

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2019-0695
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2019 November 21



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
Commissioner Scott	<p>Reasons for Opposition of the Refusal Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do NOT support Administration's recommendation on the proposed policy and redesignation for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Applicant-proposed DC responds appropriately to context within 400 metre walking radius of a planned Green Line station area and deals with the unique physical constraints presented by the dual-frontage condition on 8 Street SE and Maggie Street, and significant grade changes across the site. The Administration-supportable DC bylaw proposed as an alternative to the applicant's proposed DC bylaw effectively creates policy through zoning, applicable to specific parcels and not explicitly the larger ARP area. There are presently no designated Municipal Historic Resource 'receiver' sites in Ramsay eligible for funds from the HIRF. Although there are sites in Ramsay that could qualify for grant funding should the owner request it, the current absence of additional Historic Resource properties casts question on the appropriateness and efficacy of applying a HIRF density 'bonus' to the subject parcels via a DC bylaw. The significant percentage of residential properties in Ramsay that fall within the 400 metre TOD walkshed areas of two planned Green Line stations suggests future efforts at private retention of Evaluated and non-Evaluated historic resources as potential receiver sites could be challenged. The homes within the subject parcels identified in the existing outdated Ramsay ARP and by the City in a windshield survey may have subjective character value however are not listed or identified for listing as municipal or provincial historic resources. M-C1 with 155 upha modifier is still a relatively modest increase to density within the 400 metre walk radius of the future Green Line station. Requiring a density 'bonus' for such a small increase from the maximum base M-C1 density does not encourage development in line with MDP and CTP targets, and penalizes development potential by imposing this condition ahead of wider policy. The Applicant in this case cannot be expected to accommodate policy today that may or may not be

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments

	<p>applicable to the wider ARP area at some future point in time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In principle applicant-led 'up-zoning' in close proximity to a planned LRT station, or similarly on key City-identified Main Streets has frequently occurred without an accompanying Development Permit or concept plan, and to higher densities than proposed by the Applicant in this case.
Commissioner Schmalz	<p>Reasons to support administration's recommendation of Refusal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No clear visioning for the project.• No urgency to move ahead of ARP.• If there was clear visioning for the project (i.e., comprehensive development massing models would have helped and likely resulted in support of the rezoning).