Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2023-1037 / LOC2023-0149 heard at Calgary Planning Commission Meeting 2023 October 19



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
Commissioner Tiedemann	 Reasons for Approval Application to redesignate from MU-2f3.0h16 to MU-2f4.0h23 and MU-1f3.5h23. This site is ideally located directly on the 34th Ave main street that is currently undergoing significant streetscape upgrades. Adding additional density to this site will help ensure the city sees additional development along main street corridors where city investments are being made. Because 34th ave is the main commercial frontage, it makes sense to have M-U2 (commercial required) on the north side of the street and transition to M-U1 (commercial optional) as we move south, away from 34th. This application does bring up an ongoing concern I have regarding city led redesignations along mainstreet corridors. While the mainstreet team attempted to redesignate the site to a flexible use and landed on M-U2, the reality is that from a market feasibility perspective, commercial uses are simply not supportable all the way down 19th Street. This means that the community had to go through the engagement process for the city led rezoning, only to have to go through it all over again when a private developer came in and needed to change the land use to something more viable. LAPs and the mainstreets team should set the framework for what could be permitted in the future, but direct land use amendments should be left in the hands of active land owners. Overall I was happy to support this application and I hope it leads the re-development of a significantly underused site.
Commissioner Hawryluk	 Reasons for Approval Currently, all of this property is required to have Mixed Use – Active Frontage (MU-2). This application would allow more flexibility in the southern part of the lot under the Mixed Use – General (MU-1). It would also increase the Floor Area Ratio from 3.0 to 4.0 and the height from 16m to 23m. This would allow a larger and taller building to be built. The Planning Commission had some interesting discussion about where to separate the MU-1 and MU-2 Land Use Districts. Forcing the MU-2 District too far south could produce space where businesses might not be able to survive. Administration suggested that that there are already commercial uses farther south than what is proposed and that

the dividing line aligns with the lane to the west. The applicant is comfortable with the current proposal, so there was no reason to revise the dividing line.
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·