

# Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-0263 / LOC2022-0042  
heard at Calgary Planning Commission  
Meeting 2023 March 23



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p><b>Commissioner Tiedemann</b></p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This application seeks to redesignate the parcel from S-FUD to M-CG. This application has support from the surrounding neighbours and there is a large, existing M-CG parcel, with a completed townhome development immediately to the north. This is a phenomenal opportunity to densify a significantly underutilized parcel of land in one of Calgary's established communities. The applicant made a similar application just over 2 years ago and when the file went to council, the area councillor at the time asked that that land use approval be tied to a concurrent DP. I believe that this application should be approved on its own merits and should NOT be required to be tied to a concurrent DP. Even if this specific applicant decided not to complete the development, the stock M-CG district contains a sufficient number of rules and restrictions to ensure that a contextually sensitive development would be executed by any future developer.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Commissioner Hawryluk</b></p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This application to M-CGd30 would allow 37 homes to be built on 1.24 hectares (it would be 38 if the Land Use Bylaw rounded up for density and affordability). Regardless of whether the final form would be more like the M-CGd30 district to the north or the R-C2 district to the south, this is appropriate in this location. Based on satellite images, it looks like a private outdoor pool would be lost so more people can live in the established area of Calgary. I consider that a worthwhile trade.</li> </ul> <p>Council approved a similar application at this location with a requirement for a concurrent Development Permit. Since then, it appears that the applicant has worked hard to talk to neighbours and resolve concerns while using a set Land Use District instead of a Direct Control District. Though the applicant has taken the risk of not also applying for a concurrent Development Permit, I think it would be unnecessary to require a concurrent Development Permit for an application of this scale.</p>