

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2022-0348 / LOC2021-0129
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2022 March 24



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Tiedemann</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application is changing a property already zoned M-CG to a DC based on M-CG to allow for a slight increase in density and creative parking solutions. The requirements related to height, chamfers and setbacks have been maintained from the stock M-CG district. This type of development will be able to accommodate more affordable housing typologies in a highly desirable established area community where many Calgarians are unable to afford a typical single family home residence. The additional tightening of the FAR cap in the DC land use from 1.5 to 1.4 (as proposed by commissioner Palmiere and approved by CPC) provides further certainty to the community and the City in term of the maximum density that can be delivered on the site.
<p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As I see it, this application is primarily about density. The height and setbacks are all the same as the current Land Use District. The difference is the number of units within the Direct Control. <p>When I initially looked at the location map (page 2 of CPC Attachment 1), I wondered if this application would lead to more Direct Control applications to the south in the R-C2 area. Most of the lots to the south side of this lane have already been redeveloped as semi-detached homes. It seems unlikely that they will redevelop anytime soon. This application can be seen as a transition between the M-C1 to the west and the M-CG to the north and east of this site. In that context, this application's density seems appropriate.</p> <p>Commissioner Palmiere's amendment to bring the Floor Area Ratio from 1.5 to 1.3 was smart. The associated Development Permit proposes a Floor Area Ratio of 1.19. This amendment would allow the proposed Development Permit without giving the developer an extra ~350m² of floor area (if I remember correctly) that isn't required.</p> <p>Thinking of the smaller units, I asked about the timing of the 34th Ave cycle track. I was told that this building will likely be</p>

completed one year before the 34th Ave cycle track is completed. Historically, private investment has preceded public investment. Only in the last century has that pattern reversed, with detrimental effects on municipal finances. Applications like this support funding the 34th Ave cycle track.

This Direct Control does not require parking for the smaller units. Soon after this meeting, I was listening to the UCLA Housing Voice podcast. Because people choose where they live, there is a chicken-egg question about the relationship between housing and transportation choice. Demand for subsidized housing in San Francisco is so immense that Adam Millard-Ball, Jeremy West, Nazanin Rezaei, and Garima Desai were able to use San Francisco's affordable housing lottery as a natural experiment. People who need affordable housing in San Francisco have about a 1% chance of being selected for an affordable house, so they rarely turn down an offer hoping to be selected a second time for a different building. As a result, people are essentially assigned at random to different buildings in different parts of the city. The researchers sent a survey to residents about how the built environment shaped their behaviour. Nearly 30% of residents completed the survey. According to the authors, the survey results show that "neighbourhood attributes and a building's parking supply ... significantly affect transportation mode choices. Most notably, we show that essentially random variation in on-site parking availability greatly changes households' car ownership decisions and driving frequency, with substitution away from public transport. In contrast, we find that parking availability does not affect employment or job mobility. Overall, the evidence from our study robustly supports that local features of the built environment are important determinants of transportation behaviour." To put that more directly, building more parking causes people to own more cars, drive more, and park more. Building more parking also discourages people from taking transit and walking.

Podcast: <https://www.lewis.ucla.edu/2022/03/16/ep-22-how-housing-shapes-transportation-choices-with-adam-millard-ball/>
Journal article: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0042098021995139>
Magazine article: <https://transfersmagazine.org/magazine-article/issue-8/what-do-residential-lotteries-show-us-about-transportation-choices/>