

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2025-0330 / LOC2024-0224 heard at
Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2025 March 27



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
Commissioner Montgomery	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Added uses are complimentary to plans and uses already determined for the site. Administration has done a good job trying to balance the needs of the user with the Currie Barracks CFB West Master Plan. Disappointed in the letter received by the applicant justifying no public engagement. It presents as an exemption from public engagement, but the applicant chose not to do any engagement, they weren't exempt from something that is their choice to do.
Commissioner Hawryluk	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "A development permit (DP2023-05035) for a new Assisted Living, Retail and Consumer Service, Office and Restaurant has been approved and the development is under construction" (Cover Report, page 1). <p>The approved Development Permit includes a traffic lay-by (a place where drivers can pull over and park). The proposed Direct Control District would allow the applicant to add a window in the building near the lay-by so people can use a Retail and Consumer Service use, which the Applicant says "would resemble a pharmacy drive-through" (Attachment 3, page 2).</p> <p>Commission asked operational questions about the proposal. According to the Applicant, customers would pre-order a product or service from the pharmacy, make an appointment to use the drive through, and then arrive at their appointed time. This approach is supposed to reduce the risk of cars stacking up in the lay-by or elsewhere in the area.</p> <p>There is some tension between this application and the Revised Currie Barracks CFB West Master Plan (2015). Like other New Urbanist neighbourhoods, Currie's designs should encourage people to walk within the neighbourhood. Drive throughs tend to encourage driving. To help reduce this tension between walking and driving, the proposed Direct</p>

	<p>Control District defines the use of Retail Drive Through and requires that the Retail Drive Through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Must be approved with a Retail and Consumer Service Use” (Attachment 2, Section 4), - Not have outdoor speakers and may have only one service window (Attachment 2, Section 12 (1)), - Not have more than 3 vehicle stacking spaces (Attachment 2, Section 13(e)), and - Follow additional rules about its location, screening, and fences (Attachment 2, Section 13). <p>The proposed Direct Control District adds the discretionary use of Health Care Service. Other uses that are listed in Sections 5 and 6 of the proposed District were included in the existing District.</p> <p>The proposed District increased the minimum and maximum parking requirements to match the current rules in the Land Use Bylaw (Attachment 2, Section 22). The current Direct Control has lower parking requirements, which better aligns with the Currie Plan. Commission amended the proposed Direct Control District to return the minimum and maximum parking requirements to the levels in the current Direct Control District.</p> <p>Because this application has a small scope and scale, a new Traffic Impact Assessment was not required.</p> <p>Based on the scope and scale of this application, the Applicant did not conduct engagement (Attachment 4, page 1). Administration accepted that argument. However, not conducting any engagement may have made this application more difficult than needed. The Community Association is “opposed to any potential for drive through addiction treatment as part of this proposal” (Attachment 5, page 1). The proposed Direct Control District’s requirement that the Retail Drive Through “must be approved with a Retail and Consumer Service Use” would not allow a drive through addiction treatment (Attachment 2, Section 4). If the applicant had contacted the Community Association and conducted a minimal level of communication, this confusion could have been avoided.</p> <p>A Councillor might want to ask the Applicant if they have done any communication or engagement since Commission’s review.</p> <p>Commission unanimously supported this application. It is worth noting that Commissioners’ debates suggested unenthusiastic support. Based on conversations with other Commissioners</p>
--	--

	<p>after the vote, if the vote was being held again, I suspect that some Commissioners (likely a minority of Commissioners) might not have supported this application. However, for the reasons above, I would still have supported this amended recommendation.</p>
--	--