

# Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-0026/LOC2022-0146  
heard at Calgary Planning Commission  
Meeting 2023 January 26



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<b>Commissioner Tiedemann</b>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This application is to redesignate a parcel from R-CG to H-GO. The parcel is on a corner lot, in close proximity to the red line and several neighbourhood parks. It is great to see community support for sensitive density additions in locations that truly make sense.</li> </ul>
<b>Commissioner Weber</b>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The subject land use application seeks to; amend the Banff Trail Area Redevelopment Plan, and redesignate a parcel in the neighbourhood of Banff Trail from Residential – Grade-Oriented Infill (R-CG) District to Housing – Grade Oriented (H-GO) District.</li> </ul> <p>There was discussion at Commission as to whether this proposed amendment to the Banff Trail ARP was required. It seemed odd to Commission that the existing R-CG is considered “Low Density Rowhouse” and H-GO is considered “Medium Density Low-Rise” as the two are very similar in overall density and form. The rationale is that it is a nuance of the category descriptions in the ARP which do not coordinate well with the current Land Use Bylaw. Similarly, the ARP needs to be amended to adjust the allowable height from 11 metres to 12 metres as H-GO is allowed that additional incremental increase in height over the existing R-CG on this parcel. Unfortunately these required amendments to the ARP make the application appear to be tantamount to spot zoning. I encourage administration and council to examine revising the entire Banff Trail ARP to accommodate the new H-GO land use to avoid future similar amendments and to provide guidance to future developers in the area on where the City feels H-GO is appropriate within the boundaries of the ARP.</p> <p>In addition, there was discussion at Commission if this application met all the criteria for H-GO given its unique lot configuration. Commission agreed that notwithstanding it being located more embedded into the community it does sit on a corner lot across from a small park. Therefore, the use does seem appropriate in this context.</p>

	<p>I support Administration’s recommendation for approval of this application. If redeveloped, this will add some missing middle housing and create diversity of housing in the Banff Trail neighbourhood.</p>
<b>Commissioner Hawryluk</b>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Administration is correct that “The subject site is located within 400 metres of the University C-Train Station and meets the criteria to be considered for the H-GO District.” (Attachment 1, Page 4).</li></ul> <p>From what I can tell, the following has happened with this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Council approved Land Use Amendments to R-CG in the area, including this site. This may have been when the Banff Trail ARP was amended in March 2016.</li><li>- The applicant intended to build a five-unit rowhouse but could not because Land Use Bylaw section 14.2.a rounds down to the next lowest unit (see Attachment 1, page 3).</li><li>- The applicant applied for a Direct Control District based on R-CG to build a five-unit rowhouse, which did not meet the test for a Direct Control District.</li><li>- The applicant has applied for H-GO to build a five-unit rowhouse. According to later conversations with the file manager, “The DP that was submitted with the original DC LOC did not change when it went to H-GO.”</li></ul> <p>If that timeline is correct, Land Use Bylaw section 14.2.a appears to have been an obstacle to redevelopment that is consistent with Council’s direction for this site. If the Land Use Bylaw aligned more consistently with the Municipal Development Plan by rounding unit densities that were equal to or above 0.5 units up to the nearest whole number, five houses could have been built with a Development Permit application instead of a Land Use Amendment application, which would have saved everyone time and energy.</p>