

## Calgary Planning Commission Review Closed Session Summary

Summary of comments from Calgary Planning Commission – 2025 June 19 Closed Session workshop and Administration’s follow up.

<b>Topic 1: Transit-Supportive Development</b>		
<b>Given the uncertainty around the Red Line LRT extension, do CPC members support the enabling policies for Transit-Oriented Development outlined in Section 5 of Supplementary Handout 5 (Phased Growth)?</b>		
<b>Comment</b>	<b>Edits</b>	<b>Administration Follow Up</b>
CPC members remarked that the enabling policies for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) may be premature given the uncertainty around the Red Line extension, and there is concern about locking in TOD-oriented land use without confirmed transit investment.	No changes required.	The intent of these policies is not to lock in high-density transit-oriented development now, but to ensure the planning framework is <i>ready and responsive</i> if and when the LRT is extended south. Importantly, these policies are structured as <i>enabling</i> , not prescriptive. They would only be activated through a future planning process once a station location and timeline are confirmed. This approach avoids missing an opportunity for integration while maintaining flexibility and ensuring that near-term development is not constrained by long-term transit uncertainty.
Some members emphasized the importance of safeguarding the potential for a future Red Line station and not undermining that opportunity in the ASP.	No changes required.	

<p>There were concerns that the scale and density proposed are too ambitious for a greenfield location on the city’s periphery, particularly one with ecological and connectivity challenges.</p>		<p>The densities proposed are intended to support more complete communities, make efficient use of infrastructure, and align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary’s Growth Management Overlay. Built in flexibility—recognizing that some parts of the plan area may evolve at a different pace or form depending on servicing capacity, market conditions, and transportation access.</p>
<p>Questions were raised about the timing of the Belmont LRT extension and how this uncertainty might impact the viability of TOD in the area.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	
<p>The need for a balanced approach was highlighted — one that allows for flexibility and responsiveness as transit decisions evolve.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	
<p><b>Topic 2: Mixed Use Development</b></p>		
<p><b>With reference to the Draft Land Use Concept, do CPC members support keeping the Special Purpose Recreation Site and Gateway Function in its current location as a key planning and public realm feature of the ASP?</b></p>		
<p><b>Comment</b></p>	<p><b>Edits</b></p>	<p><b>Administration Follow Up</b></p>
<p>CPC members remarked that while there was general support for including a Special Purpose Recreation Site, some questioned whether its proposed location was optimal.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	<p>Many other locations were explored during the development of The Plan. Ultimately, the proposed location made the most sense from a community building, infrastructure, and planning perspective.</p>

<p>Several members felt the site's location in the west made sense if the Red Line were to be extended, though others preferred a southeast location closer to Macleod Trail and areas less desirable for residential use.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	<p>The current location was selected based on its proximity to a potential future transit node, regional access, and its visibility as a community anchor. However, we recognize the importance of flexibility and are open to further evaluating whether the site's location best serves long-term community needs and integration with adjacent land uses.</p>
<p>There was uncertainty about whether including such a significant facility in the ASP was appropriate at this stage, or whether its location should remain flexible.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	
<p>Some members appreciated the intent to retain the gateway function and civic presence but emphasized the importance of integrating it with future transportation infrastructure and servicing plans.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	

**Topic 3: Growth Flexibility**

**With reference to the Growth Projections, do CPC members feel the land use framework and Land Use Concept provide the right balance of flexibility and density, or should the range be more narrowly defined?**

Comment	Edits	Administration Follow Up
<p>There were mixed views on whether the proposed density was appropriate, with several suggesting it may be too high for the area's southern location and infrastructure context.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>	<p>The Plan aims to provide a flexible land use framework that supports long-term growth objectives without prescribing a downtown-style built form; the proposed density range is intended to be adaptable</p>

		and context-sensitive, with detailed form and scale to be determined through future outline plan and land use applications.
Some members felt the Land Use Concept and associated policies were overly prescriptive and resembled a downtown development model rather than a greenfield ASP.	No changes required.	While the framework within the Plan may appear prescriptive, it is intended to provide clarity and certainty in a developer-funded model—ensuring that infrastructure investments align with a clear, compact, and efficient land use vision appropriate for a greenfield context.
The layering of growth management objectives over the Land Use Concept was seen by some as adding rigidity that may hinder implementation.	No changes required.	The Plan aims to balance growth management objectives with implementation flexibility, ensuring that policy direction supports infrastructure coordination without limiting the ability to respond to evolving market or servicing conditions
Members emphasized the importance of flexibility in the framework to accommodate future changes in servicing, transportation, and market conditions.	No changes required.	