

# Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2022-0966 / LOC2018-0250  
heard at Calgary Planning Commission  
Meeting 2022 September 01



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p><b>Commissioner Tiedemann</b></p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While this application will allow for a taller, more dense building than we have previously seen along this side of 17<sup>th</sup> Ave, the specific details provided in the DC district ensure that the majority of the mass and height are placed in a thoughtful and sensitive way on the site. The DC district will ensure the best possible outcome for this site once the project moves into the DP design stage. This application represents an exciting re-development on a significantly underutilized parcel along one of Calgary's most vibrant streets. While the CA did bring up some strong points regarding the value of the density bonusing and community amenity contribution on this site, I believe this is a larger issue that should be discussed at broader level, rather than at a project specific level.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Hawryluk</b></p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cliff Bungalow-Mission Community Association (CBMCA) wrote three letters about this application. It is clear that this is a significant project in the area of their community west of 4th St SW and that there are concerns. I hope that by the time this goes to Council, the Community Association has clarified their major concerns.</li> </ul> <p>As I understand it, some of the topics that CBMCA discusses should be dealt with at a higher policy level than this application. The City should probably review bonus density formulae across the city. Community amenities associated with bonus density should be included in the Implementation Options of a Local Area Plan. They make good points about the loss of naturally occurring affordable housing, about which I hope the Housing and Affordability Task Force will make meaningful recommendations. I'm sure that urbanists on Twitter would respond to their comments about vacant lots with, "A land value tax would solve this."</p> <p>I was a little surprised that there wasn't a parking relaxation, but the applicant said marketability was more important than parking concerns.</p> <p>On the whole, this application does the following well:</p>

	<p>It is along a corridor, consistent with Municipal Development Plan direction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Urban Forestry has been involved with this application from the beginning to ensure the protection of the 5A Street SW Boulevards;</li><li>○ It gives the College Apartments to the south more space with a 4 meter setback; and</li><li>○ The tower further is located to the south to try to keep the sidewalk less shaded and create a better gathering place along 17th Avenue.</li></ul>
--	--