

Project No. AC-D2SL CDG 004 – Nanton 2007
for Project Team 8/21/08

Draft Checklist

Gavin, Ivan, George, and both Roberts, I am looking for some direction and assistance in identifying which items below may strictly apply to the Subdivision Plan(s), and which may strictly apply to the ASP Plans. I would also like to get your opinions as to which of the Subdivision items will need to be carried backward and applied to the ASP Plans, and which of the ASP items will have to be carried forward to the Subdivision Plan(s). I need as much direction as you can offer me to be able to supply Kim Catalano and D2S Farms and estimate of time and cost to revise the current plans, to be taken to the next level of review. The following itemized list is a comprehensive compilation of comments received from everyone, given at different times during the course of pre-submittal for the ASP and pre-preparation of the submission for the Subdivision (Tentative) Plan, and subsequent to the comments made by the Town's Planner, Engineering Consultant and Council.

- 1) Roadways should not show any land use designation unless contained within a private condominium development where the roadway is considered part of the common area. The roadways should just be listed with a summary of their land area.
- 2) 'MR' calculation should not include any utility parcels because they are two distinct things. Utility parcels should be labeled PUL (public utility lot). It was understood that the developer's intent was to not to have any PUL's ...only MR parcels. The MR parcel concept, if agreed upon by Council, may contain utility functions, but should not be labeled as such for subdivision. **NEED DIRECTION. Do we only want to denote MR parcels on the Plan?** Further, reference to pond or trails for MR is not necessary for survey. These details are easily found in the ASP. **We need to make sure that the MR Parcels are correlated between Subdivision and ASP plans.**
- 3) The school site should be labeled MSR (Municipal School Reserve). The MSR designation is appropriate because unless the school is ready to be built, the municipality won't need the land, but the Town can still proceed with their public buildings. **Only the buildable portion of the MSR Parcel should be labeled MSR. Storm Water Management and Park areas shall be labeled MR.**
- 4) The MR surrounding the cul-de-sac labeled 13th St. needs to show acreage. MR lot south of Block 'E' needs to show acreage. **NEED DIRECTION: 4A) What are we going to do w/ "hammerhead" issue. Talk to Gavin.**
- 5) All MR parcels should have Lot numbers (common notation is 12MR meaning Lot 12 Municipal Reserve) and be entered into a table. Lot numbering is especially important for lots requiring utility hook ups. This numbering can come with a final Plan of Survey, if desired. **Per discussion w/ Kim, we will use the convention of 1R, 2R, 3R and so on, which will be in order of the overall Sub-division Plan, as opposed to the SDA Plans. NEED DIRECTION: Gavin to confirm convention. See item 4A also.**

6) General criteria for tentative subdivision submittals should also include the following:

Location of the proposed subdivision in the municipality;

Legal description of the land;

All lot locations and measurements;

All easements, rights of way, roads, railways, etc;

Location or surveyed boundaries of any environmental features such as a water course;

Existing Building locations and setbacks;

Other information (external to diagram, i.e. potable water)

Name of Alberta Land Surveyor preparing plan;

Alberta Land Surveyor's Permit Stamp (if corporation).

7) Two parcels on the east side of 27th have no labels. Either remove the parcel lines or provide MR labels, acreage and lot number. Eliminate the parcels so that 27th abuts eastern property line to. Taper pond and well parcels to match new alignment of 27th. **Per discussion w/ Kim, we will not proceed until you have obtained the Owner's approval of a new design concept. NEED DIRECTION: discuss w/ Gavin.**

8) Street naming convention: The existing bylaw which only allows for avenues and streets should be changed to accommodate appropriate street naming for cul-de-sacs and streets that have no direct tie to an existing street like 15th Street. **Per discussion w/ Kim, until such time as the Town changes their Bylaw, new streets that are not inter-connecting to existing streets will be designated with the suffix [xy] (i.e. 15th [xy] street.) Need to discuss w/ Gavin.**

9) The label for 16th street has no associated right of way dedication and should be removed.

10) The street perpendicular to the 13th Street cul-de-sac has not been labeled with a street name. **Describe as extension of proposed 32nd Ave. NEED DIRECTION: Re-name per convention described in Item 8?**

11) Parcel 1-F has a few extra lines that make it appear as if you have 3-4 parcels. Each should be labeled separately, or your line type notation should be clarified. **NEED DIRECTION: We are unsure as to what the Town Planner is looking for here. The concept of Common Lots, as denoted, appears to be unfamiliar with him. Shall we denote as CL1 (1-F) common lot 1 for lot 1-F, CL2 (1-F & 2-F) common lot 2 for lots 1-F & 2-F, etc..... Talk to Gavin, Ivan and George & Robert**

12) Block 'D' is missing a corner cut dedication on the southwest corner.

13) All lanes should be labeled as such. **All trails and lanes shall be 7M in width.**

14) In Calgary and Lethbridge if storm water management facilities can be demonstrated to have recreational amenity (i.e. pathway access, fountains, etc.) they are accepted as MR Municipal Reserve rather than PUL Public Utility Lots. This is totally at Nanton's discretion. **NEED DIRECTION: Action contingent upon response to Item 5 above, and the Planner's discretion. PT & Developer to put question to proposed Council Mtg in mid-Sept. for ASP & PPSP1 finalization.**

15) All of parcels of land that are not lots, lanes or roadways should be labeled as "Blocks". **Refer to PPSP-1 and all ASP plans to assure conformity.**

16) It is not a good idea to use the middle of any road as a boundary for a plan of subdivision. The Town can argue that as it is only half a roadway and the lots/blocks fronting on it do not have proper physical and legal access, and they could refuse to grant subdivision approval or future building permits until the both plans are registered in Land Titles. This could lead to delays. It is much safer having the entire roadway on one plan or the other. **This may change, depending upon the possible Concept revisions discussed.** The Development Agreement will cover phasing, servicing and security issues. Problem was corrected as part of PPSP1, dev agreement will follow w/ final approval & registr. Of PPSP1 7 will cover dev block utility % road cost sharing phasing & security issues.

17) ZONING does not exist in Alberta. The technically correct term is LAND USE under Alberta's Municipal Government Act that governs Subdivision Approval. **Per discussion w/ Kim, PT members to review their plans to assure comprehensive compliance.**

18) Special Development Agreements are part of Alberta's Subdivision Approval and although could be mentioned in an ASP technically are not usually part of that document. If you put the details or principles of the Development Agreement in the ASP and the client changes his mind, or through negotiation the details are changed, you will need both an ASP amendment and a public hearing under the MGA, which might add 6 to 8 months to the planning approval process. **Insert into note the words "may be needed or could be used". NEED DIRECTION: Ask Gavin how we should deal with Common Lots?**

19) In all these plans the symbol for the Subdivision Zone does not match what is shown on the plan and should be amended to be the same. Use the term "Plan Boundary" for this rather than "zone". **NEED DIRECTION: Ask Robert & Gavin what was meant by this.**

20) All detailed insets shown on enlarged SDA plans need arrows back to the overall plan to clearly reference where they are taken from. They would also benefit by having the street names called out. **NEED DIRECTION: Does this need to be carried forward to PPSP-1? Talk to Gavin to get clarification example.**

21) Plan SDA D – Block 1 D - boundaries of the neighbourhood parks need to be added unless this park is really a private park part of the local condo. If this is the case, in the future condo application, it should be shown as a block of land in the common element. **NEED DIRECTION: Ask Gavin to clarify & explain our intention to pre-plan for storm water management & public trails. Can we specify on PPSP-1 a required amount of land that is to be dedicated for each Block, and note this on the plan?**

22) The well location should be moved out of the surface parking lot. The well should be in a landscaped area for better protection. **Town Council has rejected the idea of incorporating the use of the existing water wells into any functions. Therefore, they will have to be decommissioned, and shall be noted as such throughout the ASP. Also, any reference to their use therein must be removed from plans, both graphically and in writing.**

Comments below in green italics are from Council Directives on D2S ASP, dated 8/5/08:

23) Reduce Commercial Village size from 10 acres to 3 acres. **NEED DIRECTION.** Per our discussion today, we will not proceed until you have obtained the Owner's approval of a new design concept. As per discussion, we will not proceed until approval or denial of new road design concept. Client needs to advise us on scope of design change recommendations to make to the Town, and whether they want to go back to the Council?

24) Reduce all residential road widths from 20M to 16M by eliminating 4M landscaped, bioswale medians, and enlarging the residential lots on both sides of these collector roads by 2M to compensate.collector. Road to remain 20M in width if Council allows LID design on one side of road only. Otherwise, road will need to be reduced to 18M (coordinate with Westview Drive).

25) Reduce lot coverage densities to be closer to 50% in a land to building ratio. **NEED DIRECTION.** Please clarify w/ Gavin and/or Council what was meant relative to "residential" density (i.e. Was this primarily aimed at Single Family & Senior Bungalow lots? Are the Multi-Family lots excluded from this reduction?) Re-analyze lot coverages for different residential types. Go back to Council with new proposal.

26) Provide separate tabulation of all detention pond areas, as distinct from MR parcels. **NEED ASSISTANCE:** Cicon Engineering will need to provide grades and volumes of all pond areas. Kim, Please discuss with Gavin, Ivan & Henry to clarify exactly what the issue is here. Ivan advised that to provide 100 year detention, we need additional 6 acres of ponding at 4' deep.