

Summary of Amendments as Agreed to By All Parties

Urban Design Review Panel Terms of Reference		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
3.2 Eligibility of Public Members	Desire expressed for Development Industry involvement in the nomination of panel members. (Not included in letter; raised through engagement)	The Urban Design Review Panel is comprised of 12 members and one adjunct member (see below), nominated by their professional associations. As well, BILD Calgary Region and NAIOP will each nominate from within their membership one registered design professional from any of the professional associations referred to below. The complete list of nominations will be considered by Council who will appoint the Panel members, by resolution, at the annual Organizational Meeting of Council.
3.3 Selection Criteria	Clarification requested with regard to UDRP Panel member nomination and selection process; there was concern that a “shortlist” would be created and Council would not be provided the entire list of nominees. Not the intent; the text provides additional clarification. (Not included in letter; raised through engagement)	Panel members are selected for their individual experience and qualifications, and are expected to be leaders in their professions, with experience in delivering high quality design outcomes. The Panel overall should represent a broad range of experience which, in addition to urban design should include high-rise design, commercial building design, civic building design, accessible design, sustainable design, and experience with large scale development projects. The Chief Urban Designer and Urban Design Review Panel Chair will review the list of nominations provided by the Professional Associations and submit a short-list recommendation which will be considered, together with the entire list, to inform Council's decision, in accordance with Council Policy CP2016-03. No more than one member of any particular firm may be allowed to sit on the Panel at the same time.
3.6 Duties of the Panel Chair	Suggestion that communicating UDRP comments directly to applicants would foster better connection; File Manager to maintain communication; UDRP chair/vice available for clarification if necessary.	<p>“Summarizes Panel commentary utilizing an established template and sends directly to the File Manager, copy to the Chief Urban Design, within two to five days of the meeting. The File Manager will communicate this commentary, <u>unedited</u>, to the applicant, as soon as possible.”</p> <p>Represents the Panel when Urban Design Review Panel representation is required outside of regular Panel duties, including being periodically available to address questions of clarification.</p>

Summary of Amendments As Agreed To By All Parties

Urban Design Review Panel Terms of Reference		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
3.7 Attendance by Non-Members	Suggestion made that applicants were not given opportunity to present; text was strengthened to clarify the roles of each involved and to emphasize the applicant's central role in explaining their design rationale and decisions.	<p>The Chief Urban Designer or designate (non-voting) will be available at Panel meetings to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present Provide applicable urban design policy/guideline context to at the request of the Panel. relevant design documentation such as streetscape studies. <p>"The meetings are not open to members of the public; however, applicants will be requested to present the project and address questions of the Urban Design Review Panel (further detail of the conduct of Panel meetings is set out in the Urban Design Review Protocol). The File Manager/Project Planner (non-voting) will be available to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present the relevant planning and physical context of the proposal, the project's history, the policy context and relevant process considerations as requested by the Panel. 2. Answer questions raised by the Panel. <p>The Applicant and/or their representative (non-voting) will be available to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present the overall design rationale and physical context of the proposal, and, as relevant, the project's history. 2. Answer questions raised by the Panel.
5.0 Code of Conduct	Additional emphasis on transparency and open discussion with applicants requested.	<p>added:</p> <p>"Members of the Urban Design Review Panel will conduct their assessments in a collaborative and transparent manner with the applicant."</p>
7.0 Record of Meetings	Assurance requested with regard to consistency between comments made during meetings and the final written comments.	<p>"Comments of the Urban Design Review Panel made during the course of the meeting will be noted by the Chair or Deputy Chair and formalized within an established template after the conclusion of the meeting with the assistance of Administration as required. No new material or information will be introduced into the comments that were not discussed in the open portion of the meeting."</p>

Summary of Amendments As Agreed To By All Parties

Urban Design Review Protocol		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
4.1 Application Types	Desire expressed for greater opportunities for applicants to access UDRP (not included in letter; raised through engagement)	<p>Following: “Additional projects of significant complexity may be referred to the Urban Design Review Panel at the request of the Planning File Manager and the discretion of the Chief Urban Designer or designate and depending on the capacity of the Panel at the time...”</p> <p>Added: “Applicants may request a review with Urban Design Review Panel even if their project is not deemed to meet the criteria for review. In these cases the capacity and workload of Urban Design Review panel will be taken into account and a priority assigned. Applicants should be aware that such requests may take longer to accommodate. “.</p>
5.1 Administration Roles and Responsibilities	More detail requested regarding Administration’s role; desire expressed to maintain independence of UDRP comments	<p>Planning File Manager / City Wide Urban Design: The Planning file Manager will be available at Panel meetings to present an overview of the application if requested by the applicant or UDRP, including relevant planning policy and any issues raised previously by CPAG or the Community that were not raised as part of the applicant’s presentation and require UDRP consideration.</p>
5.2 Conduct of Panel Meetings	More clarity requested regarding the procedures of UDRP; concern that discussions were occurring between UDRP and staff which did not include applicant; It was felt that term “in camera” implied confidentiality; intent is to provide time for UDRP to pull together coordinated written comments.	<p>5.2(2) The City Wide Urban Designer has five minutes to present urban design context including policy considerations, comments previously given to the applicant and outline urban design-related reactions and concerns.</p> <p>5.2(6) Following the presentations and discussion with the applicant and Administration, the Panel will meet separately review drawings and discuss merits and issues of the project “in camera” to craft a clear and coordinated written response. This discussion will typically be conducted without the applicant present, however a verbal summary of the content of the discussion may be provided by the Chair of the Urban Design Review Panel upon request.</p>

Summary of Amendments As Agreed To By All Parties

Urban Design Review Protocol		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
5.2 Conduct of Panel Meetings (continued)		5.2(8) "A vote is held at the end of each project review to determine the Panel's position on the project. The vote only relates to the design issues discussed during the review and is not connected to The City's development approvals process."

Implementation Plan		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
2.2.1 Status of UDRP Comments	Concern expressed about lack of clear authority regarding design comments and where the responsibility lay for resolving conflicts between the various sets of design comments. Text reinforces difference between policy and advisory, and clarifies that File Manager has task of communicating.	Where there are conflicts between the guidance of Administration and UDRP, an applicant will be expected to address the comments of Administration which are based on Council approved City policy, and strongly encouraged to, as far as possible, address the comments of UDRP. The File Manager will provide clear direction with regard to those areas of conflicting direction where policy must be adhered to or where there is room for relaxation and/or interpretation to achieve a superior design outcome. In every case UDRP recommendations will be taken into consideration by both Administration and the Applicant. Rationale will be provided by the applicant for those instances where UDRP advice cannot be accommodated.
2.3.1 External Stakeholder Outreach	Additional ideas with regard to effective outreach, monitoring and measurement of the success of the process offered by Industry.	<u>Development Industry, "what they need" :</u> Added: a. The differentiated value, roles and responsibilities of UDRP/CWUD/CPC as they go through the process; b. The selection criteria (what applications get selected for UDRP and why) c. The process (what happens when selected, expectations of each group within that process) d. How to successfully get through to an approval e. The cumulative value/impact to industry (through monitoring and reporting) <u>Section 3 "Metrics & Monitoring":</u>

**Summary of Amendments
As Agreed To By All Parties**

Implementation Plan		
Section	Issue raised:	Proposed amendments:
	Additional ideas with regard to effective outreach, monitoring and measurement of the success of the process offered by Industry.	Added: a. Impact of UDRP on decisions/revisions made by applicant; b. How often the pre-app option is utilized by an applicant; c. Impact on timelines: i. with/without pre-app ii. with/without UDRP review iii. which targets are being met d. How many applications get 'endorsed' in the pre-app, vs. 'endorsed with conditions', vs. 'another UDRP review required'