

Calgary Planning Commission Input – September 20, 2018

The following feedback was provided during the 2018 September 20 meeting of Calgary Planning Commission. The information is compiled according to topic area.

Employment – Industrial Flex

1. Support for the Employment – Industrial Flex Building Block as it meets current market demands.
2. Figure 2-1 in Attachment 1, Proposed Amendments to Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 24P2009) look too residential. It would be beneficial to amend to look like an industrial area.
3. Visual examples of Employment – Industrial Flex would improve the document.
4. Policy (a) of Employment Flex may be a reiteration of the intent statement of what the Employment Flex area is. This may be redundant. Policy (c) may also be redundant.
5. Policy (d) may be confusing regarding at-grade units and it could be understood as above-grade industrial.
6. Policy (f), which enables local area plans to define a minimum requirement of at-grade industrial uses on a block, may be overly prescriptive.
7. Policy (g) is unclear that large format commercial and auto-oriented uses are not noxious uses. There is support for restricting large format commercial and auto-oriented uses.

Heritage Policy

8. The City needs to be careful in its policy approach to heritage preservation. Policies could become an unintended tool for conservation areas and a gentrification tool.
9. Policy (f) may be confusing by using the word “measures”. “Tools” may be a more appropriate word.
10. Policy (g) is only intended for designated heritage buildings.
11. Policy (b), consider clarifying if the policy applies to the inventory versus designated heritage sites. The current draft policy appears to be elevating the value of the inventory to be equal to the designated heritage sites. If the policy is intended to apply to the heritage inventory, there are tax implications. It is important for land owners to have a more rigorous public process through designation.

Alignment with the Municipal Government Act

12. The Federation of Calgary Communities may have a valid concern in how the Guidebook would be applied throughout the Developed Areas, and how it can impact the local area plans.

Developed Areas Guidebook, Draft: For Information

13. Urban design and community character – the draft addresses architectural styles as a component of community character. The density is more palatable to communities because the community character is being preserved in terms of architectural characteristics. An opportunity is missed in satisfying the community with regard to their initiatives and still achieving the planning goals of the City.

14. Heritage character and community character are values that are considered important in many communities and cities. It is concerning if this is being defined as an inhibiting factor to development. These qualities have a monetary value to The City and shouldn't be ignored. There is concern with the comment that The City is not controlling or directing architectural style. There is a heritage policy (i) "Discourage new development from creating a false sense of heritage character by copying or mimicking the design of heritage buildings in the area." The City is sensitive to architectural style and is playing a role in discouraging certain kinds of styles, so to say that they don't control or regulate style simply isn't true. There is a certain amount of contradiction and confusion in these sections, and The City is making commitments that they aren't following through on.

General Comments

15. It is important for investors and/or developers subject to the Developed Areas Guidebook to know what off-site costs and additional costs are attached to those areas. Alignment with the Established Areas Growth and Change Strategy is important.