

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-0412 / LOC2022-0220
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2023 April 20



| Member | Reasons for Decision or Comments |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Commissioner Tiedemann</p> | <p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application seeks to redesignate the parcel from R-CG to M-CG. The parcel is mid-block, close to Edmonton Trail and in proximity to schools and parks. This application is 100% in compliance with the NHLAP as it falls under the “Neighbourhood Local” form and “Limited Scale” height areas of the NHLAP map. These areas are specifically identified for developments with 3 or more units and heights up to a maximum of 3 storeys. Given the location and compliance with the NHLAP, this site is a perfect candidate for this type of minor increase in intensity. <p>I am significantly concerned about the letter submitted by the Tuxedo Park Community Association dated April 5, 2023 for this file. The NHLAP is relatively new and all CA’s in the area were invited to participate in the process. While it is a technical planning document, I would expect the basic premises of the NHLAP would still be fresh in most people’s minds, especially those who were actively engaged. The letter from the Tuxedo Park CA brings up 5 points of contention, all of which are <u>factually incorrect</u> and represents a <u>fundamental misunderstanding of the most basic principles</u> enshrined in the NHLAP. Their points of contention along with corrections are included below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> “We feel it is important to restrict the R-CG and M-CG designation to the blocks identified for Neighbourhood Connector in the LAP.” – This is actually not the function of the Neighbourhood Connector areas. “Neighbourhood Local” is specifically designated for residential uses and this application is for residential uses with a max height of 3 storeys. This application is completely compliant with the restrictions set out in the NHLAP. “The LAP already identifies this space as a future mobility corridor, increased density will impact the viability of this plan.” – Mobility corridors and other public infrastructure are most effective when they are served by larger numbers of citizens. Notwithstanding the fact that this application represents an incredibly minor density increase, additional |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>people in the vicinity actually makes the mobility corridor MORE viable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. “We do not feel that adding high density housing at this location is appropriate without improved bicycle infrastructure on that street.” – I would agree that this location would benefit from additional cycling infrastructure, but to my point above, additional citizens living in the area increase the viability of this type of infrastructure. Additionally, the M-CG land use does not allow for high density housing as indicated by the CA. M-CG is by definition a mid density land use which conforms to both the Neighbourhood Local and Limited Scale zones in the NHLAP. These two zones represent both the lowest intensity and height in the entire plan area. 4. “The overall height permitted for M-CG is not contextual” – Again, the M-CG land use is by definition a contextual zoning (that is what the C stands for....) which conforms to both the Neighbourhood Local and Limited Scale zones in the NHLAP. These two zones represent both the lowest intensity and height in the entire plan area. The maximum height permitted in M-CG is 12.0 m while the maximum height permitted in R-C1 is 10.0 m. The requested M-CG land use at this location is incredibly sensitive from a contextual perspective. 5. “The M-CG zoning does not align in general with the Local Area Plan (LAP) as this site is within the “Neighbourhood Local” zone.” – This phrase represents a complete misunderstanding of the most basic principles in the NHLAP document. The “Neighbourhood Local” zone is applied primarily to residential areas in the NHLAP. The NHLAP states: “Building forms that contain 3 or more residential units should be supported in the following areas: i. within transit station areas, ii. Near or adjacent to an identified Main Street or Activity Center, iii. On higher activity streets, iv. Where the parcel has a lane and parking can be accommodated on site.” The application before us meets all of the listed criteria and complies 100% with the policies outlined in the NHLAP. |
| <p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p> | <p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This application from R-C2 to M-CGd50 aligns with the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan’s vision for the Neighbourhood Local Urban Form and Limited Building Scale. |