

Urban Design Review Framework Stakeholder Engagement Summary April-May 2017

Project Background

The Urban Design Review Framework project is a fresh look at the intent of the Decision Framework project which was to define and design a recommended framework for combining Calgary Planning Commission (CPC) and Urban Design Review Panel (UDRP). The project name was changed from Decision Framework to Urban Design Review Framework (UDRF) to better reflect the objectives of this second phase of the project. The Urban Design Review Framework project will provide clarity and consistency around decision making. The result will be an efficient and effective urban design review process that supports outcome-based decision making on development applications.

Engagement Overview

The project objective is to engage with industry and internal experts, Urban Design Review Panel and Calgary Planning Commission and return to Committee and Council with recommendations no later than Q1 2017. During this phase of the project, feedback from industry stakeholders will be used to inform the updated Terms of Reference for Urban Design Review Panel, the supporting Protocol document and the Implementation Strategy. Questions and comments from participants will provide the content for a Frequently Asked Questions document that will be

September 2016 - December 2016

March 2017

April 2017



available for all interested stakeholders, internal and external.

In March 2017 the SPC on Planning & Urban Development recommended that Council:

1. Receive the Urban Design Review Framework Document for information, and
2. Direct Administration to revise the Terms of Reference of the Urban Design Review Panel and provide a more detailed implementation plan with stakeholder input, including the Industry/City Process Improvement Working Group, and return through the SPC on PUD to Council no later than July 2017.

To gather input on the Terms of Reference for UDRP and implementation plan, two workshops and two report back meetings have been planned.

What We Heard/What We Did

What we asked

Workshop 1 April 24, 2017 focused on the Terms of Reference for URDP and the Protocol document. Stakeholders included representation from industry users and internal planning experts. All participants were provided with copies of the draft Terms of Reference and the Protocol. After a brief presentation table groups discussed the following:

1. Regarding the Terms of Reference for Urban Design Review Panel and Protocol, is there anything missing? Identify any gaps you may see.

Themes identified included:

- Clarity of roles and responsibilities of UDRP
- Ensure the applicant is able to meet timelines
- Outline plans as part of UDRP review

2. Defining Success, what does successful implementation of Urban Design Review Framework recommendations look like for you?

Themes identified included:

- More projects approved with outright support
- More feedback provided to the applicant, earlier in the process
- Reduction in the amount of time CPC discusses urban design
- Better design outcomes

Workshop 2 April 27, 2017 focused on the implementation plan. Participants discussed what a Pre-Application and Development Permit process might look like when early UDRP review was recommended. Participants were asked to consider:

1. What challenges do you see with the proposed process change?

Themes identified included:

- Clarity of roles/function/purpose and expectations of each group
- Clarity on process and requirements
- Ability of UDRP to manage reviews in a timely manner

2. What support would be required?

Themes identified included:

- Reduce scope of reviews to ensure adequate resources are in place
- Scheduled review of effectiveness of new framework

Report Back Session May 3, 2017 revised Terms of Reference for URDP and Protocol document were provided in addition to the Implementation Strategy. Stakeholders were able to ask questions and give comments based on What We Heard & What We Did.

What We Heard/What We Did

What We Heard & What We Did

Stakeholder engagement from September 2016 to April 2017 surfaced many issues, concerns, comments and potential impacts. See below a summary of the key concerns and the resulting actions considered to address these concerns.

WHAT WE HEARD	WHAT WE DID
<p>Desire for early design conversations</p>	<p>Expand Panel mandate to enable early design conversations on key sites/projects city-wide encourage early design discussion to clearly establish urban design and design review process expectations through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-application enquiries • DC land use amendment applications, • Include early urban design advice with any subsequent review to provide context and ensure that commentary respects the process
<p>Consider phasing any future expansion of UDRP scope and mandate</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on pre-applications, DC land use amendment applications, development permits / liaisons, relevant public projects across broader geographic scope 2. Initiate monitoring/feedback plan; review UDRP capacity 3. Consider additional project types based on results over time: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline Plans • Area Structure Plans
<p>Clearly define UDRP circulation triggers</p>	<p>UDRP circulation triggers identify candidate application types and locations. Specific projects referred to UDRP based on impact on public realm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private + public projects • DPs for decision by CPC • PE, DP, DC, DL applications in Centre City, TOD, Main Streets, gateway locations • Exceptional Design bonus candidates • Urban design components of City policies and guidelines
<p>Concern that Panel size and expertise is appropriate for application types and volume</p>	<p>Panel size increased to accommodate additional file volume, to ensure quorum is met, and to provide broad range of expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 members, quorum of 50%+1 (Currently 9/3) • Nomination criteria specifies expertise in urban design; high-rise design; commercial building design; civic building design; accessible design; sustainable design; multi-modal transportation; complete streets; tactical urbanism • In addition an <i>adjunct</i> member with heritage conservation experience to be accessed as needed

What We Heard/What We Did

WHAT WE HEARD	WHAT WE DID
<p>Concern with collaborative vs independent relationship of UDRP and CWUD</p>	<p>UDRP purpose (unchanged)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional, independent design advice as an expert, third-party, peer review group <p>Relationship of UDRP and CWUD established to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make best use of design expertise • Provide opportunities for discussion • Formalize CWUD role in representing urban design matters at CPC
<p>Need to clarify roles and responsibilities of UDRP/CWUD unchanged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UDRP is independent, peer review group with ability to make best practice recommendations • CWUD is a specialist within CPAG, working within the context of City policy 	<p>Roles and responsibilities of UDRP and CWUD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UDRP Terms of Reference • Protocol – defines role of CWUD in relation to UDRP process • Implementation Plan
<p>Need for clearly reported, transparent design discussions UDRF comments (unchanged)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unedited comments attached to DTR and CPC report as Appendix, including (in CPC report) applicant’s response 	<p>Establish consistent reporting of <i>design narrative</i> to describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban design related negotiations within the review process • If/when UDRP was consulted • When CWUD was consulted • How UDRP/CWUD consultation impacted the result
<p>Need a mechanism which allows UDRP to critically comment without impacting timelines and application stream</p>	<p>City Wide Urban Design will work with CPAG to ensure clarity of recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where comments are not aligned, a clear explanation for the resulting recommendation will be provided in all reporting • Provide a forum/review mechanism for UDRP to comment on policy concerns outside of specific application reviews

What We Heard/What We Did

Stakeholders

The project targeted stakeholders who were familiar with City of Calgary planning processes and could offer knowledgeable feedback based on their experiences. These stakeholders included industry and City of Calgary experts, members of Urban Design Review Panel and Calgary Planning Commission.

As part of the ongoing engagement sessions the following members participated and/or were involved in the project:

City of Calgary

- David Down, Coordinator/City Wide Urban Design
- Dawn Clarke, Planner/City Wide Urban Design
- Kieran Slattery, City Process Improvement Program
- Amie Blanchette, Calgary Approvals
- Scott Lockwood, Manager, Community Planning
- Debra Hamilton, Community Planning
- Chris Wolfe, Community Planning
- Jordan Furness, Community Planning
- Gareth Webster, Community Planning
- Afrah Rayes, City Wide Urban Design
- Ken Melanson, Legislative Services
- Christine Leung, Community Planning
- Cathy Ashcroft
- Adelle Palmer, Engage Resource Unit

Calgary Planning Commission

- Malcolm Logan, Chair
- Matthias Tita
- Gian-Carlo Carra
- Shane Keating
- Colin Friesen
- Lourdes Juan
- Melvin Foht
- Doug Leighton
- Andrew Palmiere
- Roy Wright

Industry Representatives

- Grace Lui, BILD
- Bev Jarvis, BILD

Industry Representatives Continued

- Kathy Oberg, B+A Planning Group
- Greg Brown, B+A Planning Group
- Ryan Boyd, Brookfield
- Josh White, Dream
- Jim Grandan, Dream
- Jessica Karpat, Quantum Place
- Catherine Agar, WestCreek Developments
- Ryan Darragh, Ronmor
- Lesley Kalmakoff
- Mike Brander, Remington

Urban Design Review Panel

- Janice Liebe, Chair
- Bruce Nelligan

Urban Design Review Panel Continued

- Brian Horton
- Terry Klassen
- Robert LeBlond
- Philip Vandermey
- Chad Russill
- Yogeshwar Navagrah
- Al Devani, RNDSQR
- Christopher Pollen
- Greg Bodnarchuk
- Joel Tiedemann, Serena
- Chris Battistella
- Chito Pabustan, Gibbs Gage
- Jonny Hehr, Gibbs Gage
- Jeremy Sturgess, Sturgess Architecture
- Mark Boutin, MBAC
- Douglas Olson, O2 Planning & Design
- Oliver Trutina, Truman Development
- Jeff Hyde, Great West Life
- Kate Thompson, CMLC
- James Robertson, West Campus Dev.

What We Heard/What We Did

Verbatim Feedback April 24, 2017 Stakeholder Workshop 1

Working in table groups stakeholders reflected on the revised Terms of Reference for UDRP and the Protocol and identified what may be missing, or gaps. Table groups were then asked to select one item as their table priority. Discussion about what success looks like followed. (21 Attendees)

1. Regarding the Terms of Reference for Urban Design Review Panel and Protocol, is there anything missing? Identify any gaps you may see.

Table Priorities – participants were asked to identify their top priorities from the conversation.

- Applicant should be involved throughout -not clear if applicant can attend TOR – 5.3 Protocol should be in TOR
- TOR vs Protocol - 1 document?
- Suggested panel expansion -> heavily favors architects -now reviewing ARP + LU
- Could process work w/ application to see what is optimal timing for UDRP ->some applicants are very far into design at pre-app
- LU amendment review + effect on timelines -understanding that OP is not a large priority for UDRP. If it is, does this add red tape? Should CAG not address issues related to OP?
- OP in or out
- Role + Responsibilities ->cannot advice outside guidelines
- Terms of Reference Roles + Responsibilities, UDRP vs CPC vs Chief UD vs Staff vs Council Guidelines applicability of the input
- role + purpose of guidelines + ppl/groups implementing them

General Feedback

- How to ensure optimal timing for UDRP review to change applicant can make changes
- Success Measures - report back after built? Or a few season to enjoy it
- Educate beforehand. Generally applications are impressive. System is reactive vs should be proactive
- Lots of rules/guidelines in place already
- Have education on going for industry
- "Good porridge"
- Roles + responsibility
- Explanation for UDRP or context of application
- Representation -> computerization
- Blank slate @ UDRP is not effective

- Design gets overridden by Technical requirements -> What can UDRP do? -Grid - intersection springs -bulb widths (technical stuff)
- How do you manage potential/perceived conflicts of interests
- First visit from the Library, how much detail?
- Want a better design pkg
- AB intent is to build the design story to provide more background on the current bare bones table UDRP|Applicant Response
- I think this weakens the critical role of UDRP as an independent, expert advisory panel. The panel (in addition to administration) needs to make *direct recommendations and direct comments/advice to COC, council and decision makers

What We Heard/What We Did

1. Regarding the Terms of Reference for Urban Design Review Panel and Protocol, is there anything missing? Identify any gaps you may see.

- Early review should be optional. It should also be just that -preliminary comments; not a formal recommendation of support etc. A formal recommendation by UDRP should be made at the end of the process, based on the design to be presented for decision. Doesn't a formal recommendation early in the process directly contradict/undermine the purpose of early, preliminary review?
- Defining what qualifies for a review
- Paying close attention to Mainstreets & ensuring UDRP does provide comments & reviews more often than not
- I think this would help alleviate community concerns of the type of developments we are getting
- Density is one thing but good urban design is another
- Ensuring UDRP comments go to CPC + council without City staff comment
- Add full comments as appendix to report
- Bring urban Design components of City Policy to UDRP, -no need to specifically reference ARPs
- Few minor comments on revised TOR: Page 3 4th paragraph ->Include CTP Page 4 Should we limit panel members to no more than 2 members from one company (to avoid too many being absent do to conflict).
- Still a little confused as to why UDRP needs to provide a recommendation or support, support w/ conditions or non-support ... what's the value to the applicant /CPC/Staff?
- Clearly defined success measures
- Standardized template for CPC from UDRP & Applicant. Response -rational of background
- Update attachment #1 to show what happens if pre-app is skipped
- Pre-application/PD requirement list (pg 8 protocol) could be considered as "should haves" in order to encourage early presentation to UDRP ->ex. Maybe elevations aren't always needed
- Timing is key. It sounds like this has been addressed but the earlier the UDRP can comment, the more realistic the proposal changes will be (from a developer's perspective)
- Appendix 1 is the protocol document: -items 5-7 are typically available at DP stage. The pre-app package should allow for more generic conversation.
- How do you evaluate success of the UDRP reviews?
- UDRP members need to be aware of development application process
- Roles / Responsibility +purpose of guidelines of -application / consultants -CWUD Team (city) -UDRP -CPC
- Missing in TOR: missing ASP & OP -re definition of UDRP is looking at term, shape & character to arrangement building & whole neighbourhood. How can we evaluate DPE & its circulation w/o planning holistically this would avoid many issues later on i.e. congestion, dead space -> key to "healthy communities" project i.e. Nosecreek
- Missing in TOR of composition of members: -> Transportation planner = engineers -> Urban designers -> this is a separate profession from architecture or landscape architecture
- Clear understanding of the purpose of urban design ->form & function first, aesthetic is a result of form & function -> different b/t UDRP (function & term of community) & CPC (planning merit)
- Expectations of all stakeholders -> how do we educate Calgarians to expect design. ---> implementations suggestion: Process urban design analysis

What We Heard/What We Did

2. What does successful implementation of Urban Design Review Framework recommendations look like for you?

- Clarify a role & function b/t CPC & UDRP -> UDRP only reviews process based a UD principles -> have more clout
- Raise expectations of urban design. For all projects -> culture & knowledge of UD -> measure -># support
- Better build forms
- Happier CA's
- Streamlined timelines for application in hopes that stronger design reviews
- Curious to look at failed or perceived failed UDRP past reviewed projects what went wrong? How can we fix it? How did those projects get support? See if the changes would/could change the outcome of those projects now
- A tangible measure of success would be more projects, getting through the process with outright support. This should reflect better overall design on projects across the city
- Clarify on CPC's ability to comment on urban design -> if the urban design review is done correctly there should be fewer comments from CPC regarding urban design. ->Tangible reduction in the amount of time CPC discusses urban design (minute? # of occurrences?)
- More projects approved with outright support down the road as the overall design of projects & proponents throughout the city.
- More certainty on when a project will or won't require an UDRP review
- Good Projects attain better support; move through more quickly
- Feedback process. Were comments inserted?
- Timing aligned w/ Development of project (given at right useful moment)
- Difference between C.P.C, Urban Design, UDRP comments (variety of comments)
- Volume of projects reviewed
- Alignment between projects that could use UDRP comments and the projects UDRP is seeing
- Post -construction analysis of projects
- Variety, diversity, unusual projects making it through bureaucratic process that could easily tend towards conformity (encourage risk-taking, unusual, unique projects through inclusive process that celebrates them) -> requires benchmark that realizes this
- Success is that there is more feedback provided to the applicant at an earlier stage of the process
- Success is seeing more changes to the site design as a direct result of comments about urban design
- More feedback w/o extending overall timeline for approval process
- Comment : If we are providing more feedback but are not impacting the design of building / infrastructure in a positive way than we have failed in our mandate
- Identify what is broken/gaps so we can circle back to verify ->intersection @ the right moment ->catalyst to state this? ->unusable feedback ->identify certain projects
- Build on. Track feedback process after each project so "date" can be compiled (what's the benchmark) ->after approval/decision} relevance & timing of comments -> after construction
- Track: look @feedback from CPC + are there comments redundant to UDRP process

What We Heard/What We Did

2. Continued
 - Transportation vs Urban Design
 - # of applications + types
 - Process length
 - OP detail/cost has increased hugely in 10 years. How are negative comments treated? Changed? Accepted? St Patrick's Island (not so controversy same cost) vs Peace Bridge (controversy same cost). How do you measure in the heat of the moment? (cool down period)
 - Minimum implementation issues / flexible implementation issues
 - Added value as determined by i) City ii) Applicant iii)community??
 - Effective clean monitoring -2 -Monitoring benefits of UDRP over time
 - Improvements -to the process over time (revisit) -making the City better
 - Systems of success
 - UDRP can add value to the project in a way that is applicable/implementable -technically feasible / requirements [monitoring for value]
 - Top considerations -> CPAG (City staff review) ->CPC
 - Min/few lasting implementation issues + value as determined by application + city + (community)?
 - Effective, clear monitoring system -> monitors impact of UDRP to outcome --> is better design result of -UDRP comments? Staff input? Applicants?
 - Improvement + revisions/upgrades -ongoing (to policy)
 - UDRP -> valuable to City + applicant -CPAG comments to work w/ UDRP comments
 - Applicant success -process clear -timely
 - City success -> improved design/outcomes -satisfied clients/customers
 - Effective clear monitoring system
 - No impact on timelines from panel review
 - A process that works better
 - Better design outcomes
 - Reduced discussion of "design" issues at CPC
 - How to recognize good design outcomes: ~more emphasis on mayors urban design awards; other forms of recognition
 - There was a fair bit of discussion of the Vancouver example for Panel review; what is it? How is it different from what is proposed here?
 - Reduction of ability for CPC to comment on design aspects
 - Post evaluation; look @ projects gone through UDRP and after construction, what is the public opinion of the project? -> create a forum for evaluation (?)
 - Better urban design outcomes:
 - a) Clearer easy vision + consensus + celebration(what constitutes "good" or great urban design)
 - b) Public (and media) recognition of urban design as important to Calgary as a destination for people compared to capital
 - c) Increased expertise/capacity
 - Smoother better process:
 - a) Clear, consistent expert advice to decision makers (council, admin, CPC)
 - b) Options for applicants –two-step process (with preliminary review) or standard finer UDRP review
 - c) Separate advisory design roles from decision making roles
 - d) Incentivize projects -accelerate projects "cut red tape" for great process

What We Heard/What We Did

Verbatim Feedback April 27, 2017 Stakeholder Workshop 2

Stakeholders reviewed the proposed implementation plan for Pre-applications and Development Permits to have UDRP review earlier in the CPAG process. Feedback is as recorded by participants. (20 Attendees)

What challenges do you see with the proposed process changes?

- Decision Authority - at a couple of points in the DP process (less so at Pre-App) a single individual has to make a decision. There will be times when the applicant disagrees. I see a need to have a defined 'appeal' process or path for at least +1 level. It will happen anyway so lets put it in writing.
- They are measurable (*drawing of a checkmark*).
- How/when will the results be shared with industry?
- I think there are some fundamental flaws in the proposed process diagram. Preliminary UDRP review should be voluntary; and this should be based on an 'urban design analysis.'
- The UDRP should remain as an independent, expert peer-review and advisory group making a direct recommendation to the CPC and City once the DP is finished.
- The sequence of the process, its drawing requirements, and the authority, or power, of the panel's support needs to be refined.
- Clarity of roles/function/purpose and expectations of each group.
- Clarity on process and requirements.
- As an optional value added service, is good at pre-application: the smart one will utilize the service. My concern would be the ones that don't understand the benefits and value. Perhaps specific projects that CPAG can see potential problems with. Can ask then, applicant, to submit or refer then to the UDRP. For peer review these are the ones that many need this service the most.
- Concern for resources - i.e. ability of UDRP to manage reviews in a timely manner - particularly if there are multiple UDRP touch points in the process and given the expanded size and number of applications/projects going to UDRP.
- Concern for applications that cannot go thru UDRP due to resources restrictions - increased risk for applicant at CPC RE: Urban Design
- Timelines. Clarity of process. Type of comments/value UDRP can provide. Lack of understanding CPAG impacts on design to align w/ UDRP objectives. That expectation of level of design review will require more risk of upfront spending. Scale-ability of projects.
- Risk: 17 UDRP is advisory but their comments have clout, and they are a CARL requirement (potential) one could argue CA comments should have the same clout and need to be on the pre-app process and make the appropriate changes. Local knowledge is also important at UD. Esp 17 we are asking them to support CPC or conditions vs. CAs who are being told to move away from this. However I do support the need for a technical body to increase the level of UD in city (value-added).

What support would be required?

- I would suggest that the framework will be more likely to be supported if a review process of the framework is identified and scheduled in conjunction with the policy change.
- City staff should be reminded the UDRP will be a strong voice to support good urban design. Their expert voice will help to counter cases of strong political will and/or NIMBY push back.
- This proposed process should be re-thought. To be effective, independent oversight/governance of the UDRP is required: it is not part of City administration.

What We Heard/What We Did

What support would be required?

- The CPC and UDRP members should be allowed to meet directly to finalize this. I would like to see motions by UDRP and CPC supporting the proposed 'framework' and 'protocol'.
- It's important to recognize the value of the early conceptual level meeting. Asking for too much will force designers to take their efforts too far, which will then make them more protective of their design decisions. A follow up in the DP process should be included to close the loop.
- Clear communication
- Support via process
- Not mandatory at the pre-application stage, m but have reference to UDRP as comment from pre-application that the project may need to go through the peer review as part of the P.D. Application.
- Support: Reduce scope of reviews until we demonstrate resources are adequate to review all the appropriate files/____/applications.
- Restrict scope to applications that would go to CPC - hold balance until this process is stabilized and working well.
- Look at Seattle exercise.

Verbatim Feedback May 3, 2017 Stakeholder Workshop 3

The Urban Design Team presented the changes that would occur as a result of earlier Urban Design Review Panel comment at the pre-application stake and the implementation considerations. Information presented was in response to "What We Heard" from stakeholders in Workshops 1 & 2. Stakeholders were able to ask questions and the UD team and working group members responded. A summary of that conversation is below. (19 Attendees)

- Bulleted items indicate response given to question/comment

What We Heard: Desire for early design conversations

What We Did: Expand Panel mandate to enable early design conversations on key sites/projects city-wide

Does CPC know that the applicant was declined to have early UDRP review?

- This information becomes part of the design story. Comments from UDRP are appended, unedited, to the CPC report.

How does resolution to conflicting opinion occur when CPC does not have UDRP comments submitted? Must the applicant address those UDRP comments.

- UDRP review is not mandatory at the pre-app stage. UDRP comments at any stage are non-binding, expert opinion providing recommendations to the applicant. UDRP comments are appended, unedited to the CPC report.
- CPC can ask applicant to go back and make the recommended UDRP changes, or CPC can refuse the application.
- UDRP comments are reviewed by CPC
- There is a need for clarity on when a file was reviewed by UDRP, what was reviewed and when.

Will design narrative be required on all files or just those going to CPC? Need to describe the 2 paths. If this was just about CPC this process would not be a concerning re: timing.

- Applications must fit within the CPAG process. Once a file goes to CPC the timeline may change depending on approval, or not.

What We Heard/What We Did

What We Heard: Clearly define UDRP circulation triggers

What We Did: UDRP circulation triggers identify candidate application types and locations. Specific projects referred to UDRP based on impact on public realm.

What percentage of files will go to UDRP?

- Number of files will increase to 40-50 per year.

Need a clear understanding of file types that will go to UDRP?

- Not all files will go to UDRP. Urban Design will select those that warrant it.

What if the applicant wants to go to UDRP and Urban Design says no?

- Urban Design will determine if an application should go to UDRP.
- Urban Design can and does give urban design advice to applicants.

I do not understand the push for more files to go to UDRP?

- It is not for all files. The purpose is to ensure that we use this resource effectively.

How many staff are a part of CWUD? Do you have the capacity to do this expanded work?

- 6 people in CWUD. Yes, the internal team have been working with expanded review for a year.

Outline Plans and UDRP review – if an outline plan contains gateway access do they go to UDRP?

- Currently outline plans are not part of UDRP review.

Don't believe UDRP would affect outline plan timelines. Some have benefited from early review.

- Outline plans do receive internal urban design review.

Public projects – DL – should have review. What public projects get reviewed, is it only Capital Projects? Phrasing in the Protocol needs to be more specific.

- Projects with significant urban design components
- Triggers in ToR or Protocol. Protocol is an internal administrative process. Outline plans will be phased in and will not go back to Council for approval. List makes it feel as if the majority of DP's will be heading to CPC.
- This will be determined based on the capacity of UDRP.

What We Heard: Concern that Panel size and expertise is appropriate for application types and volume

What We Did: Panel size increased to accommodate additional file volume, to ensure quorum is met, and to provide broad range of expertise

Could you bring in other members with specific expertise to sit on UDRP as needed?

- Possible, this is a bigger conversation. Currently members have 6 year maximum term. Could consider bringing back previous members.

Do you feel UDRP membership could handle outline plans when they come?

- Current Panel members have the expertise – could bring in others if needed.

What type of skill set do Panel members have? They need to understand the servicing side of outline

What We Heard/What We Did

plans.

Continued

- Role of the Panel is not to provide technical expertise, comments are urban design specific. UDRP role is to provide a critique. Outline plans could benefit from urban design comment early. Current outline plans that don't have urban design comment early cannot be fixed once they come to CPC.

Is it realistic to increase quorum and membership of UDRP – is this possible given past practice?

- Level of commitment needs to be enforced. Clear expectations.

Does ToR for UDRP include number of hours required? Consider adding this to the ToR.

Meetings need to be in calendar and not cancelled at last minute. Need a regular schedule.

- Currently UDRP meet every 2 weeks and meetings are cancelled if there are no reviews. Urban Design is the gatekeeper determining who goes to UDRP. Urban Design sends application a week in advance. If there are no reviews the meeting is cancelled.

Will there be an expanded CARL list at pre-app?

- Not expanding CARL. Pre-app meeting without UDRP will follow-up with applicant if more details required (suggested requirement). UDRP is voluntary at pre-app stage
- Specific list of requirements for UDRP at DP stage.

Want to ensure sure UDRP can make meaningful comment – make requirements clear.

- It is not the intent to make the review onerous.

What we heard: Concern with collaborative vs independent relationship of UDRP and CWUD

What we did: UDRP purpose (unchanged)

- Provide professional, independent design advice as an expert, third-party, peer review group relationship of UDRP and CWUD established to:
- Make best use of design expertise
- Provide opportunities for discussion
- Formalize CWUD role in representing urban design matters at CPC

UDRP could also provide voice on policy

- This is included in Protocol but does not happen related to specific applications at CPC. Need to consider what forum to use; Round table, position paper, etc.

Real role for UDRP comment on policy i.e. Developed Areas Guide Book.

Helpful for CPC to have more 3rd party review.

Difficult to be outside the bounds of Policy at CPC.

- ToR includes this reference (shared objective)

CPC will object if it affects operating costs. This could be a forum for discussion.

Policy discussions are important. If guidelines are followed design should be complete.

What We Heard/What We Did

What we heard: Need for clearly reported, transparent design discussions

UDRF comments (unchanged)

- Unedited comments attached to DTR and CPC report as Appendix, including (in CPC report) applicant's response

What we did: Establish consistent reporting of *design narrative* to describe:

- Urban design related negotiations within the review process
- If/when UDRP was consulted
- When CWUD was consulted
- How UDRP/CWUD consultation impacted the result

Would be nice to know who from UDRP commented on a review and have that information included as part of the CPC submission.

Does CPC see the UDRP submission?

- Version would be different as changes made

There is a time-lag from panel to CPC and the applicant rebuttal at CPC. CPC want to hear directly from the panel – Urban Design now in the middle.

- CPC sees everything – File Manager report doesn't necessarily include their discussions with applicant.

Would like to see Panel recommendation in its entirety

- It is the responsibility of the File Manager to show the progression.

Final recommendation from UDRP is most important at CPC

- Conflicts between UDRP and applicant need to be part of the report to CPC.

Final drawings going to CPC need to be submitted to UDRP from File Manager with comments. To be accurate when it goes to CPC.

CPC needs to see the benefit of the UDRP review.

- UDRP has a new template that indicates; support, support with comment, do not support. Urban Design meets with the applicant to find a resolution.

More robust report will be enough, 3rd review should not be necessary.

What We Heard/What We Did

What we heard: Need a mechanism which allows UDRP to critically comment without impacting timelines and application stream.

What we did: City Wide Urban Design will work with CPAG to ensure clarity of recommendations

- Where comments are not aligned, a clear explanation for the resulting recommendation will be provided in all reporting.
- Provide a forum/review mechanism for UDRP to comment on policy concerns outside of specific application reviews.

UDRP needs to be before DTR1 – based on best practice in other cities.

Is there an opportunity for 3rd UDRP?

- It is possible

This is an evolving process, to be reviewed.

- Currently review is every 2 years

Poor design should be delayed.

On flow chart should have an arrow out of endorse – direct to DTR

City needs to say No to bad design.