



LANCASTER LANDING

8/13/08

Status Report 2 - Area Structure Plan Document Review
[August 13/08 Plains West Planning meeting with Gavin Scott - Oldman River Regional Services Commission]

These notes are intended for the project team only.

Meeting Purpose

The basic purpose of the meeting was to review the ASP discussion document to ascertain how it might be clarified and reduced in size and complexity.

Opening Discussion

ORRSC documenting time not money in terms tracking input into Lancaster landing ASP on behalf of Town of Nanton

TIA (Traffic Impact Assessment) content not yet established

- Henry Vander Pyl (Associate Eng.), Georgina Sharpe (Town of Nanton) & Gavin Scott (ORRSC) still need to get together to determine content/scope
- Gavin Scott was asked to directly connect with MMM or whomever else D2S Farms engages as transportation consultants

No agency comments yet received from circulation of the ASP discussion document

Gavin was also asked to speak with Mary regarding the manner by which the Town presented its comments to Steven Butt and the project team.

- This was an issue because there were several “deal-breaker” issues that Steven and the Project Team had no advance notice of and subsequently were unable to respond /defend/explain what D2S Farms was trying to achieve. The Town comments were only partially reflective of Gavin Scott’s comments and he was somewhat surprised at how they were delivered as well.
- It was also acknowledged that the positive aspects of the plan, of which there were many, were not brought forward during the August 7 meeting which was a missed opportunity with the developers

ASP Discussion

Gavin Scott confirmed that there generally were not too many issues with the actual content of the plan which was/is evident from the lack of detailed comments from both the Town and ORRSC.

- The larger issues were itemized in the report handed out by Mary Robley at the August 7th meeting in Nanton.



LANCASTER LANDING

It was agreed that the document was somewhat cumbersome owing to the lack of section dividers as well as names and map/figure/appendix numbers being inconsistently displayed

- Remedies discussed included:
 - placement of maps/figures in text at or near where the discussion occurs
 - inclusion of consistent, well-identified sections that are listed in the table of contents complete with page numbers
 - support material and research not directly required in the ASP itself could be included in a companion volume for reference purposes and should also be formatted in a consistent, cohesive manner

Inclusion of the ASP name throughout is required

Sub-areas to be illustrated on a key map to be consistently used

The land titles (certificate of title #'s) for entire site should be included

All landowners should be listed on the Landownership Map (some were missing as D2S Farms Project Team did not then and may still not have them all yet)

Maps/figures within a particular group should be renumbered to reflect the series they are a part of such as the site conditions and the engineering maps

Section 4 (Area Structure Plan Objectives) – combine subsections l & m

Section 7 (Level of Planning Detail) – 3rd paragraph is unclear and needs to be reworded

Reference to and the details of (Figure 13 - Driveway separation distances) needs to be clarified/documented; in addition, it should be confirmed that proposed roundabouts are capable of handling trucks (i.e. garbage & fire trucks)

Section 14, subsection h, should mention fencing and landscaping in more detail

There are some numbering glitches in Section 14 following Section 14, subsection h

Figures 18 and 18a (Preliminary Road Plan and Typical Residential Streets) are not referenced in the text

The Land Use Concept Map used in the ASP should reflect the current proposal

Some Figures have unnecessary layers turned on (trails in blue and green on the vicinity inset map on the overall subdivision plan)

Photos on the Development Opportunities Map do not align with the purpose of the map



LANCASTER LANDING

Buildings illustrated on public land need to be removed as they give the impression that they will be constructed as part of the plan

- this comment applies to all maps/figures on which these buildings are illustrated (including Development Opportunities; Detailed Site Plan-Community Park & Multi-use Facility)

The Green Space & Water Management Opportunities map: information should either be combined with other maps or the map eliminated

All of the engineering maps should either be together or inserted where they are referenced in the text

- The cross sections on the Preliminary Road Plan should either be enlarged or included as separate figures
- The M.D. road which forms the northern extent of the plan area and which will be used as part of the access to Lancaster Landing
- Location of cross-sections should be indicated on the plan

Additional comments may be forthcoming from ORRSC as there was insufficient time to conclude a review of the remainder of the document.