



Changes to Land Use Bylaw

Presented by: Jason New, October 2022

CITY OF CALGARY
RECEIVED
 IN COUNCIL CHAMBER
 OCT 04 2022
 ITEM: 8.2.1 IP2022-0969
Distribution
 CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT

City Provided Information

The City indicates:

“ A minimum parking requirement of 0.375 stalls per unit and suite (**same as mixed-use districts**)”

The bylaw for Mixed Use is actually 0.85 (0.75 resident + 0.1 visitor) with eligible reductions (close to frequent transit, Class 1 bicycle stalls) to get to 0.425:

1350 The minimum number of motor vehicle parking stalls:

a) for each Dwelling Unit is:

i) 0.75 stalls per unit for resident parking; and

ii) 0.1 visitor parking stalls;

The new HGO has no requirement for reduction to close to transit, instead just assigning 0.375. For example, one could apply for land use outside of the 200/400/600 meters and if granted you would only need 0.375 stalls per unit. But if this same re-designation occurred for MU, MU would require 0.6375 for the parcel (assuming the bicycle reduction was there).

Incorrect City Provided Information

The City indicates as a reason to not do public consultation:

“Citizens would not have the technical expertise to contribute to the writing of land use districts; ”

This type of statement by administration is not only high handed, but false.

The Bowness Community Association has on its Planning Committee:

- Professional Architect (Chair of the committee)
- Realtor
- A paid person who is responsible for planning matters

The BCA planning committee reviews approximately 50 development proposals each year

Inaccurate City Provided Information

At IPC committee the City indicated it took approximately 5 minutes to walk 600 meters. 600 meters is the zone being proposed around LRTs

Although technically correct, in practicality it is not as no one can walk as the crow flies. In evaluating around North hill, the average time to walk 600 meters at randomly taken points, was 12min according to google maps

It also does not take into account the river.

For instance, Councilor Carra's development on New St in Inglewood is within 600M of the Zoo LRT, but it would take 32 minutes to get to the LRT

The Bylaw discriminates against certain areas

HGO is being promoted around transit areas but only in certain parts of the City as the proposed bylaw indicates it should be in a Local Area Plan or within 200,400,600 meters of different types of transit, This effectively means only older neighborhoods

- (d) should only be designated on **parcels** located within:
 - (i) an area that supports the development form in an approved Local Area Plan as part of the Neighbourhood Connector or Neighbourhood Flex Urban Form Categories; or
 - (ii) the Centre City or Inner City areas identified on the Urban Structure Map of the Calgary Municipal Development Plan and also within one or more of the following:
 - (A) 200 metres of a Main Street or Activity Centre identified on the Urban Structure Map of the Calgary Municipal Development Plan;
 - (B) 600 metres of an existing or capital-funded **LRT platform**;
 - (C) 400 metres of an existing or capital-funded **BRT station**; or
 - (D) 200 metres of **primary transit service**.

The Bylaw gives an advantage to RC-G/H-GO

By allowing RC-G/H-GO midblock to have less side and front setbacks and more lot coverage (up to 60%), a neighbor with RC1/2 cannot match his or her housing form to match, as RC1/2 is limited to 45%.

Why should the person next door get to build more, wider, deeper, higher? And with less parking per unit?

The premise of this new district is to reduce DC applications. Has anyone asked, will this new district increase land use re-designations, because now they will be promoted within 200,400,600 meters of transit?

Most importantly..

The City did not do public engagement. The only letters of support are from developers

No community associations, no members of the public were consulted

The City has a public engagement policy, how can the City administration decide not to do it, and then surprise everyone at committee that none was done?

Here are all of the people missed being consulted just for the BRT Criteria. It would be a larger area if I had time to draw circles for bus service as well



Requests to Council

Why does it matter? Isn't it just another land use and Council will still decide?

A: It matters, as administration will indicate the City policies and bylaws “support” the future requested land use changes whenever they are within the prescribed 200,400,600 meter zones, or in an LAP, as RCG is part of the “Part 5, Low Density Residential District”. There appears to be no current means within an LAP to exclude the new RCG from being midblock

Requests to council/committee

- Send back to committee for public consultation
- Have the HGO & RCG apply to the entire City where there is LRT, BRT, primary transit. And not just for those with LAPs, city centres
- Have the RCG/HGO land uses modified to be the same lot coverage, setbacks, when adjacent to RC1/2. MU already has rules around transitioning. RCG/HGO midblock should as well
- Change to use walking distance, not as the crow flies
- Revert back to the already defined “frequent bus service” instead of primary transit/BRT