

## Calgary Planning Commission Review

Summary of comments from Calgary Planning Commission on 2025 February 13 Closed Session workshop. The summary includes Administration follow up.

<b>Topic 1: Industrial Land Use</b>		
<b>1A: The proposed land use concept represents a conversion of approximately 80% of the developable lands from employment to residential use. Does CPC support the land use conversion? Should the ASP maintain opportunities for light industrial?</b>		
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Edits</b>	<b>Administration Follow Up</b>
Commissioners remarked on the challenges for industrial development in this area. Direction was provided to consider a greater mix of uses adjacent to transit.	Maps and text have been revised to eliminate standalone industrial and employment zones from the plan area.	Mixed use areas continue to provide opportunities for employment. Policies of the draft plan favour land uses that are easily integrated within other land uses namely residential.
Administration should review the regional land use in context of the application. Opportunities for light industrial uses are significant within the NE quadrant of the City.	The draft area structure plan was further refined to promote and support employment and commercial development within mixed use policy areas.	Light industrial development in these areas may discourage residential development. The change will allow the policies to integrate employment uses within mixed use policy framework. The Plan does not provide opportunities for light industrial developments.
Administration could consider office-quasi-industrial employment that is compatible to residential uses.	Light industrial land uses or quasi-industrial land uses were explored. Priority was given to land uses which are compatible with residential development, airport service and offices.	Industrial land uses and quasi-industrial land uses were removed from land use concept.
Commissioners supported and discussed the various land use areas. Strong support for higher residential land use in this area given the area's context is already well supplied with ground oriented residential and planned industrial lands.	Maps and text have been revised to eliminate sole employment areas from the plan area.	The revised land use concept provided a simplified and more conceptual approach to mixed use development.
<b>Topic 2: Mixed Use Development</b>		
<b>Should more opportunities be provided for mixed use or multi-unit residential development in areas designated for Ground-Oriented Residential south of the wetland?</b>		
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Edits</b>	<b>Administration Follow Up</b>
The commission members supported residential uses, especially during a housing crisis. Administration should strongly consider maximizing any opportunities for mixed-use development adjacent to transit.	Maps have been revised to prioritize Mixed Use Areas in proximity to Transit Stations especially along 96 Avenue NE. Special policy focus was provided for Mixed Use Area which applies to lands designated as an existing commercial plaza.	Mixed use areas remain for areas north of the wetland along 96 Avenue NE. Policies of the plan support higher activity and density in all transit station planning areas.

<p>Mixed-use makes sense around the transit station areas but Administration should remain cognizant of the flexibility for these areas. Administration should allow opportunities for both vertically integrated and horizontal mixed-use.</p>	<p>Maps have been revised to replace sole employment areas with Mixed Use Areas in proximity to Transit Stations.</p>	<p>Revisions to the proposed area structure plan included additional guidance and flexibility for both horizontally and vertically integrated mixed-use areas.</p>
<p><b>Topic 3: Transit-Oriented Development</b></p>		
<p><b>Question 1A &amp; 2A: The NW corner of the ASP area is currently developed with a commercial plaza. How can policy best encourage intensification and redevelopment of this plaza that would be transit-supportive?</b></p>		
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>Edits</b></p>	<p><b>Administration Follow Up</b></p>
<p>The best TOD areas offer a balance of residential and employment opportunities in proximity to transit. Administration has the opportunity to achieve this with the proposed Plan. The construction of the light rail will create additional interest in higher density development.</p> <p>Administration should consider both immediate needs (horizontal commercial development) as well as opportunities for higher density development in the future. Policies of the plan should not be limiting to current demand for horizontal commercial development.</p>	<p>Maps have been updated to accommodate with sub areas identified for Area A – and Area B. Area A policies are provided to enable the transition from existing commercial plaza to mixed use developments.</p>	<p>The proposed Plan designates a large extent of the lands along 96 Avenue NE as mixed use. This approach promotes opportunities for both commercial and residential development. As these areas are within proximity to existing rapid transit service (rapid bus routes) , the policies of the plan support higher density along this corridor.</p> <p>The policies provide flexibility with the ultimate goal of supporting higher density developments in this area over the 30 year lifespan of the proposed Plan.</p>
<p>Administration should continue to support the highest development intensity on lands within transit station planning areas. Commission members agreed that the density should, gradually decline in built-form the further away from the station.</p>	<p>Mapping changes were provided to provide a more contiguous mixed use policy area along 96 Avenue NE.</p> <p>Policies require development to provide a transition in built form to ensure complimentary built forms and scale.</p>	<p>Transit Station Planning Areas are required to achieve a density of 150 people and jobs per gross developable hectare. Areas of greatest density are located adjacent to higher-order transit stations (Transit Station Planning Areas and Mixed Use Areas) with areas of lowest density (Ground-Oriented Residential) located further away.</p>
<p>As an infill community, the Plan should focus on density ranges that allow for flexibility and adaptation for the life cycle of the plan. Building heights should gradually increase as you move towards transit stations.</p>	<p>Minor changes to Land Use Concept to accommodate gradual shifts in density.</p>	<p>Density targets are provided for each of the land use policy areas to ensure that density is tapered and appropriate within context of the sub-regions plan area.</p>

<p>Transit Station Planning Areas (as shown) should be larger to encompass larger components of the plan area. Administration could consider increasing the mixed use areas to envelop the entire transit station planning area.</p>	<p>No changes made to size of Transit Station Planning Areas. Policy language provided encourages high activity rates within the transit station planning areas. This is sufficient to achieve the policy intent of the proposed Plan and the MDP.</p>	<p>Transit Station Planning Areas encompass all lands with 600 metres of future transit stations, in accordance with the New Community Planning Guidebook.</p>
--	--	--

**Topic 4: Connectivity and Pedestrian Focused Policy Areas**

**Question 1E: The primary collector road has two school sites and is flanked by Neighbourhood Activity Centres on each end. Should the city consider making this road a pedestrian priority street (urban main street)? Or would it be preferable to break up the pedestrian areas into two distinct zones?**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Edits</b>	<b>Administration Follow Up</b>
<p>Commission members supported moving the main streets from internal to the plan area so that there are connections to the edges of the plan area.</p> <p>Administration should encourage main streets as special areas and destinations with the plan area.</p>	<p>The main street location, size and policies was further refined. The neighbourhood corridor was introduced as a feature street within the plan area. The policies provided for the neighbourhood collector are based on the desire for a local destination and pedestrian focused area in the middle of the plan area.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood corridor will allow for flexible approach for a local street. Key components to support a transit and pedestrian focused area are provided within the policies applicable to this area.</p>
<p>Connectivity is key, with both the green space and to all the different transit stations along with the established retail and employment that is already there.</p>	<p>Maps have been updated to accommodate a larger regional pathway network that is integrated and aligned with the parks pathway network within West Nose Creek.</p>	<p>The proposed Regional Pathway network provides connections between existing green spaces, existing commercial areas, and future transit stations.</p>

**Topic 5: Maintenance and Storage Facility (MSF)**

**This theme and discussion item emerged naturally as part of question and answers discussion with Calgary Planning Commission.**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Edits</b>	<b>Administration Follow Up</b>
<p>What is the purpose of the MSF? Is it meant to serve the Green Line, Airport Connector, or Regional Rail Hub?</p> <p>Commission members were curious about any flexibility with moving the location of the MSF to relocate the facility away from Harvest Hills Boulevard.</p> <p>Would the NE corner of the plan area not be a more suitable place for the facility?</p>	<p>No edits to the plan were carried out as a result of this questions or discussion item.</p> <p>Other locations internal and external to the plan area were explored but deemed not feasible based on grading challenges, impact on road network, intersection distancing, and land availability.</p>	<p>The location of the MSF was workshopped with representatives from Calgary Transit and RE&amp;DS to ensure that the location would be most efficient and effective to serve the future Green Line.</p>