

### Record of Specific Stakeholder Comments

Record of Specific Stakeholder Comments collected for 2015 June 10 report to PUD	How the comment is addressed in the enhanced Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill
<b><u>Group 1 – Administration</u></b>	
Specific observations and suggestions for improvement of the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill included:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification of some of the terminology used (i.e. primary transit stop, collector or higher standard roadway);</li> </ul>	clarification has been provided for primary transit.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• removal of specific districts so that the criteria can be applied to any multi-residential district;</li> </ul>	reference to specific districts has been removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consideration of adding R-CG (Residential – Grade Oriented Infill District) as a district in which the location criteria could be applied;</li> </ul>	the Location Criteria state that they are also intended to guide land use and policy amendments to support ground-oriented development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creation of a handbook to better explain the rationale behind the criteria;</li> </ul>	more explanation of the rationale for each criterion has been provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creation of a brochure to help illustrate the concepts;</li> </ul>	illustrations have been provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification of the intent of the location criteria – are they a list or a policy framework;</li> </ul>	the Location Criteria is described in the preamble as a list of preferred conditions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• making them more accessible/available;</li> </ul>	this would be part of implementation and is not specifically addressed in this report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consideration of the location criteria being including in initial planning staff training; and</li> </ul>	part of implementation – this comment has been forwarded to the training group
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addition of criteria to address parking issues and potential congestion (current criteria focus on transit use).</li> </ul>	this comment is noted and will be considered with regard to guidelines, policy and regulatory tools
<b><u>Group 2 – Council Members</u></b>	
Observations and suggestions by the Councillors for improvement of the Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill included expanding the scope of the criteria to add in such items as:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addressing access to off-street parking;</li> </ul>	these comments are noted and will be considered with regard to guidelines, policy and regulatory tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lane access;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• changes or improvements to the public realm in exchange for density bonusing;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encouraging the remediation of contaminated sites;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• shadowing impact assessments;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• addressing the design of roofs and rooflines;</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clearer communication regarding how community feedback to a proposal is considered;</li> </ul>	comment noted – part of the application process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consideration of sight-lines and privacy;</li> <li>reviewing potentials for parking and traffic congestion;</li> </ul>	these comments are noted and will be considered with regard to guidelines, policy and regulatory tools
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>providing more context and a narrative along the lines of Edmonton's infill criteria to make the criteria more user-friendly for community associations and the public;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the inclusion of visuals to assist in demonstrating or showcasing better development potentials for the site;</li> </ul>	illustrations have been included
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consideration of expanding the number of districts to which the criteria apply or even eliminating the mention of districts at all in the criteria;</li> </ul>	reference to specific districts has been removed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarification that the location criteria are general items for consideration when evaluating an application and there is no set number that must be achieved by an applicant to gain The City's support; and</li> </ul>	the description of how to apply the Location Criteria has been clarified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>encouraging land use redesignations and development permit applications for an inner city site to proceed concurrently through the planning approval process.</li> </ul>	comment noted
<b>Group 3 – Calgary Planning Commission</b>	
Feedback revealed the following:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concern was expressed that the location criteria might discourage planners from using their discretion when considering a land use amendment application and would eventually stop them from evaluating a proposal intently ie. they would simply tick the box of each criteria addressed by the proposal;</li> </ul>	the description of how to apply the Location Criteria has been amended to more clearly state that planning discretion should take precedent over the criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the criteria might become rules rather than a guideline;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>community associations and the public might oppose an application based on how many of the criteria it did or did not meet.</li> </ul>	

<b>Group 4 – Community Associations</b>	
In its reply, the FCC advised:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the location criteria are viewed as tool to assist community associations in understanding the process of how some inner city multi-residential projects are evaluated as well as anticipate changes;</li> </ul>	this remains the case
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the criteria “could make outcomes more predictable by providing additional rationale for decisions”;</li> </ul>	more explanation of the rationale for each criterion has been provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the criteria help to provide a link between the land use bylaw and the MDP, though “a more explicit link to specific MDP/CTP policies that each condition supports would be helpful”;</li> </ul>	links to relevant MDP policy have been added for each criterion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the criteria are useful as long as “it is clear that these are preferred conditions and not rules”;</li> <li>and</li> </ul>	the description of how to apply the Location Criteria has been clarified
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visual examples/illustrations would be useful as an indicator of the “perfect” site for multi-residential re-designation.</li> </ul>	illustrations have been included
<b>Group 5 – Development Industry (UDI and CHBA)</b>	
Feedback received from the UDI had the following observations:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>among their reviewers, there was not much experience so far in the use of the location criteria that would yield meaningful data even though some had undertaken land use applications in the districts effected by the criteria;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it was unclear to what extent the criteria were being used, if at all;</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>most of the re-designation applications would [intrinsically] exhibit the majority of the criteria;</li> </ul>	the location criteria reflect typical planning practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>would recommend approved contextual multi-family districts anywhere without restriction in developed areas;</li> </ul>	the contextual multi-residential and R-CG districts include rules to help integrate new development adjacent to low density development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the location criteria could be considered as a starting base for M-C1 and higher densities;</li> </ul>	the scale and type of development, grade-oriented requirements and contextual and transitional rules in the M-CG and R-CG districts are designed to facilitate infill development within low density neighbourhoods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M-CG should be considered in the same light as R-CG, where an incremental approach to reliance on the criteria “increases proportional to density and/or parcel area”; and</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“applications need to continue to be evaluated on their own merit with unique circumstances considered</li> </ul>	the description of how to apply the Location Criteria has been amended to more clearly state that planning discretion should take precedent over the criteria

Feedback from the CHBA provided the following comments:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Additional clarity on planning rationale is always helpful.”</li> </ul>	the enhanced criteria expand on the planning rationale to help further this benefit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “The guidelines themselves do little to reduce the time it takes for a land use amendment application to proceed.”</li> </ul>	these comments are related to application process considerations and are not directly addressed by the improvements to the location criteria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “While the guidelines may improve general consistency in the way the land use amendments are evaluated certainty is elusive given other variables and the uniqueness of a site.”</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “[The] applicants in general have a solid grasp [of] the MDP objectives and work to achieve them. The barriers are often at the community level or at times the hesitancy of Council to implement change.”</li> </ul>	by providing more explanation regarding preferred conditions for multi-residential and ground-oriented infill the enhanced location criteria may help to increase community understanding of the choice of location for infill developments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “While there may be some question as to whether or not the guidelines will impact future development in a meaningful way, they are a helpful tool and certainly not detrimental to redevelopment.”</li> </ul>	