

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2022-0421 / LOC2021-0092
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2022 April 07



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Tiedemann</p>	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While I voted “no” on this file at CPC, it was only because I did not believe the density modifier should have been included on the M-C2 designation. Given existing development surrounding the site and the location directly on 12th Ave NW, the base M-C2 designation is completely reasonable. During debate, I put forward a motion to remove the density modifier as I believe it limits the future development potential of the site. Commissioners who did not support my motion primarily did so because the density modifier had been agreed to between the community association and the owner. This was done to provide the community some certainty in terms of unit count on the site (i.e. cap the unit count where it is today). While I do understand that rationale, and that the owner and CA negotiated in good faith, the density modifier only impacts unit count and has no impact on overall building size or contextual response. The base M-C2 district defines the allowable height, setbacks and FAR. These metrics do not change at all with the inclusion of a density modifier. As a basic example (numbers are not reflective of the actual site in question), if the FAR on the site allowed for 10,000SF of buildable area, a builder may choose to develop 20, 500SF units. If a density modifier was applied to the theoretical site that only allowed for 10 units, the developer could build <u>a building that is the exact same size</u>, it would just have to contain 10, 1000SF units instead. So in this context, we are doing nothing to limit building size or contextual response, we are just restricting the flexibility of the future development plans. For this reason, adding the density modifier to the land use designation on this site makes absolutely no sense. (It should be noted that the current owner plans to operate the building as-is for the foreseeable future). With this in mind, my recommendations for council are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) A motion should be brought forward to amend administration’s recommendation, remove the density modifier and approve an unmodified M-C2 land use change on the parcel. (b) If no councilor is interested in bringing the motion above forward, I recommend that council approve the

	application with the existing density modifier as this is the second best outcome for the site.
Commissioner Pollen	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I understand that the applicant had originally asked for a stock MC-2 district with no modifier and only added the modifier when there was opposition from the community. <p>I voiced my disappointment over a density modifier added during the process. I felt it was unfortunate and a missed opportunity to future-ready the site.</p> <p>With that said, I ultimately decided to vote against the amendment as the applicant willingly added the modifier in good faith after the engagement process, and the file manager did not seem to object to this. I felt that we should respect that relationship.</p> <p>If City Council chooses to re-introduce a removal of the density modifier at the Public hearing because they felt it was in the best interest of the City overall, this would provide direction to the administration to be considering the future readiness when reviewing files to reduce red-tape and costs, I would be in full support of that recommendation.</p>