

## Record of Specific Stakeholder Comments

### Group 1 – Administration

Specific observations and suggestions for improvement of the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill included:

- clarification of some of the terminology used (i.e. primary transit stop, collector or higher standard roadway);
- removal of specific districts so that the criteria can be applied to any multi-residential district;
- consideration of adding R-CG (Residential – Grade Oriented Infill District) as a district in which the location criteria could be applied;
- creation of a handbook to better explain the rationale behind the criteria;
- creation of a brochure to help illustrate the concepts;
- clarification of the intent of the location criteria – are they a list or a policy framework;
- making them more accessible/available;
- consideration of the location criteria being included in initial planning staff training; and
- addition of criteria to address parking issues and potential congestion (current criteria focus on transit use).

### Group 2 – Council Members

Observations and suggestions by the Councillors for improvement of the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill included expanding the scope of the criteria to add in such items as:

- addressing access to off-street parking;
- lane access;
- changes or improvements to the public realm in exchange for density bonusing;
- encouraging the remediation of contaminated sites;
- shadowing impact assessments;
- addressing the design of roofs and rooflines;
- clearer communication regarding how community feedback to a proposal is considered;
- consideration of sight-lines and privacy;
- reviewing potentials for parking and traffic congestion;
- providing more context and a narrative along the lines of Edmonton's infill criteria to make the criteria more user-friendly for community associations and the public;
- the inclusion of visuals to assist in demonstrating or showcasing better development potentials for the site;
- consideration of expanding the number of districts to which the criteria apply or even eliminating the mention of districts at all in the criteria;
- clarification that the location criteria are general items for consideration when evaluating an application and there is no set number that must be achieved by an applicant to gain The City's support; and
- encouraging land use redesignations and development permit applications for an inner city site to proceed concurrently through the planning approval process.

### Group 3 – Calgary Planning Commission

Feedback revealed the following:

- concern was expressed that the location criteria might discourage planners from using their discretion when considering a land use amendment application and would eventually stop them from evaluating a proposal intently ie. they would simply tick the box of each criteria addressed by the proposal;

## Record of Specific Stakeholder Comments

- the criteria might become rules rather than a guideline;
- community associations and the public might oppose an application based on how many of the criteria it did or did not meet.

### Group 4 – Community Associations

In its reply, the FCC advised:

- that the location criteria are viewed as tool to assist community associations in understanding the process of how some inner city multi-residential projects are evaluated as well as anticipate changes;
- the criteria “could make outcomes more predictable by providing additional rationale for decisions”;
- the criteria help to provide a link between the land use bylaw and the MDP, though “a more explicit link to specific MDP/CTP policies that each condition supports would be helpful”;
- the criteria are useful as long as “it is clear that these are preferred conditions and not rules”; and
- visual examples/illustrations would be useful as an indicator of the “perfect” site for multi-residential re-designation.

### Group 5 – Development Industry (UDI and CHBA)

Feedback received from the UDI had the following observations:

- among their reviewers, there was not much experience so far in the use of the location criteria that would yield meaningful data even though some had undertaken land use applications in the districts effected by the criteria;
- it was unclear to what extent the criteria were being used, if at all;
- most of the re-designation applications would [intrinsically] exhibit the majority of the criteria;
- would recommend approved contextual multi-family districts anywhere without restriction in developed areas;
- the location criteria could be considered as a starting base for M-C1 and higher densities;
- M-CG should be considered in the same light as R-CG, where an incremental approach to reliance on the criteria “increases proportional to density and/or parcel area”; and
- “applications need to continue to be evaluated on their own merit with unique circumstances considered

Feedback from the CHBA provided the following comments:

- “Additional clarity on planning rationale is always helpful.”
- “The guidelines themselves do little to reduce the time it takes for a land use amendment application to proceed.”
- “While the guidelines may improve general consistency in the way the land use amendments are evaluated certainty is elusive given other variables and the uniqueness of a site.”
- “[The] applicants in general have a solid grasp [of] the MDP objectives and work to achieve them. The barriers are often at the community level or at times the hesitancy of Council to implement change.”
- “While there may be some question as to whether or not the guidelines will impact future development in a meaningful way, they are a helpful tool and certainly not detrimental to redevelopment.”