



APPENDIX A: APPLICATION REFERRALS

AGENCY	COMMENTS
<i>School Authority</i>	
Calgary Catholic School District	<p>CCSD does note that the Janet ASP does not currently indicate any potential residential population growth. However if the residential transition area covered by this Conceptual Scheme (PL20190131) were to see residential development CCSD would look forward to further discussions with the county and/or municipality on how best to support the educational needs of these residents, as well as public open space planning, through municipal reserve (MR) dedication.</p> <p>Further, please note that Calgary Catholic School District (CCSD) has no objections specific to the re-designation application or conceptual scheme (PL20190131).</p>
<i>Province of Alberta</i>	
Alberta Transportation	<p>This property is outside of the Alberta Transportation's control limits as set out in the Subdivision and Development Regulation as it is located greater than 1600 metres from Highway 560.</p> <p>Any proposed future development does not fall within the control distance of a provincial highway as outlined in the Highways Development and Protection Act/Regulation, and will not require a roadside development permit from Alberta Transportation.</p> <p>However, the department does expect that the municipality will mitigate the impacts of traffic generated by developments approved on the local road connection to the highway system, pursuant to Policy 7 of the Provincial Land Use Policies and Section 648(2)(c.2) of the <i>Municipal Government Act</i>.</p>
Alberta Health Services	<p>The application indicates potable water will be supplied via water well/cistern and that a storage tank or septic field will be employed to handle sewage. AHS-EPH supports connection to existing Alberta Environment and Parks approved municipal or regional water and wastewater systems wherever possible. AHS-EPH would appreciate being notified if changes are made to this plan during future development states.</p> <p>AHS-EPH understands that currently there are existing residential land uses in proximity to the proposed industrial area. We would welcome the opportunity to review and comment on building permit applications for businesses which may be storing hazardous chemicals onsite and/or which might partake in activities that create emissions, odors, noise, or other conditions that could impact adjacent properties and/or which otherwise constitute a public health nuisance.</p> <p>If there are plans to construct any public facilities on the subject lands in the future, AHS-EPH would like an opportunity to review and comment on</p>



AGENCY	COMMENTS
<i>Adjacent Municipality</i>	<p>these development and building permit applications (e.g. food establishments, swimming facilities, daycares, child or adult care facilities, personal service establishments, etc.). Forwarding applications and building plans for these facilities to our department for review before the building permit is granted helps to ensure that the proposed facilities will meet the requirements of the Public Health Act and its regulations.</p>
The City of Calgary	<p>The images attached to the application are of low quality and make it difficult to evaluate. Could new images be submitted and circulated for review. (Exhibit 13.3)</p> <p>The circulation indicates that a stormwater management plan has been provided as a part of the application. The circulation does not seem to include the document. Could the master drainage plan, stormwater management plan and attendant grading plan be circulated to the City of Calgary.</p> <p>Servicing of the area, with the exception of Cell B, is unclear. Is there contemplation of comprehensive servicing?</p>
<i>Internal Departments</i>	<p>General:</p> <p>All documents exhibits – maps and figures are difficult to read due to poor print quality.</p> <p>All exhibits are difficult to discern what information is being presented due to a lack of titles, legends and descriptions.</p> <p>Overall document is not on par with other Conceptual Schemes submitted in terms of general format, layout, inclusion of figures and overall readability.</p> <p>Document would benefit from inclusion of comprehensive supporting information to support stated policies.</p> <p>Inclusion of detailed site maps supporting Development Cells A-D is recommended.</p> <p>Application is urged to review the Parks and Opens Space Master Plan and the Active Transportation Plan: South County to help inform development of the Conceptual Scheme.</p> <p>Policy 3.3.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please note, the proper name of the municipality is 'Rocky View County'. Suggest the document is revised reflective of use of the proper name.



AGENCY	COMMENTS
Planning and Development Services - Engineering	Policy 6.0.5 Municipal Reserve:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the policy indicates reserve dedication will be in accordance with the terms of the MGA; it is recommended that a preamble be added to the policy which describes in greater detail the intended assignment of MR lands for each development cell.
	Policy 6.0.6 Pedestrian Pathways
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend use of "Active Transportation Network" instead of Pathways as this term includes provision for pathways, trail, walkway, sidewalks.
	Policy 7.0.5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More explanation regarding why accommodation for pathways located within the road right of way is required. The County has many successful examples of pathways being integrated into the road right of way. Please review the Active Transportation Plan: South County for examples of acceptable facilities to be considered to provide connectivity throughout the regional active transportation network.
	Page 26 – Phase 1, Development Cell – Municipal Reserve
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement is vague. Request whether proponent is considering dedication of reserves, provision for cash in lieu of reserve dedication or a combination of reserve dedication and cash in lieu.
	General:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review of this file is based upon the application submitted.
	Geotechnical:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering does not have any concerns at this time. The applicant will be required to submit a geotechnical evaluation at time of DP in accordance with the County Servicing Standards.
	Transportation:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provided an updated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) for cell B of the conceptual scheme prepared by JCB Engineering dated October 25, 2019. The TIA considered offsite impacts to the road network and key intersections and determined that no upgrades to the offsite networks will be required at this time. The TIA suggest that two accesses will be built into cell B of the conceptual scheme, while the existing north access will be used for future phases of the development. The north access will not be required until phase 2 or 3 of cell B and will only be used to access the west residential property at the moment. The middle access is proposed to be all movements while the south access is proposed to be right in/right out only. Engineering has reviewed the access



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<p>plan and has no further comments at this time. The TIA recommends that a new TIA will be required when the second phase of cell B is built.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TIA did not address access to the other cells within the conceptual scheme. Future updates to the conceptual scheme should address this. • 61st Avenue is part of the Janet Area Structure Plan where it is to be extended south of the subject lands of the conceptual scheme and have a future connection to Range Road 284. As 61st Avenue is not adjacent to cell B, future updates to the conceptual scheme should address this. • As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to construct the middle and south accesses to an Industrial Standard in accordance with the County Servicing Standard. No upgrade to the north access will be required for phase 1 of cell B. • As a permanent condition, the north access must only provide access to the west residential property as indicated in the TIA. • As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant is required to dedicate 8m along the entire east boundary of the subject site for future road widening in accordance with the requirements of the SE Industrial Growth Study. Five (5) meters shall be dedicated by Plan of Survey with the remaining three (3) meters to be dedicated by caveat. • As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to provide payment of the Transportation Offsite Levy in accordance with the applicable by-law at time of approval. <p>Sanitary/Waste Water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant proposes using a PSTS system on the subject site. The Janet ASP policy 22.8 states that new business development should provide wastewater treatment by the use of pump out tanks or other acceptable methods, in accordance with County Policy and Provincial regulation. County Standards only support PSTS systems for normal domestic sewage and requires sewage holding tanks for all industrial and commercial uses. Engineering does not support the use of a PSTS for this development. • As a permanent condition of future DP, sanitary sewage shall be contained in pump out tanks and transported off-site to an approved wastewater receiving facility for disposal. <p>Water Supply And Waterworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has proposed to use a water well to fill a potable water tank and to use cisterns to service the proposed development, which does not align with the policies of the Janet



AGENCY	COMMENTS
	<p>ASP. As per Policies 22.5 of the Janet ASP, water cisterns or alternative systems consistent with County policy should service all new development. Water wells located on individual subdivision lots should not be supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engineering recommends the use of potable water cisterns to service the proposed development in accordance with County Policy and the Janet ASP. <p>Storm Water Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provided a conceptual stormwater management plan for cell B of the conceptual scheme prepared by Storm Water Solutions Inc. dated July 2018 which proposes the use of an onsite evaporation pond to service the proposed development. The stormwater management plan did not address the other cells within the conceptual scheme. Future updates to the conceptual scheme should address this. As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to submit a site-specific stormwater management plan, prepared by a qualified professional, assessing the post development site stormwater management to identify any stormwater management measures that are required to be implemented to service cell B. The proposed subdivision is within the Janet Master Drainage Plan. Any stormwater management plan submitted will have to align with the recommendations in this plan. As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required by dedication by caveat a 12m right of way along the entire southern boundary of cell B to allow for a future regional conveyance for the CSMI system. This dedication is consistent with dedication provided by the CARMEK Business Park immediately west of the subject lands. As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to provide verification of AEP approvals and registration (EPEA) for the stormwater system. As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to provide payment of the Stormwater Offsite Levy in accordance with the applicable bylaw at time of approval. <p>Environmental:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provided a Desktop Environmental Assessment for cell B of the conceptual scheme prepared by Ghostpine Environmental Services Ltd. dated June 22, 2018. The assessment provided a summary of the potential environmental concerns associated with the proposed development based on published information. The assessment took into consideration the



ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

AGENCY	COMMENTS
Agricultural & Environmental Services	<p>significance of the onsite soils, vegetation, wildlife, historical resources and wetlands and concludes that further field study is needed to verify the findings of the assessment.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provided a Wetland Impact Assessment for cell B of the conceptual scheme prepared by Omnia Ecological Services dated July 19, 2019. The assessment provided a Historical Precipitation and Aerial Photography review to determine if any of the three wetlands within cell B are permanent and fall under the Water Act. • The Environmental Assessment/Wetland Impact Assessment plan did not address the other cells within the conceptual scheme. Future updates to the conceptual scheme should address this. • The Assessment determined that one of the three wetlands one is semi-permanent and will require approval under the Water Act for any proposed modifications. • As a condition of future subdivision or DP, the applicant will be required to obtain all necessary approvals under the Water Act for impacts to identified wetlands due to the proposed development.
	<p>Because this parcel falls within the Janet Area Structure Plan Agricultural Services has no concerns. The application of the Agricultural Boundary Design Guidelines may be beneficial in buffering the residential land use from the agricultural land. The guidelines would help mitigate areas of concern including trespass, litter, pets, noise, providing a visual barrier and concern over fertilizers, dust & normal agricultural practices.</p>

Circulation Period: Adjacency: September 27, 2019 – October 21, 2020

Agencies that did not respond, expressed no concerns, or were not required for distribution, are not listed.