

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-0225 / LOC2022-0213
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2023 March 23



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
Commissioner Tiedemann	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application seeks to redesignate a single parcel from R-C2 to R-CG on a corner lot, 2 blocks from Edmonton Trail and in proximity to a number of large parks. This represents the second lowest density increase possible and is the bare minimum we should be looking to approve if we truly want to achieve the 50/50 growth goal outlined in the MDP. R-CG is classified as a low-density residential district in the <u>same</u> category as R-C1 and R-C2. These types of land use redesignations (R-C1 and R-C2 to R-CG) allow for <u>sensitive</u>, <u>contextual</u>, and extremely <u>minor</u> density increases. Land use designations on individual parcels are not static, just as our City is not static. Growth and change are constants as our City and communities evolve. The majority of Calgary was agricultural land at one point in the past and the evolution within our City cannot and should not be frozen at any particular moment in time. The minor increase in intensity permitted by the R-CG redesignations allows for more housing units on the same amount of land which means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More people living in our communities, as individual household sizes continue to shrink. More families and children to make use of existing community amenities and schools. A larger, stronger tax base in our established communities. More diverse and affordable housing options. (In contrast to having only detached single family homes as the primary housing option) <p>These types of applications are easy to support and represent the absolute minimum we should be doing in terms of adding sensitive, contextual density to our established communities.</p>
Commissioner Hawryluk	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is one of the first applications within one of the North Hill Communities' Heritage Guideline Areas (specifically, Regal Terrace). In response to concerns about Development Permit-level questions in the Heritage Guideline Areas, the North Hill Communities Heritage Guideline Implementation Guide gives clear direction about the site and landscape design; roofs and massing; front facades; windows, materials and details. The

	<p>Implementation Guide has enough teeth to Development Permit-level questions.</p> <p>The North Hill Communities Plan (4.2.g) notes that “The word ‘should’ is explicitly used to further clarify the directional nature of the statement. Policies that use active tense or ‘should’ are to be applied in all situations, unless it can be clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of The City that the policy is not reasonable, practical or feasible in a given situation.” From what I can see, all of the ‘should’ statements in the Heritage Guideline Implementation Guide are reasonable, practical and feasible in this location, so the Implementation Guide ought to be followed completely. This make me comfortable that if an applicant was to propose a Development Permit application that flies in the face of the Guide, Administration would refuse the Development Permit application.</p> <p>Due to lower construction costs and more flexible forms, rowhouses and other missing middle housing forms are more effective at producing larger three- and four-bedroom homes than taller buildings. Allowing smaller units, like secondary suites, allows smaller households to live in established areas too.</p>
--	---