

**Calgary Planning Commission Review – Administration Follow-up**  
Summary of CPC comments – 2019 December 5 – Closed session of CPC meeting

CPC members comments	Administrations’ Edits	Administrations Follow-up
<p><b>Approved Outline Plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Do the approved outline plans need to conform with the Plan?</li> <li>b) What discussions have happened with developers</li> <li>c) How does one side of the street respond to the other side (lots backing onto the Interface Street)?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Plan, when approved will not apply to approved outline plans. However, Administrations hope that developers consider changes at future planning application stages to better align with the vision for the plan area.</li> <li>b) Administrations have had discussions with developers and landowners during the policy work. It has been acknowledged that The Plan offer long term opportunities.</li> <li>c) some lots, in the approved outline plans, side or back onto the Interface Street. Again, further discussion will happen at future planning stages to explore opportunities to better align with the vision for the plan area.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Hierarchy of Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) It is confusing where The Plan sits within the hierarchy of municipal policies.</li> <li>b) Unclear why The Plan includes high level policies as well as detailed policies?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A graphic “Hierarchy of Legislation Plans and Policies” has been added to help clarify where the plan sits.</li> <li>b) The Plan includes high level policies to address intermunicipal collaboration and coordination, and detailed policies to allow for consistency in the plan area. Wording has been added to explain that.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Plan, as an Intermunicipal Plan, sits above policies and plans in Calgary and Chestermere.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Vision</b> Vision is unclear. Why are we doing this? why should I go there? What is so unique about this interface? What is the goal of The Plan?</p>	<p>Wording revised throughout the document to make it easier to understand and to highlight the fact that this is a collaborative approach that seeks to create a unique and active interface between the two municipalities.</p>	<p>Calgary and Chestermere have jointly completed The Plan to support an attractive and pleasant interface. The Plan supports active development along the interface area and various travel modes and prevents the Interface Street to become a tunnel-like thoroughfare for vehicle and be an area where the two municipalities turn their backs onto each other.</p>
<p><b>Transportation Functional Study / road cross-section</b> a) What is the road cross section? Why not include details? b) When is the transportation Functional Study going to be completed? c) What is the classification of the road?</p>	<p>a) A “Conceptual Interface Street Cross Section Sketch” has been added as an appendix. Also, wording has been added to link the Mobility section to the transportation Intermunicipal Collaboration section to clarify that the study is required to identify details and final alignment of the Interface Street.</p>	<p>b) At this time there is no funding assigned to complete the study, however both municipalities expect to jointly complete the study as soon as possible. c) The Interface Street will be a modified road classification, which will be identified as part of the Transportation Functional Study.</p>
<p><b>Maps</b> Maps 3, 4 and 5 do not clearly indicate what they are referring to.</p>	<p>New maps included</p>	
<p><b>Wording</b> a) Development should be compatible and “complementary”? b) Clarify what private amenity spaces refer to? c) Pathways should not run through natural features d) 3.3.3 should only apply where pathways are routed through an intersection.</p>	<p>a) “complementary” removed b) Section 2.1.11 – “private amenity space” changed to “backyards” c) Section 3.3.2 “Pathways in the Plan Area should be routed through the Open Space...” changed to “Pathways in the Plan Area should be integrated with the Open Space...”</p>	

<p>e) 6.4.11 why is the policy dictating action “shall” for Rocky View County and the Province</p>	<p>d) Added “located at intersections” e) Wording revised to emphasize that Rocky View Council and The Province are stakeholders and Calgary and Chestermere are the ones to action items.</p>	
<p><b>Natural Features</b> Why is a Natural Feature map not included? Not sure where the tree stand is located?</p>	<p>A “Conceptual Natural Feature Location Map” has been added as an appendix.</p>	<p>Due to lack of consistent information between the two municipalities, a natural feature map was not included in the initial draft.</p>
<p><b>Mid-block Crossing</b> Is it possible and safe to have mid-block crossings at 60Km/h? why are we allowing/encouraging it?</p>		<p>Yes, mid-block crossing is possible, and we have some examples in Calgary. The mid-block crossing is planned at the intersection of the Power Transmission Line right-of-way and the Interface Street to facilitate pedestrian/bicycle-users movement.</p>
<p><b>Transit</b> How does transit work here?</p>		<p>Local transit options may be considered along the Interface Street, further discussion between the two municipalities could happen at a later stage. Both municipalities are currently discussing transit along 17 Avenue S.E. / Chestermere Boulevard, those discussions are out of the scope of The Plan.</p>
<p><b>CMRB</b> Is the plan going to the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board (CMRB)?</p>		<p>As a new statutory plan, The Plan will be sent to the CMRB for review and approval after respective readings by both councils.</p>