

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2025-0665 / LOC2024-0166
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2025 July 24



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This application aligns with the following direction from Council: <p>Municipal Development Plan/Calgary Transportation Plan (2020):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is located on 4 St NE, which is part of the Edmonton Trail Urban Main Street and the Primary Transit Network (MDP, 2020, Maps 1 and 2). This location is consistent with planning around “nodes and corridors” (MDP, 2020, 2.2). <p>Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) (1980):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site is within the Community Centre area and has an Active Frontage requirement. Both the current and proposed Mixed Use – Active Frontage (MU-2) Districts require Active Frontage. “Buildings in the Community Centre building block should not exceed 34 metres in height, providing for taller first storeys in buildings where vertical mixed use is desired” (4.1) “Within the area identified as the Community Centre building block, applications for higher levels of intensity and height may be supported subject to further analysis, engagement, and approvals process, including a land use redesignation as part of a comprehensive plan submission that may include consideration of community infrastructure improvements and heritage resource conservation” (4.3). Administration finds that “the proposal meets the intent of the ARP, as a comprehensive plan has been provided, which proposes community infrastructure improvements including a plaza space at the south side of the site, facing 1 Avenue NE and a widened sidewalk along 4 Street NE” (Attachment 1, page 6, see also Attachment 4 for the Applicant’s comprehensive plan). <p>The proposed Mixed Use – Active Frontage (MU-2f9.0h80) District is higher than 34m and would likely produce a building that is up to 26 storeys tall. For context, the Applicant noted</p>

	<p>during Commission’s review that the hill to the northwest is about 40m tall; an 80m tower would be taller than the hill.</p> <p>The Applicant reports that the Transportation Impact Assessment “found that there are no operational issues expected at full build-out on ‘opening day’ in 2029. However, traffic volumes projected for 2039 indicate that the 4 Street NE / 2 Avenue NE (east leg) intersection will require upgrades to accommodate future demand” (Attachment 3, page 4).</p> <p>Administration notes the Applicant’s intent to mark the Roma Grocery, located at 217 4 St NE and on the Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources, with a commemorative plaque (Attachment 1, page 4).</p> <p>This would present a substantial change to the area. The Crescent Heights and Bridgeland-Riverside Community Associations oppose this application; the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association recommended creating an ad hoc stakeholder group to plan for future development (Attachments 5-7). To produce a more comprehensive plan along this Urban Main Street, this area should have been part of the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan (LAP). Early in the LAP process, the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association asked to be removed from the LAP.</p>
<p>Commissioner Damiani</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application proposes a considerable increase of density and height to the subject site without providing clear community reinvestment in the proposed standard district. It is recognized that the site is in an MDP identified Urban Main Street however local policy exists for the area in the Bridgeland-Riverside ARP. <p>Local policy indicates “applications for higher levels of intensity and height may be supported subject to further analysis, engagement, and approvals process, including a land use redesignation as part of a comprehensive plan submission that may include consideration of community infrastructure improvements and heritage resource conservation”.</p> <p>Administration indicates local area policy is met referencing a planning analysis and concept plan, highlighting community infrastructure improvements of a plaza space and a widened sidewalk along 4 Street NE. Neither of these improvements are reflected in the proposed land use district.</p> <p>CPC has reviewed innovative land use proposals that translate broader community benefits into land use policy, such as affordable housing commitments, heritage and publicly accessible private open space integration, to balance</p>

	<p>increased densities with future and existing public needs and benefits. A DC district would have been a more appropriate land use proposal to make sure community benefits are achieved in giving this height and density to the site.</p>
--	---