Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2024-1057 / LOC2024-0193 heard at Calgary Planning Commission Meeting 2024 October 3



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
Commissioner Hawryluk	 Administration is correct that, "Section 1386(d) of the Land Use Bylaw 1P2007 provides the location criteria for where the H-GO District may be considered appropriate. The subject site meets the location criteria as it is within the overall Residential Developed Inner-City area and an Urban Main Street area, as identified under the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) – Urban Structure Map. In addition, the subject site is within 600 metres of an existing LRT platform (Lions Park Station), 400 metres of an existing BRT Station (Route 303 MAX Orange) and 200 metres from an existing primary service network" (Attachment 1, page 4).
	In other words, applications for the H-GO District need to be in the Inner City and meet a second location criterion. This application meets all of the location criteria, which Slide 8 of Administration's presentation shows clearly (https://pub-calgary.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=3065 47).
	This application would also make small amendments to two maps in the Banff Trail Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) amendments: Land Use Plan (Low-Density Rowhouse to Medium Density Low-Rise) and Maximum Building Heights (from 11m to 12m). The Land Use Plan map is being updated because the ARP does not allow stacked forms that are possible under the H-GO District.
	One Commissioner voted against this based on Administration's correct observation that, "The amendment is not in alignment with the draft urban form category, which is identified as Neighbourhood Local, but is in alignment with the building scale modifier, Limited Scale (up to three storeys), for the subject sites in the draft South Shaganappi Communities Local Area Plan (LAP)" Attachment 1, page 6).
	A draft LAP remains non-statutory until third reading. Neither the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board nor the Development Authority can consider a document that has not received third reading. Even if Council had given first reading to

the LAP, Council can make amendments prior to second reading of the bylaw.

Therefore, the question is whether the ARP and Land Use Amendments are appropriate. Because Council more recently approved the H-GO Land Use District and the location criteria in Section 1386 (d) of the Land Use Bylaw (every one of which this application meets) than the Area Redevelopment Development Plan (which needs only minor map amendments to align with this application), this application is appropriate.