

Section 1: General Conditions

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	The standard of granting CCC when the contract is 100% complete with zero deficiencies is not reasonable. "Minor deficiencies" are reasonable to be issued a Contract Completion Certificate.	ICC are no longer being enforced. Reference to ICC's have been removed in Sections 3.10.9, 4.8.3, and 8.2.3.2.
Missing	Are Interim Completion Certificates (ICC) still being enforced? This needs to be clarified.	
Missing	Consider issuing separate CCC's for water, sanitation, etc. Do not lump everything into one CCC.	Development Engineers already have the discretion to issue CCC's for separate work. It is recommended to try and get all the work completed in a timely manner such that one CCC may be issued.
Missing	Need to be specific about what is required on submissions, what needs to be included in the plans. This needs more clarity.	The specifics of what is required on submissions and plans are better defined in each section
Missing	Need to mandate a full review of engineering design submissions. Partial reviews create a lot of iterative work and extend the length of the process.	These comments are not relevant to items within the standards. The comments address the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.
Missing	Need a method for reducing the back and forth, iterative review process. Need to streamline the process.	
Missing	Don't move to a detailed design prematurely. Need to provide comments on the final submission.	

Section 2: Engineering Plans & Drawings

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	"Authentication" is challenging to obtain. Is it necessary to have standard drawings at initial review stage? Are "working drawings" sufficient?	This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.
Concern	Flexibility for conditional plans from shallow utility groups.	This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.

Section 3: Water Distribution

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	Should 6,000 be changed to 6,170 to match sanitary capacity?(response is no)	Response given at workshop was no. The sanitary capacity and water capacity vary.
Concern	3.2.3 – This is a prescriptive demand. Need flexibility / discretion for the amount of flow in industrial development.	If the demand required is higher for industrial, further assessment of the overall system would be required. Standards allowing too much flexibility would impact and effect future development needs and upgrades. The standards are to protect for future requirements.
Concern	3.2.8 – Disagree with having a prescribed time period for required looping. This is not within the development agreement. This needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis.	The standard offers the minimum requirement and ensures the looping will occur if development slows. Variances may be requested. Administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	3.10.10 – Need to check the leakage allowance formula, as the current formula doesn't work.	Formula was corrected to read: $L = (NDP(1/2))/128225$ for PVC and $L = (NDP(1/2))/32046$ for ductile iron pipe.
Concern	3.5.3 – Having one valve for every hydrant is unreasonable. One valve for two hydrants is more reasonable.	The 1999 Standard required this and it was decided to keep the standard the same.
Concern	3.2.9 – The looping requirement for the distance to a cul-de-sac should be discretionary.	The new standard is 170m. Strathcona County for residential and industrial is that anything over 120m must be looped.
Concern	Looping requirements cannot be applied to an industrial environment.	
Missing	3.11.4.7 – Specify the procedure that needs to be followed for testing the water system instead of having developers get an approval for a procedure.	This is a procedure that needs to be submitted as each test is different. Simply the chlorine needs to be injected at some location and then valves and hydrants need to be opened and closed to insure that all the lines are disinfected.

Section 4: Sanitary Sewer Systems

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	4.2.2.1 is good, but it conflicts with 4.2.2.2. 4.2.2.1 – need to justify it, proven flows based on use.	4.2.2.1 indicates that each case will be assessed based on the development to determine the requirement for the design of the sanitary sewer systems. However, if the assessment for 4.2.2.1 provides a value less than 6170 litres/ha/d, 4.2.2.2 indicates that the 6170 litres/ha/d shall be used as a minimum contribution.
Concern	4.7.9 – 98% compaction in grass or landscaped areas is too intense. Should be 95%.	Many municipalities ask for landscaped areas to be 100% compaction.
Concern	4.8.2 – Water leakage test for 100% of sewer system is too extensive. Why the entire system? E.g. filtration with PVC pipe.	The 1999 Standard required this and it was decided to keep the standard the same.
Concern	Auguring under existing infrastructure. Should be with consideration of manager (e.g. gravel road)	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	Lift station design standards should be flexible where constructability is a challenge. (e.g. standard barrel shape)	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Missing	More clarity of timing on ICC. Consistency of ICC with documents.	ICC are no longer being enforced. Reference to ICC's have been removed in Sections 4.8.3.
Missing	4.7.11 – More clarity please.	Was reviewed and decided that it was clear. "Backfill around valves, valve boxes and hydrants shall be placed in 150 mm layers and compacted with mechanical tampers to a minimum of 98% of Standard Proctor Density."

Section 5: Service Connections

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	Having no services under driveways is unreasonable, as a 4-5m depth is unreasonable. Should be able to place services under driveways.	Reducing conflicts of services is the standard. Strathcona County's standards are "services shall be located such that they do not conflict with driveway locations" Variances may be requested. Administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	Need to make sure that lot purchasers are notified of requirements.	Responsibility of developer to disclose all information relevant about the lot to the purchaser.
Concern	Need flexibility around service connections. This shouldn't be an absolute rule.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	Tie utilities to development permits, not subdivision permits.	Utilities should be correctly installed and ready for development to occur; therefore all utilities should be tied to subdivision approval. Also, due to some utilities being constructed under the road, the connections must be completed at subdivision approval time.
Concern	Don't have an absolute requirement to run water services to a lot. This needs to be determined once the lot usage is known.	

Section 6: Storm Drainage Systems

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	For 20-40 acres, need a large grading allowance, need flexibility in the allowance and the approach.	<p>Rough grading changes:</p> <p>"Rough grading of all lots to be within +/- 50mm of the final grades around the perimeter of the lots."</p>
Concern	The lot grading plan should be handled by builders as long as it meets approved drainage scheme.	
Concern	Developers should comply with an overall drainage plan, as opposed to a prescribed tolerance.	
Concern	Having rough grading of lots within two degrees of the finished grade is unreasonable. Need flexibility for the acceptance of constructed lots.	
Concern	Final lot development grading should remain to be determined.	
Concern	6.4.6.1 – Disagree with a need for 3/16 stainless steel. There are other good quality materials that are less expensive.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration will other material if proven to be equal or better quality.
Concern	Translating guidelines into standards may be too strict. Need to allow for discretion and to be open to design innovation.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	6.4.4 – Requirements for storm lift station are too close to the requirements for sanitary lift stations. Allow different materials. 6.4.4.1.5 is excessive.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	6.4.4.1.5 – The shape of chambers doesn't matter. Need flexibility in how we design storm lift stations.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	Need to prevent unnecessary negative financial impacts, both from the County's and the developers' perspectives.	<p>These comments are not relevant to items within the standards. The comments address the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.</p>
Concern	Need alignment between developers' goals and the needs of the County. Need to have further discussions on this topic.	

Section 7: Roadway Systems

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Support	7.4.8.5 – Density penalty system should be implemented.	Often with a penalty system there is a bonus system which would not be possible. Administration recommends that the developer could implement a penalty system with their contractors to ensure densities are being met.
Concern	Asking for a geotech report is counter-intuitive or redundant. Add: “or as otherwise suggested by a geotech.”	The standards indicate the minimum required, however due to varied soil conditions within Parkland County the geotech report is required to ensure that the minimum standards work. If the minimum standards do not work then the geotech report will rule. However, if the geotech recommends less than the minimum standard, the minimum standard will be required.
Concern	Either prescribe standards or allow for a geotech to guide. Having both is redundant.	
Concern	Better to have curb, gutter and sidewalk on a smaller cross-section.	40m right-of-way is only required for Arterial and Major Collector Roads. This is to ensure enough room for the ultimate 4 lane cross sections. At intersections even with the 40m right-of-way, curb and gutter urban standards may be required.
Concern	30m – 40m increase in right of way entails a tremendous cost – 20% to 30% increase in costs.	
Concern	Tremendous impacts on real estate!	Comparison to many municipalities in the capital region area indicate that most Arterials and Collectors require 40m
Concern	7.4.8.5 – Additional one year warranty doesn’t serve the County. Road will break down well after the warranty period.	Administration believes the additional one (1) year materials and workmanship warranty for the final lift after the Final Acceptance Certificate is issued for surface improvements should be required.
Concern	7.4.7 – Thickness tolerances – there’s too much discretion, suggest a penalty program (like CoE)	Often with a penalty system there is a bonus system which would not be possible. Administration recommends that the developer could implement a penalty system with their contractors to ensure thickness tolerances.
Concern	Approach and design standards should be open for professional judgment (on private portions).	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Missing	7.3.8 – Paragraph 1, 2nd and 3rd sentence should be tied together with “unless.”	<p>Unless is not required as each sentence relates to two separate items.</p> <p>3rd sentence is for all cul-de-sacs (not just ones exceeding 170m), the developer’s engineer must demonstrate that looping is not required for fire flow.</p> <p>A new paragraph was started for the 3rd sentence to avoid confusion.</p>

Section 8: Miscellaneous Requirements

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	8.2.3.2 – Disagree with legal pins before ICC, should be before CCC.	Section 8.2.3.2 was changed to "Legal pins shall be installed prior to subdivision endorsement"
Concern	8.4 – For industrial development, expense incurred for no valid reason.	8.4 is Municipal addressing signage is required for residential and industrial lots.
Concern	8.10.1 – Disagree with mandating underground power in industrial – increases cost 3-4 times, issue of competitiveness. Should be situational. Forecasting clients' end need. Difficult to update underground.	Underground power in industrial areas is as per council direction.
Concern	Load connections – recovery costs: based on power usage, never guaranteed, how long until paid back?	Section 8.12.2 and 8.12.3 were removed from the standards as energy costs are a policy issue not relevant to the standards.
Concern	8.5 – Should be relevant to subdivision. Size should be with discretion.	Section 8.5, Subdivision Signs, was changed to exclude Acheson Industrial Park. All other industrial subdivisions require the subdivision signs.
Missing	Include a standard where Industrial, Commercial and Residential Developers have to install a conduit to allow for the provision if future fiber optic service installation.	Added in to Section 8

Section 9: Landscape Requirements

Category		Action Item/Comments
Missing	Need to clarify the process for handling disagreements between landscape architects and the planning department.	This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.
Missing	Need a policy for dealing with third party damage during warranty period.	During the warranty period, this is the responsibility of the developer.
Missing	Missing a month for planting.	Planting season for trees and shrubs removed from standards.

Section 10: Standard Detail Drawings

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Concern	Pump station standard should have more flexibility for shape.	See comments in Section 4 - as per administration developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.
Concern	Road cross-sections – increased right of way widths.	See comments in Section 7 - as per right-of-way.
Concern	Road cross-sections – sloped ditch bottom versus flat bottom ditch.	Administration recommended keeping the sloped ditch bottom for maintenance purposes.
Concern	Purpose of lot pin on road right of way? To protect, identify, survey pin.	The purpose of the lot pin is to protect and identify the survey pin.
Concern	3.5 – Not enough room. 3.5 & 7.1 should be consistent, better detail.	Drawings 7.1 to 7.7 and 3.5 were changed to give better detail.
Concern	Water tie-in is almost 4m deep on the one side.	Water services and mains have not changed from the 1999 standards and are at acceptable depths.
Concern	Having sanitation under the road has issues with industrial, impacts the lot design, consolidation of lots is more challenging, suggest leaving as is.	Utilities should be correctly installed and ready for development to occur; therefore all utilities should be tied to subdivision approval. Also, due to some utilities being constructed under the road, the connections must be completed at subdivision approval time.
Concern	5.6 – instead of trademarked “Styrofoam” suggest “extruded high density foam.”	Drawing was updated to include "or approved equal"
Missing	6.8 Should have one for sanitation, another for storm. Material standards should be appropriately reflected.	Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.

Section 11: Naturalized Storm Water Management Facilities**After the workshop Section 11 was merged together with Section 6.**

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item
Missing	Strong consideration for public and stakeholder involvement to consider policy.	Direction provided by Council to match other municipalities in the Capital Region
Missing	Any consideration for MR allocation / credit.	This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.
Concern	Major concerns with brand brushing all ponds. Needs more review. (e.g. Trail system in the industrial park? Practicality?)	Standards similar to other municipalities in Capital Region. Trail also provides access for maintenance.
Concern	Any thoughts for alternate ponds? Regional or consolidated ponds? Takes municipal investment.	<p>This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.</p> <p>Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.</p>
Concern	Real estate implications on storm water management facilities.	Naturalized storm water management facilities will also increase the value of the properties in the area.
Concern	(Bioswale) maintenance is problematic.	Maintenance is less since the pond will be more naturalized.
Concern	Maintenance responsibility falls to the County? (Response is yes)	Yes, maintenance is borne by Parkland County and it is less due to naturalized state.
General	January 1, 2015, all SWMF shall be naturalized.	As per Council Policy

General Comments relevant to all sections

Category	Stakeholder Comments	Action Item/Comments
Missing	Suggest a variance committee for the exceptional cases.	<p>This comment is not relevant to items within the standards. The comment addresses the process between developers and Parkland County and have been passed on to the appropriate personnel for review.</p> <p>Development will be expected to design and construct as per the standards; however administration is developing a process in which variances to the standards may be requested.</p>