

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-0399 / LOC2020-0148
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2023 May 04



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Tiedemann</p>	<p>Reasons for the Refusal Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed outline plan (and associated land use application) looks like any typical, bland, uninspired new community we would have seen designed in Calgary in the early late 1980's or early 1990's. The R-Gm land use is 100% restricted to the main thoroughfare road while the R-G takes all the prime locations with no intermingling of higher or mid density product. City of Calgary data indicates that of all the land zoned R-G in newer communities, 99% ends up being developed as single detached or semi-detached product with only 1% being built out as row towns. The alignment of the R-Gm lots in this plan represents a clear segregation of end users and housing typologies. The single family owners live in one area, the multi family owners live along the busy streets, and there is no mingling proposed. This represents bad community planning. The proposed "community node" has a tokenistic amount of commercial and a multifamily site that is only there because it is required to hit the community density targets. While admin and the applicant did indicate that this plan meets the bare minimum for density and intensity targets, this is largely due to the fact that the R-G district technically allows for row townhome product, however the data shows us that in reality, the end result is typically just single family homes and some semi-detached. I have no confidence that at build out, this plan would actually meet the required density and intensity targets. <p>Applications in the established area are constantly asked to provide outcomes over and above the identified minimums. Council, admin and CPC all push applicants to deliver the best possible outcomes for redevelopment projects, however this same standard is not applied to new, greenfield communities. If we are going to demand better projects, well above the minimum requirements, in our established areas (as we should!), then we should be demanding the same in our new growth areas.</p> <p>This OLP represents the absolute bottom of the barrel in terms of the bare minimum required from applicants and <u>it is not good enough</u>. As a City, we should expect to see more</p>

	<p>creative plans for our greenfield communities, and I know it can be done based on the success we have seen in communities such as Seton and Alpine Park. This plan looks like the applicant put their expected returns into a spreadsheet and then just put forward the most simple, uncreative way to achieve those returns. This is community design by Microsoft Excel and again, it is not good enough. Council, admin and CPC are all trying our best to build a great city and this application does nothing to contribute to that goal.</p> <p>It is my strong recommendation that council vote to <u>file and abandon the land use application related to the outline plan that CPC refused</u>. The applicant should be asked to go back to the drawing board and present a community plan reflective of modern planning principles and that will help to make Calgary a better place to live in.</p>
<p>Commissioner Weber</p>	<p>Reasons for the Refusal Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 4, 2023 Calgary Planning Commission reviewed the Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan Application LOC 2020-0148. The subject lands are located within the community of Residual Sub-Area 02L and encompass an area of 67.31 hectares within the confines of the Glacier Ridge Area Structure Plan. <p>The application was reviewed in the context of the applicable statutory documents including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (the "SSRP"), - the Municipal Development Plan (the "MDP"), - the Rocky View County/City of Calgary Intermunicipal Plan (the "IDP"), and - the Glacier Ridge Area Structure Plan (the "ASP"). <p>MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN</p> <p>Upon review, the application was found to not be compliant with the MDP. Specifically, the following policies were not met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1.1 Sustainability Principals 2.2.1 Vibrant and Transit Supportive Mixed-Use Activity Centres - Policies; a & b 2.2.4 Complete Communities - Policies; a & b 2.3.1 Housing diversity and choice - Policy; a 2.3.4 Parks, Open Space, and Outdoor Recreation - Policies; b, d,e, i, j, l, m, o, r, & t 2.4.1 Creating a Beautiful City - Policies; b, c, & e 2.4.3 Enhancing the Public Realm - Policies; a, b, c, & f 2.5.1 Transportation Choice - Objective 2.6.1 Natural Infrastructure - Policy; a 2.6.2 Land - Policies; f & h

- 3.3.1 General Policies for Activity Centres - Policies; b, h, l, j, n, & s
- 3.3.4 Neighbourhood Activity Centres - Policy; b
- 3.6.2 Future Greenfield Area - Policies; d, h, & n

GLACIER RIDGE AREA STRUCTURE PLAN

Upon review, the application was found to not be compliant with the ASP. Specifically, the following items were not in conformance:

Core Idea #4

"Walkable Activity Centres and corridors stitch together the communities and provide pathway connections into the Symons Valley, the heart of the Plan Area."

Vision

The Plan Area will benefit from its connections to Symons Valley to create a shared natural focal point for four new communities.

All Six Guiding Principles

- 1 Community Focus
- 2 Design with Nature
- 3 Movement
- 4 Neighbourhood Focal Points
- 5 Landscape Ecology
- 6 Interface

Maps & Tables

Map 3: Land Use Concept – Location of Neighbourhood Activity Centre

Table 1: Land Use Concept Elements; Neighbourhood Activity Centre

Policies

- 3.3 Neighbourhood Activity Centres – Policies; 1, 2, & 9
- 3.17 Interfaces within and Adjacent to the plan Area – Policy; 1
- 3.18 Interface with Natural Areas – Policies; 1&2
- 7.1 Interpretation – Policy; 1

PRIMARY ITEMS OF NON-COMPLIANCE

There are three primary characteristics of the outline plan and land use amendment that result in the applications not being in conformance with the MDP and the ASP.

1. Multimodal Linkages & Permeability

The Outline Plan does not satisfy the requirements in either policy document for the design of a complete community that integrates with the adjacent natural areas nor provide logical and safe connections to the West Nose Creek Valley.

For example on the Outline Plan there are three (3.0) metre wide walkways indicated in various locations on the plan, including:

between Road J and Road M,
between Road T and Road S,
and between the two crescents of Road W.

These pedestrian linkages by their very nature of being 3.0 metres (10 feet) wide do not enhance the public realm. They are narrow and run the full depth of the adjacent back-to-back residential lots. The length of these pathways are over 61 metre (200 feet) long with the only exit being at either end. This is roughly half the length of the Peace Bridge, but in a very different context with 2 metre (6 feet) high residential fences on each side. To give a different perspective, the Chinook underpass that was recently closed under Macleod north of Glenmore was 42 metres (140') long.

The pedestrian linkages in the plan do not give any consideration to public safety nor do they enhance the public realm by providing for any placemaking such as tree plantings or meaningful landscaping.

Furthermore, the Outline plan has been designed with four separate quadrants that do not adequately relate to each other, nor the adjacent communities, and most certainly not to the West Nose Creek Valley, which is one of the core tenements of the ASP.

2. Relationship to Natural Features

The overarching intent, vision, and guiding principles of the ASP have been largely ignored in the design of the plan. The West Nose Creek Valley is intended to be the focus of development in the plan area. The design of the Outline Plan and Land Use has been arranged to all but turn the neighbourhood's back to its most important feature. The vast majority of the neighbourhood will have low density residential back yards and fences along the top of the coulee ridge. The ASP clearly articulates the requirement to embrace the natural landscape and incorporate it into the design of the neighbourhood. The existing design provides mere tokenism with a single "green pathway" to a look out point. While it is culturally significant to preserve the existing erratics, they

should be central to this plan, not located hidden amongst rear yard fences. This requirement is clearly articulated in the ASP.

3. Location of the Neighbourhood Activity Centre (the "NAC")

The location of the NAC was moved from its current location on Map 3 of the ASP and an amendment to the plan is required. The asterisk shown on Map 3 is clearly located at the southwest corner of Panorama Road and what is indicated as Road V on the Outline Plan. On the Outline Plan the NAC has been shown on both sides of Road Q on the Outline Plan. This is a material change to the ASP and requires an amendment. This is reinforced by the fact that the intersection of Road Q and Road V is shown on Map 3 of the Outline Plan. Policy 7.1.1.a states:

"Unless otherwise specified in this ASP, the boundaries or locations of any symbols or areas shown on a map are approximate only, not absolute, and will be interpreted as such. They are not intended to define exact locations except where they coincide with clearly recognizable physical features or fixed boundaries such as property lines or road or utility rights-of-way."

All of the aforementioned roads are clearly indicated on Map 3 of the ASP and therefore moving the NAC asterisk to the intersection would be clearly recognizable on Map 3.

Furthermore, Policy 3.3.9. states:

Neighbourhoods C4 and 07: These two NA Cs may be adjusted to locate along Panorama Rd NW to create a neighbourhood corridor development without requiring an amendment to the ASP.

The subject NAC is located in Neighbourhood C4 and the existing asterisk is shown adjacent to Road V and Panorama Road. This indicates that a subtle shift east to be located directly on Panorama Road would be considered a nominal change. The change shown on the Outline Plan is significantly greater and further reinforces the language of Policy 7.1.1.a.

CONCLUSION

For the above primary reasons, I supported the recommendation of Calgary Planning Commission to refuse the proposed Land Use Application and reject the proposed Outline Plan. The design is not technically compliant with many important principals and policies of both the MDP and ASP.

Commissioner Hawryluk	<p>Reasons for the Refusal Recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I apologize if this it too direct, but please do not approve this Land Use Amendment. <p>This area's Outline Plan was weighed in the balance and found wanting. Other Commissioners have provided complete lists of ways in which the Outline Plan falls short of the Area Structure Plan's requirements. The Land Use Districts cannot function and buildings cannot be built without an Outline Plan's block patterns, hierarchy of roadways, and distribution of open space in a new area. If Council approves this Land Use Amendment, it will simply add a step (replacing the currently proposed Land Use Districts) in the future when a Land Use Amendment application comes to Council with an Outline Plan that aligns with the Area Structure Plan.</p>
----------------------------------	--