2012**.

Sincerely,

Christina Kortmeyer, RPP, MCIP, Planner