



ATTACHMENT B: APPLICATION REFERRALS

| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|---|---|
| <i>School Authority</i> | |
| Calgary Catholic School District | <p>(From original circulation)</p> <p>CCSD does note that the Greater Bragg Creek ASP does indicate a potential population of 7,000. Such a population triggers the need for a school site for the District. Therefore, the CCSD looks forward to further discussions with the municipality on how best to support the educational needs of these citizens, as well as public open space planning, through municipal reserve (MR) dedication for the Greater Bragg Creek area. Further, please note that Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objections specific to the re-designation application or the conceptual scheme (PL20190102/20190103).</p> |
| <i>Province of Alberta</i> | |
| Alberta Health Services | <p>(From original circulation)</p> <p>AHS-EPH would like to remind the Applicant, however, if individual water wells are proposed for the development, that any water wells on the subject lands should be completely contained within the proposed property boundaries. Any drinking water sources must conform to the most recent Canadian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines and the Alberta Public Health Act, Nuisance and General Sanitation Guideline (AR 243/2003), which states:</p> <p>A person shall not locate a water well that supplies water that is intended or used for human consumption within</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10 metres of any watertight septic tank, pump out tank or other watertight compartment of a sewage or waste water system, 15 metres of a weeping tile field, an evaporative treatment mound or an outdoor toilet facility with a pit, 30 metres of a leaching cesspool, 50 metres of sewage effluent on the ground surface, 100 metres of a sewage lagoon, or 450 metres of any area where waste is or may be disposed of at a landfill within the meaning of the Waste Control Regulation (AR 192/96). |
| <i>Internal Departments</i> | |
| Recreation, Parks and Community Support | <p>PL2019102- Redesignation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Parks office of the Recreation, Parks and Community Support department has no concerns with this land use redesignation application. |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--------|---|
| | <p>PL20190103- Conceptual Scheme (Recirculated)</p> <p>General comments: Municipal Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Municipal Reserve dedication and use is to be in compliance with the MGA. The taking of cash in lieu of reserve dedication is acceptable as per the MGA and may be considered where there is no tangible need to take land for true public recreational and/or park purposes. Identification of a large proposed MR complex is recognized; however, the applicant/developer is asked to demonstrate the tangible recreational and park use of these lands and why the County should entertain taking these as MR, considering: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two acre county residential lots are essentially parks and serve a passive recreational use by/for residents. A large MR is publically accessible; however, there is no provision for parking for the greater public to use the lands. The County is not in a practice of taking land if there is no commitment to develop or provide amenities for the public. The County has a surplus of similar lands in the local area that are vacant, with no programming or onsite improvements. This land inventory pose a liability in terms of operational expense while serving no true park or recreational value, as intended by the MGA. Generally, as presented- the lands identified as MR or open space in this plan appear to be dedicated to meet legislative requirements and do not create a true park or recreational amenity. Further, the proposed trail connectivity within the proposed MR lacks detail and confirmation for feasibility to create a safe place for the public to walk and enjoy the land and environment. Alternately, as an alternative to MR dedication- the titling of the proposed MRs as indicated in the plan area as privately held, open space lots complete with the necessary caveats (utility ROW, easements, registration of Environmental Reserve Easements- ERE, etc...) is encouraged. <p>Section 2.3 "Greater Bragg Creek Area Structure Plan- Utilities", page 8:</p> <p>As indicated :“As per policy 6.1.5, Utilities, locations include common rights-of-way (r-o-w); in road r-o-w where there is sufficient width; and in open space lands, such as the trail connections shown as Municipal Reserve (MR) on the proposal.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This statement is confusing as “trail connections” implies the built structure, and not the land within it is located. Indeed, |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--------|--|
| | <p>location of public utilities are permissible within MR lands, when located within a registered right of way and preferably along a boundary edge so as not to interfere with the intended or proposed use of the lands for park or recreation purposes. It is recommended the applicant revise the document reflective of the County's vernacular/lexicon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overland drainage easements may be considered where adequate site conditions permit conveyance that will not cause a detriment to the lands and any improvements located there within and its intended use for public recreational, park use. • All encumbrances affecting Municipal Reserve are to be subject to County approval and require registration on the land title. • The County Servicing Standards shall be referenced when proposing all storm water conveyance solutions. <p>Section 2.3 "Greater Bragg Creek Area Structure Plan- ASP Direction for CS", Page 11:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note, the applicant is reminded that Local Recreation Boards no longer exist within the County. <p>Section 4.7 Existing Groundwater Supply- Stormwater", Page 19:</p> <p>It is acknowledged the applicant has indicated: "Development in ASP has adopted an "ecological" approach to stormwater management by implementing engineering practices that preserve and maintain the land's natural capacity to accommodate surface drainage."</p> <p>Figure 13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is unclear whether the intention is to consider all MR indicated as a single titled parcel of land. • It is typical practice that parcels intended to be MR that are not contiguous are titled as individual parcels and captured in the inventory as such. • Recommend applicant revised plan. <p>Section 5.5 Municipal Reserves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note, local recreation boards and regional recreation boards are no longer in effect within Rocky View County. <p>Section 5.7 Slope Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slope indicated in Figure 18 indicate areas of proposed MR are subject to slopes in excess of >15%. • Recognizing the Figure 18 data- the applicant is requested to indicate how the construction of trails juxtaposed with storm water swales will be undertaken within the 10 metre wide proposed MR access points to the proposed roadway are to occur. |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Figure 29, the locations are otherwise described as Junction J14 to J23 and J18-J22 <p>Section 5.10 Transportation- Trails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note- to ensure encroachment does not occur from private lots into the indicated 10 metre wide linear MR access points and SE road/private property alignment- fencing will be required to be installed on adjacent property. Linear proposed MR frontage along the SE corner offers little by way of recreational or park value unless developed with a local pathway to provide connectivity to the Great Trail located to the south. It is there recommended in the event MR is dedicated, a trail is constructed to formalize connectivity and reduce the infrastructure required to connect with the Great Trail. <p>Figure 26: Trails and Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears there are no trails presented in the figure. As defined in the referenced RVC Parks and Pathways- Planning, Development and Operational Guidelines; a trail is defined as : "Means any recognized non-paved route which is surfaced with natural or aggregate materials". The applicant is requested to update this and other relevant figures indicating proposed trail alignments located within the plan area. <p>Policy 5.10.1</p> <p>As indicated previously:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears there are no trails presented in the figure. As defined in the referenced RVC Parks and Pathways- Planning, Development and Operational Guidelines; a trail is defined as : "Means any recognized non-paved route which is surfaced with natural or aggregate materials". The applicant is requested to update this and other relevant figures indicating proposed trail alignments located within the plan area. <p>Policy 5.10.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for connectivity will be taken into consideration by the County pending further study and resource priorities. <p>Policy 5.10.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note- all pathway or trail construction within County lands shall be in accordance with the Servicing Standards. If subdivision occurs, the proponent is expected to provide typical park amenities in accordance to the terms of an applicable Development Agreement. |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--------|---|
| | <p>Policy 5.10.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maintenance of pathways and trails in addition to landscape maintenance of dedicated MR lands shall be in accordance to the appropriate Maintenance Service Level as described in the RVC Parks and Pathways- Planning, Development and Operational Guidelines. The developer shall be responsible for all maintenance and operation of all MR improvements (including pathway or trail infrastructure) until issuance of FAC. At that time either an occupant (HOA via a license of occupation) or the County shall be responsible for ongoing maintenance and operations of the MR lands and any improvements located there within. The applicant is requested to indicate whether a HOA will be established. This notion is implied in Policy 6.3.2; however, isn't formally declared. In the event a HOA is created due to location, anticipated small user base and a generally isolated context- the County requests that upon issuance of FAC; the HOA be directed to assume maintenance and operational responsibility of all MR's and improvements located there within (including trails) via a License of Occupation with the County. <p>Figure 28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears the north western most proposed MR/open space parcel has been omitted from the layout. The applicant is advised to update this map accordingly. <p>Figure 29</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the swale cross sections presented, it would appear the width of the storm water system is +/- 5.0 metres. Given the width of the proposed MR is +/- 10 metres, and assuming the swale alignment follows along the edge of the property line; that leaves only +/- 4 metres to accommodate a 2.0 metre wide trail, its set-backs and meanders/switchbacks to accommodate a grade below 10%. The applicant is asked to demonstrate how this can be practically achieved. So as not to encumber MR lands, overland storm water solutions should be considered for location on private lots. Natural drainage path- as per description of Environmental Reserve in the MGA- Section 664(1)(a); preservation of these features can be assumed to be of environmental importance and therefore should be dedicated as ER and not MR. Whereas the intention to located storm water infrastructure within lands deemed as MR; the infrastructure and applicable setbacks should be designated as PUL and not MR. Alternately, if the infrastructure is of a small footprint, then the utility |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>structure is required to be secured through an easement or right of way to ensure the improvement is captured and recognized to be associated with the MR title.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All right of way or easement agreements affecting County lands shall use a County supplied document to ensure consistency and accuracy when registering with Alberta Land Titles. • The lot boundary for the north PUL appears to be different than that of previous maps in the document. • Recommend applicant review and revise all maps/figures accordingly to ensure consistency. <p>Section 5.16 Wildfire Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event MR is dedicated; it is recommend that all forested areas located on Municipal Reserve lands are to be subjected to formal vegetation management using Fire Smart principles to ensure the County does not receive public lands that pose a threat to the general community due to high fuel loading. <p>Policy 5.17.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledgement of application of CPTED principles to pathways. • Recommend applicant revise statement to read "trails" instead of "pathways" as there are no pathways proposed within the plan area. <p>Section 7.1 Open House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon review, it would appear the area locals have concern with the proposed dedication and intended use of the MR parcels. <p>Figure 36 & 37</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the "3D model" is appreciated, the lack of contour interval data describing the line work does not accurately present the landscape. • Advise diagrams be updated with a legend indicating the contour intervals used to generate the visual. |
| GIS Services | Documentation provided regarding internal road naming |
| Fire Services & Emergency Management | <p>(First Circulation)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Fire Service recommends that the builder consider Fire Smart practices in the design and construction of the dwellings. 2. Dependent on the occupancies, the Fire Service recommends that the buildings be sprinklered, if applicable, as per the National Building Code. |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|--|--|
| Planning and Development Services - Engineering | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Please ensure that access routes are compliant to the designs specified in the National Building Code and the Rocky View County Servicing Standards. From the drawings, it appears that there is only one road in and out. Please propose an alternative access route. 4. Please ensure that there is adequate access throughout all phases of development and that the access complies with the requirements of the National Building Code & NFPA 1141. |
| | (Second Circulation) |
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommend that the builder consider Fire Smart practices in the design and construction of the dwellings. 2. There will need to be a secondary access road any time the number of homes is greater than 10 dwellings. |
| | There are no further comments at this time. |
| | General |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application will need to be circulated to Tsu T'ina for review and comment since the proposed development is located diagonally adjacent to the reserve lands. |
| | Geotechnical: |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of recirculation, the applicant/owner provided a letter conducted by Almor Testing Services Ltd. dated July 17, 2020 that verified that there are slopes that are greater than 15% on the subject land. The map attached to the letter also indicated that there are slopes greater than 30% on the subject land. The letter provided a preliminary assessment that determined that the lands may be suitable for the development. A more detailed analysis of the slopes that provides setbacks and demonstrates the findings of the letter will be required at future subdivision stage. |
| | Transportation: |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of recirculation, the applicant/owner provided a TIA Update Memo conducted by Bunt and Associates dated May 19, 2020 to supplement the trip generation memo conducted by Adoz Engineering Inc. dated May 20, 2019. The report recommended improvements at the intersection, including changing Mountain View Park to stop control; changing RR 52 to stop controlled, locating sign at Twp 232; adding pedestrian crossing with sign across RR52 at end of multi-use path; and marking the edge of the driving lanes, stop bar, pedestrian crossing and centre lines with painted lines, and providing concrete barriers to protect signs and demarcate the roadway. |



AGENCY

COMMENTS

- Although the TIA indicated that the current chip-seal road structure of Fawn Hills Drive and Range Road 52 may be able to withstand the traffic generated by the site, there is concern that the chip-seal structure is subpar to the County Servicing Standards and may require more frequent maintenance. Therefore it is recommended that Fawn Hills Drive and a portion of Range Road 52 be upgraded to be in accordance with the County Servicing Standards as a condition of future subdivision.
- As a condition of future subdivision, the applicant/owner will be required to pay the Transportation Offsite Levy as per the applicable TOL bylaw at time of subdivision approval over the proposed subdivision area.

Sanitary/Waste Water:

- As part of recirculation, the applicant/owner submitted a Preliminary Shallow Subsurface Conditions letter conducted by Almor Testing Services Ltd. dated April 18, 2001 that outlined the results of percolation testing. This does not provide the information required as part of a Level 4 PSTS Assessment, which is required to determine the site suitability for PSTS systems.
 - At time of future subdivision, the applicant owner will be required to submit a Level 4 PSTS Assessment should the proposed development be serviced using PSTS.

Water Supply And Waterworks:

- The applicant/owner is proposing to service the proposed development via ground water wells. However, from a utility perspective, consideration should be given to extending the County water system to service this development. If expansion of the County system is not feasible at this time, the developer should consider alternate methods of servicing such as the extension/modernization of the existing system along Fawn Hills Drive or construction of a new communal system. Further technical documents that explain and demonstrate the feasibility of alternate systems will be required
- The applicant/owner provided a Phase I Groundwater Site Assessment conducted by Groundwater Information Technologies Ltd. dated February 12, 2019 that indicated that the aquifer is likely capable of supplying the necessary amount of groundwater water to most lots within the proposed development.



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>Storm Water Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the recirculation package, the applicant/owner submitted a preliminary Stormwater Management Report conducted by MPE Engineering Ltd. dated May 20, 2020. The report demonstrated that the proposed stormwater infrastructure for the proposed development will meet the release rate and water quality targets in accordance with the Bragg Creek Master Drainage Plan and the County Servicing Standards. Engineering has no further concerns with the proposed stormwater strategy at this time. As a condition of future subdivision, the applicant/owner will be required to obtain AEP approvals and licensing for the proposed storm water management infrastructure including Water Act approvals and APEA registration of the facilities and discharge. Please note that there are long lead times for obtaining AEP approvals. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the AEP approvals and registrations are obtained by the time of subdivision endorsement. <p>Environmental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears that there may be some wetlands on the subject land that may be directly impacted by the proposed development. <u>As a condition of future subdivision</u>, the applicant/owner will be required to submit a Biophysical Impact Assessment (BIA) conducted by a qualified professional that assesses the existing wetland and the impacts the proposed development will have on the wetland. The BIA shall also provide recommendations on mitigation and compensation measures to address the impacts to the wetland. <u>As a condition of future subdivision</u>, the applicant/owner will be required to obtain a Water Act approval from AEP for impacts to the wetlands. Please note that there are long lead times for obtaining AEP approvals. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the AEP approvals and registrations are obtained by the time of subdivision endorsement. |
| Transportation Services | <p>No concerns at this stage of the planning with respect to the future subdivision road approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are in general agreement with the findings of the TIA We are concerned that the structural capacity of the Rge Rd 52 and Fawn Hills Drive chip seal will not support the development of the subdivision. These are weak pavements that will likely not support the heavy vehicles required to haul materials and equipment required to develop the subdivision. |



| AGENCY | COMMENTS |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>We would consider the Rge Rd 52 and Fawn Hills Drive chip seal to be at risk for the same or greater intensity of damage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Our recommendation is that the developer be required to upgrade Rge Rd 52 and Fawn Hills Drive to a paved Regional Transitional and County Collector standard respectively. We believe that a Road Use Agreement would not be appropriate in this case to cover damages as the entire length of road may become compromised during construction. We generally agree with the recommendations for the Mountain View Park and Rge Rd 52 intersection. Consideration should be given to establishing the changes permanently by removing the asphalt and re-grading the west side of the intersection instead of placing F shaped barriers. |
| Utility Services | <p>Consideration should be given to upgrading and connecting to the adjacent Fawn Hills Water system for a water supply to the proposed development to avoid the inefficient servicing of the area through multiple systems. If a communal water system is approved for the proposed development, it should be established in accordance with County Policy 415, including a turn over strategy for water infrastructure and licencing.</p> |
| Agriculture & Environment Services | <p>Because this parcel falls within the Greater Bragg Creek Area Structure Plan, Agricultural Services has no concerns.</p> <p>The applicant will need to ensure compliance with the Alberta Weed Control Act and be personally prepared, or have a contractor available, for invasive species control.</p> |

Circulation Period: September 17, 2019 to October 8, 2019; recirculation August 13, 2020 to September 3, 2020.