

Beverly Jarvis

From: Chris Ollenberger <chris@quantumplace.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, November 05, 2019 7:52 PM
To: Kahn, Lisa; Beverly Jarvis; Dave White; Scott James (PBA Land & Development); Leslie Evans; Nathan Hawryluk; Gondek, Jyoti; Sutherland, Ward
Cc: Jamieson, Robyn; Jennifer Miller; Mueller, Joachim; Pearce, Stephen M.; Schryvers, Peter; Goldstein, Teresa S.; Harper, Ian; cityclerk@calgary.ca
Subject: NAIOP Recommendations to PUD re: Guidebook for Great Communities (GGC)

Good evening members of the PUD Panel on Guidebook for Great Communities, Councillor Gondek and Councillor Sutherland (noting that Council minutes of the latest organizational meeting of Council are not yet available for updated PUD membership, but that Councillors Gondek and Sutherland both made motions on October 2, 2019):

Thank you to Lisa Kahn for preparing the presentation and panel for tomorrow, and please accept on behalf of NAIOP Calgary my apologies for not being able to support you all in person due to my moderation of a panel tomorrow at the Calgary Real Estate Forum. Its unfortunate that the conflict with regular PUD dates existed and I didn't pick up on it at the time that Councillor Gondek suggested November 6, 2019 for PUD to further consider the GGC. I apologize for the oversight Councillor Gondek.

In lieu of participation tomorrow on the panel discussion, please accept this email as a summary of NAIOPs recommendations to PUD for their consideration. Lisa Kahn has graciously agreed to print and distribute 35 copies of this email to PUD for your consideration. Thank you Lisa, I appreciate your assistance.

QUESTION 1: Timing of Adoption of Guidebook for Great Communities

NAIOP recommends Option 2, implementing in combination with the North Hill Multi Community Plan. This option allows more time for review and discussion, an opportunity for industry and community to actually see some "testing" of the GGC that we have not seen to date, and NAIOP believes that there really is no material downside to this option given the importance of the GGC in the future planning system of the City. We believe Option 2 is a reasonable decision for community and industry stakeholders after hearing all viewpoints since October 2. For additional clarity, **NAIOP strongly recommends that PUD NOT proceed with Option 1, December 16, 2019 Public Hearing of Council.** We believe that Option 1 is not in the best interests of citizens, communities or industry, precludes community and industry participating in "testing" and effective feedback based on that "testing" opportunity of the GGC prior to implementation, and could hamper future support of the planning system work underway and to come. We believe that Option 3 is unnecessarily long, and likely would not be productive or beneficial to stakeholders commensurate with the time suggested.

QUESTION 2: Applicability of the built-form and common policies (Chapter 3)

NAIOP recommends Option 3, Applied to communities as they go through a local area plan process and applied to communities without an existing statutory plan. Option 3 is a reasonable compromise and outcome for all stakeholders in our opinion. We believe it is fair to communities and allows time for transition and results in a faster and broader rollout than Option 2. We think it would result in better outcomes by the time a new LUB comes into play, and allows for a more reasonable pace of replacement of existing ASP/ARPs AND captures those communities without a statutory plan today, which is a good outcome. **For additional clarity, NAIOP strongly recommends that PUD NOT proceed with Option 1, Applied to all built-out communities once the Guidebook is approved.** As noted in the panel presentation, there has been minimal engagement or outreach with communities on this option, and we note carefully that option 1 would likely result in discouraging redevelopment via increased risk, delays, conflicts and processing times due to inherent conflicts between existing older ARP/ASPs. NAIOP does not agree that Option 1 would result in "equal application of best practices" as the conflicts in wording and application of policies between GGC and existing ASP/ARPs

are real, and likely would result in more SDAB conflicts and potential dissatisfaction with the process to date with communities and industry. We believe that Option 2 could be ok, but is less desirable than Option 3.

We do not believe that there is any member of NAIOP Calgary that would currently support Option 1 on either question based on the information presented, and therefore we strongly recommend to PUD that Option 1 on both questions not be considered any further.

Again, we apologize for not being available to participate fully today due to scheduling conflict with Calgary's largest real estate conference occurring tomorrow. NAIOP Calgary hopes that this email is helpful to PUD's discussions, and we respectfully request that it be included in your considerations and included for the official record.

On behalf of NAIOP Calgary,

Chris Ollenberger, P. Eng.
Chair, Government Affairs Committee
NAIOP Calgary

