

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For **CPC2019-0756**  
heard at Calgary Planning Commission  
Meeting 2019 June 20



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p><b>Commissioner Foht</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Approval</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I supported the land use amendment, notwithstanding questions about the bonusing dollars were waived due to the existing building's density. My view is that the new building will enhance the street, add a new fresh, technically up to date building to the current office stocks and generally provide a building that will last longer than a retro fit building. To enforce the payment o the bonusing funds may change the developer's mind about developing the site.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Palmiere</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application provides a dangerous precedent. Raising the base FAR to acknowledge the existing building has no precedent, no basis in policy, and no clear planning rationale. The decision by the applicant to tear down the existing building and rebuild is theirs alone.</li> <li>Increasing the base FAR from 5 to 7.9 to acknowledge the existing building means the City foregoes \$930,000 in potential bonuses for community benefit. Benefits the Beltline could use.</li> <li>The existing building was constructed in the 1970s and did not provide bonusing. New construction should be considered within the current policy context. A base of 5 bonusable to 9 should be applied to the site to maintain the integrity of the Beltline ARP and 1P2007 districts.</li> <li>The danger is that all applicants that remove a building could, and likely will, ask for credit of the existing building gross floor area. Again, the decision to tear down and rebuild is the applicant's choice. The City hasn't required it. So why the City is providing the applicant an almost million dollar pro forma benefit at the expense of potential community benefit is unsettling.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Juan</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This application was seemingly ripe for approval. Although, there is a relatively similar impact from the previous application, the discussion on bonusing was problematic and led to me opposition. I agree with fellow commissioners that with the density bonusing structure before us, there is almost a million dollars of foregone public benefit.</li> </ul>

### Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments

<p><b>Commissioner Scott</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Approval</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed revision to capture base density and slightly increase the maximum allowable density retains a scale of development very similar to development that already exists on the site and is contextually appropriate.</li> <li>• The proposed bylaw amendment retains the overall integrity of the larger project (Development Permit DP2017-2886), which includes transfer of heritage density to protect Beltline heritage resources, additional density bonusing on Site 2 with contribution to the Beltline Community Investment Fund, and provision of innovative publicly-accessible private open space within the project.</li> <li>• Minimal opportunity for density bonusing existed on Site 1 prior to the amendments that came into effect with existing Bylaw 50D2018 and associated amendments to the Beltline ARP to facilitate the approved DP and, on balance, the proposed amendment still results in a 'net gain' in community benefit through bonusing.</li> <li>• It should be noted that the circumstances of this application are quite unique: a comprehensive, approved DP is already in place and a relatively small net increase to density is contemplated beyond the existing built density simply to accommodate a revised construction method. I would caution that because this situation is unique, care is taken to not apply this approach more broadly to recognize 'base' density on sites with existing structures where significant increases in density are contemplated.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Schmalz</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing credit for existing FAR is not a good way forward in any area with a density bonusing option.</li> <li>• While I recognize the intent of the developer is to build a similar building, there is no certainty that this will happen.</li> <li>• Would the approval's intent 'stand' if the developer was to flip this site and profit from the credit for the existing FAR?</li> <li>• Poor precedent to set going forward.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Gedye</b></p>	<p>Reasons for <b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I question the long-term public benefit of allowing the current built area of existing buildings to be credited against future redevelopment density bonusing charges.</li> <li>• This has potentially far-reaching impacts on areas of the city that have density bonusing schemes as a part of development approvals.</li> <li>• Council should consider this precedent carefully before approval.</li> </ul>