

2019 September 19 Calgary Planning Commission Discussion

Calgary Planning Commission Review and Administration’s Response – CPC2019-1075
Secondary Suite Reform Phase 2 – Semi-detached Dwellings

Overall, Calgary Planning Commission was in support of the proposed approach. Main considerations were around the considerations for parking relaxations and criteria for when relaxations should be given. Further comments suggest that there is a desire for an increase to the distance from LRT and other forms of transit (from 600 metres to 800 metres) and that other considerations (location to employment centres etc.) should also warrant a relaxation of parking. Responding to future trends, flexibility around rules and access were also themes of the comments.

Comment/Question	Administration’s Response
1. Considerations for a relaxation	
Cllr Woolley - Does Map 1 cover the top 5 communities listed in the presentation where we’re seeing semi’s?	The top 5 communities are those that contain semi-detached buildings, not that those buildings are the ones that contain illegal suites. These 5 communities are served by transit, which would allow for a relaxation of parking for a suite in any circumstance (i.e. semi, single etc), based on the criteria. The mapping does not solve the legalization of the suite in a semi but provides parking relaxation criteria city-wide.
Comm. Schmalz – if there is no regulation/regulation of parking on the street – would this come into play into the discussion of the validity of a relaxation	Individuals can come forward to look at having a residential parking permit. The secondary suite policy would contemplate contextual circumstances (i.e. cul-de-sacs, site conditions, etc), so yes, this would come into play.
Comm. Schmalz – if a street has more than 50% with a secondary suite – would transportation look at changing the parking restriction? Would they transition to permit parking only?	The residential parking permit program could address this. Going through a redo of the residential parking permit program as we speak. Always reserve the right to look at parking outside of this.
2. Parking Requirements for a Suite	
Comm. Foht - Semi has 2 units plus potential for 2 suites which would lead to 1 parking stall per unit	Yes – 4 stalls for the site in total
Comm. Foht – so you do look at the specifics of the street – i.e cul-de-sac – as it relates to parking relaxations. Parking plays a role in this decision and I think you’ve struck a reasonable balance	Yes, the secondary suites policy would look at things like location, site design etc.

3. Accessing frequent transit	
<p>Comm. Gedye – looks like this is targeting 1960 duplexes with front and side door is that correct? The gist of the policy is great – significantly simplifies the process to legalize suites. Building permit is still onerous, but this is a good way to get it under the rule of law. Question is around parking map – like how this gives relaxations based on access to transit – from my understanding the rule around walking distance to an LRT is a half mile and quarter mile to buses. Backed up by green building council in US. Half mile is 800 metres. So recommendation is to change policy from 600m to 800m. Need to allow for relaxations in other areas that are around transit.</p>	<p>Yes, this is correct. We would support the change from 600-800 metres</p>
<p>Comm. Foht – in TOD across the city – is it 600 m around the whole city? Might be worth revisiting if it should be 800 m</p>	<p>Yes, we will consider</p>
<p>Cllr Woolley – 400 m of bus with 20 minutes – is going to evolve over time. How much of a bureaucratic process will that be? Car to go didn't fit into this at all?</p>	<p>Have access to data to determine service levels. Was presented to council</p>
<p>Cllr Woolley - Insanity of suites – shouldn't matter because there are an existing number of illegal suites and the only difference is a stove. We need an easy way to bring it up to code and this is an incremental approach. Much easier to tighten this thing up – to make it – deals with ebbing and flowing.</p>	<p>We can contemplate how to make it easier or streamlined</p>
4. Technology Trends/ mobility options	
<p>Comm. Vanderputten – car ownership is evolving, things are changing. Technological disruption – mobility options change. This will impact the number of stalls we really need to accommodate a street. From a transportation side, we are talking to residents to understand their travel</p>	<p>As technology changes we will look at how to move and advance our rules, regulations and policy to address trends etc. Administration will continue, through the Guidebook and Bylaw work, to look at parking reform and changing parking from a use based system to a location based system.</p>

<p>patterns. Frequency of routes is a regular discussion, so need flexibility</p>	
<p>Comm. Juan – thinking more broadly – did admin look at car share data to inform this work?</p>	<p>Yes, contemplated quite a few things. Reluctant to expand the scope of work beyond what council directed us. Given the large body of work in the background with the Guidebook/LUB review. Parking review will be part of larger review</p>
<p>Comm. Juan – pulled some statistics – new vehicle sales are down 6%, fewest vehicles sold in AB in the past decade. Good to look at when contemplating parking and impact on urban form.</p>	<p>When map was introduced in January – included option for ride share, however, council landed on these metrics</p>
<p>5. Flexibility</p>	
<p>Comm. Palmiere – at one point a route could qualify and the next quarter, you wouldn't qualify. Would be great to think of a way to make this more flexible.</p> <p>Personal opinion is that we shouldn't have parking minimums for suites – people can sort themselves out. Creating bylaw rules fixating on building car stalls impacts built-form. Why do this?</p> <p>Relaxations are considered for transit – but that's only one part of a discussion about relaxations – if they're close to an institution, or have great pathways etc. are we not boxing ourselves in here by saying it's about transit? Life is messier than that. If you have a compelling planning rationale – close to employment etc. could we be more nuanced? Relying on transit is only one piece of the puzzle. So, it's a little concerning</p> <p>With semis are they typically doing 2 parking stalls? If so, there is a ray of hope, these changes mean that suites don't need parking</p>	<p>Yes, we recognize through future work that there needs to be a different approach to parking and how we think about the influences that parking has on the built form. We agree there could be other considerations, however, those considerations should be contemplated not just for suites, but rather for the city as a whole, to ensure we are addressing the needs of the city's built form.</p>