

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2024-0668 / LOC2024-0121
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2024 June 06



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p>	<p>Reasons for Opposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I voted against this application. <p>Fundamentally, the proposal is acceptable. The existing buildings exceed the floor area of the current Land Use District. Increasing the floor area would bring the current building into conformance and allow more commercial space to be added (likely as a drive-through) in a parking lot. On its own, it is fine and I will understand if Council approves the application.</p> <p>However, this is across the street from an existing LRT station. Administration reported that they offered more height and floor area, which the Applicant did not want. This minor increase in floor area without increasing height or uses (including residences) seems like a lost opportunity in bringing the City closer to its land use and transportation planning objectives.</p> <p>I would prefer to see a Land Use District that allows a residential building in the parking lot along 36 St. Private and public policies likely hinder that redevelopment. The owner likely wants to keep the parking lot for busy weekends and may have rules that prevent the loss of parking stalls, which may explain why a drive-through can be added but businesses or residences that would take space and remove parking stalls are not being considered. Likewise, the need to subdivide the parcel to meet servicing requirements is likely an obstacle to that type of incremental transit-oriented infill development. These private and public policies discourage and delay redevelopment, which may not occur for decades.</p> <p>If Council wants the west side of the Marlborough LRT station to contribute more to Council’s goal that 95% of Calgarians will “live within 2000m of a dedicated transit facility (e.g. LRT, MAX bus station)” by 2050, the most reasonable location to start would be the City’s Park and Ride lot (2022 Climate Strategy, pg. 19). However, a restrictive covenant on the Park and Ride lot may limit the City’s options (see Attachment 1, page 4). This may be an obstacle to using City land to achieve the City’s goals.</p>

	<p>Maybe it was the wrong choice, but I hoped that voting against this application would draw attention to some obstacles to Council's goals for Transit Oriented Development and would encourage further examination of the City's technical policies that are involved in Transit Oriented Development.</p>
--	---