

April 15, 2010

Norcan Consulting Group Inc.

**RE: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF THE FAWN MEADOWS  
OUTLINE PLAN SUBMISSION RECEIVED FEBRUARY, 2010  
PT. E ½ OF 4-53-2 W5M, PARKLAND COUNTY**

---

Thank you for the Outline Plan submission to develop the above-mentioned titled area of land received at our office in February. Upon our review it appears that your client wishes to develop the titled area into a cluster conservation adult-oriented residential subdivision with privately owned and operated piped water and sanitary sewer services in addition to a neighbourhood commercial site and multi-storey assisted living facility adjacent to Highway 770 and near the Hamlet of Carvel. The Outline Plan submission has been prepared to support proposed amendments to the County's Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Bylaw No. 37-2007, Jackfish-Mayatan Area Structure Plan (ASP) Bylaw No. 41-80, and Land Use Bylaw (LUB) No. 20-2009.

As you are aware, Parkland County Council recently adopted new Policy PD-033 - Outline Plans that became effective March 1, 2010. Further to the Policy, Administration also recently adopted new Procedures PD-033-P regarding Outline Plans, which also become effective on March 1, 2010. Both were previously referred to your attention and are also attached to this letter for further reference. The Fawn Meadows Outline Plan Submission received in February has been reviewed against both Council's Policy and Administration's procedures.

Administration has completed its review of the received Fawn Meadows Outline Plan submission and has deemed the Outline Plan submission 'incomplete'. Therefore, please take into consideration the following comments and address the incomplete requirements and/or requested revisions and re-submit at your earliest convenience.

**1) Outline Plan – General Review**

- a) The Outline Plan is quite comprehensive in its approach and provides a great deal of information. There are some minor grammatical and spelling mistakes throughout the submission that should be addressed in any future re-submission. In addition, there are sections within the Outline Plan that seem to contradict each other or were not consistent with information put forth in different sections and appendices of the plan (*i.e. the shallow water table report not reviewing its findings in relation to 0.5 acre lots sizes*). Most of these contradictions have been noted in the sections below.

- b) It is recommended that Section 1.5 of the Outline Plan be reviewed and revised to properly and consistently address and support the necessary amendments (MDP, ASP, and LUB).
- c) Perhaps adding an additional section to particularly address the guiding policies within the Capital Region Growth Plan (CRGP) and the chart that was prepared for Fawn Meadows comparing the development to the CRB's policies would be beneficial. It would be helpful, when referring to specific policies in the CRGP, that these policies be properly identified. [i.e. Policy 1.A.(iv)]. We encourage you and your client to become familiar with the recently adopted Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) recently approved by the Province on March 15, 2010 under Ministerial Order L026/10 which has been attached to this letter for reference (i.e. Sections 3.5 and 5.4). Any future resubmission shall satisfy the requirements of Parkland County to make application to the Capital Region Board under the REF process, given that your proposed development will also require approval under the REF process.
- d) All reports should be tailored so that they are comparing the same units of measurement. It was noted on page 15 of the Outline Plan that some measurements were in metric measurements and others were in imperial measurements.
- e) Population projections and the number of units are not consistent throughout Outline Plan and different numbers have been utilized within different appendices. Please ensure that all charts, projections, and unit numbers are consistent throughout the entire Outline Plan and the appendices prepared by outside consultants reflect the accurate projections as well.
- f) The diagram depicting the "Phasing Plan for Fawn Meadows" seems to be incorrect. The looping road and interior units in the northwest plan area should be included within Phase 1 as indicated in report, not in Phase 2 as depicted in the diagram.
- g) Section 3.13 – Policy Summary should be reviewed. Administration notes that that a good proportion of these policies may not be suitable within the Outline Plan which has no statutory significance and could be included as policies within the Bylaws for the Condominium Corporation at a later date. Other policies within Section 3.13 could be retained, but included as part of the LUB Amendment.
- h) The Conservation Easement example included within the "Stat Plan and Bylaw Amendment Implementation Pkg." tab should be included as a separate appendix and have its own tab.
- i) Throughout the entire Outline Plan there are documents that are misplaced or repeated.
- j) Additional hand written comments and suggested generic changes have been provided within a copy the original Outline Plan that has been returned to you in connection with this letter.

## 2) Additional Reports and Information Required

Upon review of County Bylaws and policies and further to the complexity of the application, please provide the following additional reports as part of your Outline Plan submission:

### a) **Biophysical Assessment Report**

As required under Policy 3.19 of the Municipal Development Plan. This will assist in the definition (location) of natural conservation areas and techniques required to protect these areas. The Outline Plan refers in several places to the conservation of natural areas as an overarching principle within this development; therefore, the ecological information included within the Biophysical Report would assist in ensuring adherence to

that principle. Policy 3.2 of the MDP identifies, that a Biophysical Assessment may be required within 0.8 km of areas defined as environmentally significant. The Kilini Creek ESA is located approximately 0.8 km northwest of the titled area.

**b) Shallow Water Table Test Report**

The work for the shallow water table test was last conducted in March 2006. This report has been reviewed by the author within the scope of traditional country residential development [i.e. minimum 0.8 ha (2.0 ac)] lots and not for a cluster country residential form of development as proposed in the Fawn Meadows Outline Plan. The report must confirm the area of developable land within each unit proposed. This report should refer back to the proposed development and the units being created through this Outline Plan to prove that the lands within the plan area are suitable for the use as proposed for Fawn Meadows. Further, the subject testing is now more than four (4) years old and Administration recommends that the testing be updated with current measurements completed in accordance with Alberta Environment recommendations.

Section 5.0 of the this report should reflect the specific type(s) of sewage disposal system that are proposed to service this proposed development and the report should evaluate that system. Please refer to report written by Jacques Whitford NAWÉ Inc., dated February 2008, Project No. 1034043/NC-145 for additional information and comparison. Please ensure that metric units of measurement are included within **ALL** supporting documentation and reports.

**c) Appendix 4 – Direct Control District**

This appendix, as referred to on page 63, is missing or was not attached as part of the received Outline Plan submission. Please draft or attach the proposed Direct Control district that will accommodate the development of Fawn Meadows. Administration assumes this District Regulation will form part of your proposed Land Use Bylaw amendment.

**d) Adult Apartment Complex – Health Care Services**

Overall, the Outline Plan touched very little on the Health Care Services component of the contemplated Adult Apartment Complex, and in contrast focused on the architectural design and placement of the structure. Administration encourages that the Outline Plan be expanded in any future submission and further expands on the operation side of the facility including support from relevant provincial and/or local agencies either on the public or private side of the industry.

*Is such a facility at this location supported by the industry? Have any partnerships been established to-date to provide these contemplated Health Services in the future operation of such a facility, should Parkland County complete the requested districting amendments and allow the development to proceed?*

**e) Community Consultation & Communications**

Section 1.7 of the Outline Plan on pages 9 and 10 identify the pre-consultation completed with the rural community surrounding Fawn Meadows; however, very little of the identified correspondence, advertisements, minutes of meetings, questionnaires, etc. were included or attached within the appendix portion of the plan. Administration encourages all complete work be attached within the appendix to demonstrate to Council the actual work completed.

*The Outline Plan needs to further expand and elaborate on what the communities' issues are with the development and how the application will intends to address these issues. What, if any, changes were made or have been contemplated within the development to try and address these issues since the consultation was completed in early May of 2009?*

### 3) **Revised Reports Required**

#### a) **Groundwater Supply Analysis**

This report is generally well-written; however, the report does not reference Alberta Environment/Water Act requirements and whether or not the aquifer would be able to support the usage required by the Fawn Meadows development.

Additionally and most importantly, it is noted within the Stantec Memo dated July 17, 2009 from Shane Sparks and Jeff Elliott to \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ and referencing “*Fawn Meadows Water Management Strategy*”, that “Due to the amount of available groundwater and the sensitivity of the local groundwater aquifer, it is not feasible to provide lawn irrigation and fire protection water with groundwater supplies”.

*What are the servicing options if the necessary approvals are not obtainable from Alberta Environment? An updated report may be required to confirm whether the aquifer is indeed sensitive to additional draw?*

As a result, the Groundwater Supply Analysis should be reviewed closely and revised using the metric unit of measurement in **ALL** supporting documentation, and an updated report determining the sensitivity of the underlying aquifer to additional water draw that is to serve Fawn Meadows’ domestic water requirements.

Finally, the report is required to be completed, signed, and stamped by a professional Engineer registered with APPEGA to Alberta Environment Guidelines and Standards (in conformance with the Water Act) is required to support the summary and conclusions presented within this report.

#### b) **Fawn Meadows Water Management Strategy Memo to \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ dated July 17, 2009**

This memo indicates that there are three sources available to supply the water needs of this development. For domestic needs, the memo identifies that groundwater wells will be used to supply the needs of the residents. However, the only viable source of water to service the irrigation and fire protection systems is stormwater runoff. Please elaborate on the storage systems that will be required to conserve/store the stormwater runoff to serve the needs of this size and density of development for both irrigation and fire protection systems. Please include servicing alternatives if there is not enough runoff in any given season to serve the irrigation and fire protection needs of Fawn Meadows.

*Please note: The complete report and the entire Outline Plan will also be referred internally for comment by Safety Codes and Protective Services prior to Parkland County’s final acceptance of the Outline Plan.*

#### c) **Wastewater System Analysis**

This report is generally well-written and should be included within the Outline Plan as its own separate appendix with a separate tab. Unfortunately, the report appears to use incorrect population projections in its analysis. As previously noted the population projections are inconsistent through the Outline Plan Submission and attached reports.

An overview of the proposed sewage treatment was provided; however, the report is required to be completed, signed, and stamped by a professional Engineer registered with APPEGA to Alberta Environment Guidelines and Standards is required to support the summary and conclusions presented within this report.

Please ensure that the appropriate setback distances from the wetlands are maintained when evaluating the viable options for servicing the proposed development.

*Additionally, if Alberta Environment does not approve any of the proposed wastewater systems identified within the report as being viable options, are there any alternative servicing options?*

**d) Fire Protection Plan for Fawn Meadows Report**

The assisted living building will require that all common areas and living units have sprinklers installed to ensuring that the sprinkler system meets provincial safety code requirements.

According to the Table of Contents, the Fire Protection Plan report should include at least 15 pages. When reviewing the report included within the Fawn Meadows Outline Plan, there are only 3 pages included within this part of the Outline Plan that addresses only Section 1. Sections 2 – 6 seem to be omitted.

*Please note: The complete report and the entire Outline Plan will also be referred internally for comment by Safety Codes and Protective Services prior to Parkland County's final acceptance of the Outline Plan.*

**e) Engineered Utilities and Services Brief**

A majority of this report has simply been copied from elsewhere and has not been tailored specifically to address the Fawn Meadows development. The policies on the first page (9.0 – 9.4.1) have been reviewed and notes have been provided within the original copy of the Outline plan.

One immediate concern within the report is that it states in Policy 9.1.8, contrary to the ASP and LUB amendment applications, that the “condominium association shall be incorporated to manage, operate, and maintain the water supply, the water treatment facility, water distribution system, wastewater collection, wastewater treatment, and treated effluent disposal system”. Within the ASP and LUB amendment applications, it has been proposed that the servicing is to be County owned. Please ensure that all proposed servicing plans and their respective amendments are consistent.

**f) Traffic Impact Assessment**

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been prepared in support of the application as the proposed development is within 800 metres of Highway 770 and will require waiver from Alberta Transportation. No supporting documentation was submitted with the completed report identifying whether the report has been pre-referred either to Alberta Transportation or the County's Engineering Dep't for comment.

*In accordance with the Consultation requirements of Admin Procedure PD-033-P, the TIA should be referred to Alberta Transportation for comment. Any comments received from the Department should be included in the Outline Plan.*

*Please note: The complete TIA and the entire Outline Plan will also be referred internally for comment to the County's Engineering Services Department prior to Parkland County's final acceptance of the Outline Plan.*

**4) Revised Municipal Development Plan Amendment Application**

- a)** This application is incomplete as it does not address all applicable policies within the MDP that require amending. Administration has identified inconsistencies with policies 3.15, 3.17, 3.19 [subsections (a) and (b)] and 10.25 that require to be addressed. Other policies may also become inconsistent subject to the information included in the revised Outline Plan. A full review of the County's MDP and its policies is encouraged upon completion of a resubmission.

- b) Please provide the anticipated text amendments to the above noted policies in order to bring the Fawn Meadows proposed development into compliance with the MDP policies. To date, a text amendment was only provided addressing Policy 10.25.
- c) Please elaborate on Section F on the amendment application and provide reasons in support of this application.

**5) Revised Jackfish-Mayatan Area Structure Plan Amendment Application**

- a) Please clarify the proposed amendments required to the ASP. It is anticipated that the Fawn Meadows development may require amendments to the Residential and Public Utilities and Municipal Services (Policy 1 - Water and Sewer) Sections
  - i. Residential Section Amendments (page 3) – This application should identify the specific text that needs to be amended; for example, Administration has identified that the first last sentences in the first paragraph within the Residential Section should be amended. This should be done to allow for smaller than half acre parcel sizes and to allow for additional residences to be located on a parcel of land.
  - ii. Public Utilities and Municipal Services (Policy 1 - Water and Sewer) (page 13) – This application should make specific reference to amending the first sentence of the first paragraph of the policy for water and sewer to allow for a communal type system to serve Fawn Meadows.  
  
*Please note, that Administration may not support the proposed idea that the communal system be owned and operated by Parkland County, and that Administration may recommend that the system be privately owned, operated, and maintained by the condominium corporation.*
- b) Alternatively, you may wish consider recommending that the Jackfish-Mayatan ASP be repealed given its 1981 date and inconsistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan and other Parkland County Statutory Plans.

**6) Revised Land Use Bylaw Amendment Application**

- a) The proposed Direct Control District Regulation was omitted or not included and is required to properly review this amendment application.
- b) Please elaborate on Section F on the amendment application and provide reasons in support of this application.

If you have any questions concerning this response or the items requested to be added or amended within the Outline Plan submission required to make the application complete, please don't hesitate to contact either myself or Stephen Fegyverneki Senior Planner, Current Planning at (780) 968-8443. Should you wish to meet to discuss these items in greater detail, please feel free to contact Staff to set up an appointment. In the future, we encourage you and your client to complete additional pre-consultation with County Staff as outlined under the County's Procedures to try and identify many of these minor issues earlier in the development of your application.

As per Administrative Procedure PD-033-P, Parkland County will not open and begin processing a planning application until the Outline Plan has been accepted by the Manager of Planning & Development and all application materials have been submitted and the application deemed complete. Upon full completion of the revised Outline Plan please forward to the County's Current Planning Section, three copies of the revised Outline Plan and two digital copies for Administration's second review and internal referral. Please find enclosed one copy of the

original Outline Plan (Parts one and two), the bank draft for \$7,000.00, the cd containing digital files, Ministerial Order No. L:026/10, Policy PD-033, and Policy PD-033-P.

Yours truly,

Christina Kortmeyer  
Planning Officer  
[ckortmeyer@parklandcounty.com](mailto:ckortmeyer@parklandcounty.com)

cc: Fawn Meadows Development Inc. c/o  
cc: Paul Hanlan, Manager, Planning & Development Services  
cc: Stephen Fegyverneki, Sr. Planner, Current Planning