

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 1 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE, LOC2016-0193

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This land use amendment application was originally submitted on 2016 July 20, by Real Estate & Development Services (RE&DS) of The City of Calgary. An updated land use amendment application was resubmitted on 2018 July 23, by O2 Planning and Design, on behalf of the developer, JEMM Properties, with authorization from the landowner, The City of Calgary. The application proposes to redesignate the subject parcel from DC Direct Control District based on *Land Use Bylaw 2P80* to DC Direct Control District based on the Mixed Use – General (MU-1) District of *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007* to allow for:

- transit supportive mixed-use development;
- a maximum building height of 50.0 metres / approximately 15 storeys (an increase from 26.0 metres / approximately eight storeys);
- a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 5.5 by providing a publicly accessible private open space (the existing district has no maximum FAR);
- parking requirement of 0.3 stalls per Dwelling Unit and 0.0 stalls for all other uses; and
- the uses listed in the MU-1 District.

This report concludes that while Administration is supportive of a district that would allow for increased density, greater building height to allow flexibility in built form, and a mix of uses in close proximity to an LRT station, Administration is not in support of this application based on the use of a DC and the proposed parking rates, as presented. The proposed DC District is being used for the purposes of solidifying a proposed parking relaxation. The use of a DC District in this situation, conflicts with Section 20(2) of the *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*, where it states that a DC should not be used in substitute of a stock district that can achieve the same outcome with or without relaxations. The proposal can be adequately accommodated through the M-U1f5.5h50 District.

Further, Administration is not in support of the proposed parking rate prescribed in the DC District that is lower than the base MU-1 District. There is insufficient understanding of the future development and implementation, based on preliminary information provided. Despite requests for additional information, no development permit application or plans were submitted at the time of report writing.

ADMINISTRATION'S RECOMMENDATION:

That Calgary Planning Commission recommend that Council hold a Public Hearing; and

That Council **REFUSE** the adoption of the proposed redesignation of 0.37 hectares ± (0.92 acres ±) located at 950 McPherson Square NE (Plan 0512930, Block 7, Lot 2) from DC Direct Control District to DC Direct Control District to accommodate transit supportive mixed-use development and abandon the proposed Bylaw.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 2 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193

PREVIOUS COUNCIL DIRECTION / POLICY

None.

BACKGROUND

This land use amendment application was initially submitted on 2016 July 20, by Real Estate & Development Services (RE&DS) of The City of Calgary. The initial submission by RE&DS was seeking a more flexible land use district for future development to complete The Bridges redevelopment. RE&DS proposed DC District was based on the Multi-Residential High Density Medium Rise (M-H2) District that allowed for:

- transit supportive mixed-use development;
- a maximum height of 34.0 metres / approximately ten storeys;
- a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 5.5;
- parking requirement of 0.75 stalls per Dwelling Unit; and
- the uses listed in the M-H2 District.

RE&DS held an open house engagement on 2016 October 24, as well as provided online engagement opportunities to obtain feedback on the proposed land use amendment. Based on the feedback collected during the engagement and the comments provided by the Corporate Planning Applications Group (CPAG) during the application review, the proposed height was reduced from 34.0 metres to 26.0 metres. Subsequently, RE&DS marketed the subject site with an active land use amendment application to potential developers.

An updated land use amendment application was then resubmitted on 2018 July 23, by O2 Planning and Design, on behalf of the developer JEMM Properties. The amended application proposed a DC District based on the MU-1 District, with a maximum building height of 60.0 metres and FAR of 5.5. JEMM's application also proposed a parking rate of 0.25 stalls per Dwelling Unit and 0.1 visitor stalls per unit.

During the review of the land use amendment application, Administration recommended a joint review of the land use amendment and a development permit application through a concurrent process. As outlined to the applicant, the concurrent process provides benefits to all stakeholders through enabling a clear understanding of the intent and outcome of the land use amendment and development permit. The applicant confirmed that they have no intention of submitting a development permit until the land use amendment goes to Council for decision.

After the first detailed team review and further discussions between CPAG and the applicant, the application was amended to reduce the building height to 50.0 metres and amended the parking requirement for residential units to 0.3 stalls per unit. A summary of the proposed application and changes in scope during the review is provided in *Figure 1* below.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 3 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

Figure 1: Summary of the Proposed Application Scope and Changes

	RE&DS (July 2016)	JEMM (July 2018)	JEMM (November 2018)
Proposed Land Use District	DC based on M-H2	DC based on MU-1	DC based on MU-1
FAR	5.5	5.5	5.5
Height (metres)	34 / 26	60	50
Parking for Residential	0.75 stalls / unit	0.25 stalls / unit	0.3 stalls / unit

Prior to reaching a decision on the recommendation of this application, Administration discussed with the applicant the unresolved issues with the proposed DC District. Administration also advised that the application could proceed with support from Administration for the MU-1f5.5h50 District along with the standard parking rate included in the MU-1 District. With this recommendation, the parking reduction required by the applicant could then be explored and additional parking relaxations potentially granted as part of a future development permit.

Notwithstanding, the applicant has elected to have a decision brought forward to Calgary Planning Commission on the proposed DC District. Administration does not support the proposed application based on the use of a DC District and the proposed parking rates, as presented. The use of a DC District is inappropriate for the purposes of solidifying a proposed parking relaxation and avoiding potential appeals. Further, while the proposed DC District provides certainty and benefit to the applicant, it circumvents the planning process and may impact the larger community by removing opportunities for residents potentially affected by the development from appealing the proposed parking rates to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB).

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting



Page 4 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193

Location Maps



Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 5 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

Site Context

The subject site is located in the northeast community of Bridgeland-Riverside. Following the demolition of the Calgary General Hospital in 1998, the subject site and adjacent City owned lands were part of a City initiated policy plan known as The Bridges. The overall area of The Bridges is 14.9 hectares and is comprised of 16 sites, envisioned to be developed over three phases. Since the approval of The Bridges plan in 2002, a significant amount of redevelopment has occurred, both in terms of private residential and commercial development, as well as development of public parks and community facilities. The Bridges plan is near completion with the exception of four undeveloped sites in Phase 3, including the subject site.

Presently vacant, the parcel encompasses an area of 0.37 hectares ± (0.92 acres ±). The subject site is located within a 200 metre radius of the Bridgeland-Memorial LRT Station, walking distance to local commercial services, significant park spaces, and with easy access to the downtown core.

Lands to the north comprise of Murdoch Park, which houses the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association building, community gardens, a playground, playfields, multi-use pathways, and a surface parking lot. To the east, a mixed-use development consisting of one seven-storey and one 11-storey building exists. To the south, a six-storey mixed-use development exists. Lands to the west are partially developed and were intended for a six-storey multi-residential development. Directly northeast, a land use amendment application (LOC2018-0059) for the vacant parcel was reviewed for proposed MU-1f5.3h50 District and is going forward to Council in 2018 December.

As identified in *Figure 2*, Bridgeland-Riverside’s peak population was in 2017, reaching 6,332 residents.

Figure 2: Community Peak Population

Bridgeland-Riverside	
Peak Population Year	2017
Peak Population	6,332
2017 Current Population	6,332
Difference in Population (Number)	0
Difference in Population (Percentage)	0

Source: The City of Calgary 2017 Civic Census

Additional demographic and socio-economic information may be obtained online through the [Bridgeland-Riverside](#) community profile.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 6 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193

INVESTIGATION: ALTERNATIVES AND ANALYSIS

While the proposal generally aligns with the policies outlined in the Strategic Alignment section of this report, the proposed DC District and proposed parking rates cannot be supported by Administration for the reasons outlined in the following sections. Alternative land use options are also identified as part of this report's analysis.

Planning Considerations

The following sections highlight the scope of technical planning analysis conducted by Administration.

Land Use

Existing Land Use

The subject site is identified as 'Site 13' of the existing DC District (Bylaw 41Z2002). The existing DC from 2002 was intended to implement The Bridges redevelopment in accordance with the *Bow Valley Centre Concept Plan*. In addition to allowing for Multi-Residential Development, Site 13 of the DC outlines:

- a range of minimum yard depths specific to adjacent street interfaces;
- a maximum building height of eight storeys, not exceeding an overall building height of 26.0 metres;
- a maximum density of 321 units per hectare (130 units per acre);
- specific guidelines for building orientation and design;
- a parking ratio of 0.9 stalls per Dwelling Unit, as per *Land Use Bylaw 2P80*;
- a parking ratio of 2.0 stalls per Live Work Unit; and
- no vehicular access from 9 Street NE or McPherson Square NE.

Proposed Land Use

This application proposes to redesignate the site from the existing DC District to a new DC District based on the Mixed Use – General (MU-1) District of *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*. The proposed DC District is intended to allow:

- transit supportive mixed-use development;
- a parking ratio of 0.3 stalls per Dwelling Unit and 0.0 parking stalls for all other uses (i.e. live-work, visitor, and commercial uses);
- a maximum building height of 50.0 metres; and
- a maximum floor area ratio of 5.3, that can be increased to 5.5 by providing a publicly accessible private open space on-site, with a minimum area of 150.0 square metres.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 7 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

Section 8 of the proposed DC District (Attachment 2) states that a publicly accessible private open space can be provided to acquire additional FAR, up to 5.5. Administration supports the proposed height, FAR and increased range of uses, as it allows for a range of transit supportive mixed-use development outcomes and encourages high quality walking environments along 9 Street NE and within a 200 metres radius of the Bridgeland-Memorial LRT station. Notwithstanding, Administration is not in support of the proposed use of a DC District when a stock land use district can be used to achieve the same development outcome.

Section 20(2) of the Land Use Bylaw 1P2007

As outlined in section 20(2) of the *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*:

20(2) Direct Control Districts must not be used:

- a) in substitution of any other land use district in this Bylaw that could be used to achieve the same result either with or without relaxations of this Bylaw; or
- b) to regulate matters that are regulated by subdivision or development permit approval conditions.

Given this direction in the *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*, the application of a DC District for this application is not appropriate. The proposal can be adequately accommodated through use of the stock district of MU-1f5.5h50. The MU-1 District requires a minimum of 0.75 stalls per Dwelling Unit and also includes a 25 percent reduction of vehicular parking requirements for sites that are within 600 metres of an LRT station. As well, a reduction of one residential vehicle parking stall where four secured bicycle stalls are provided in excess of the minimum requirements can further reduced the residential vehicular parking stall requirements by an additional 25 percent. Further parking relaxations to the MU-1 District for future developments can also be explored at the development permit application stage. Using a stock MU-1f5.5h50 district, the Development Authority can still manage both relaxations to parking and the negotiation of a publicly accessible open space at the development permit stage.

Proposed Parking Requirements in the DC District

During the review of this application, the applicant confirmed they have no intentions of submitting a development permit until the land use amendment has been considered by Council and a decision rendered. Although the proposed uses, use intensity, building form, and the proposed parking supply have not been finalized, the developer, JEMM Properties, anticipates that the supply could be as low as 0.30 stalls per Dwelling Unit. The developer anticipates accommodating all parking within one level of underground parking due to existing site constraints. The proposed DC District reflects this with specific parking requirements of a minimum 0.3 parking stalls per Dwelling Unit and 0.0 parking stalls for all other uses, including visitor stalls.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 8 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE, LOC2016-0193

The proposed parking supply in the DC District will provide certainty at the land use stage by avoiding further parking discussions and appeals at later development stages. However, the use of a DC District to provide certainty for the applicant directly conflicts with section 20(2) of the *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*. Further, Administration is concerned that by embedding the proposed parking requirements into a DC District when they can be more adequately dealt with through a stock district and at the development permit stage, it circumvents the opportunity for residents potentially affected by the development from appealing the proposed parking to the SDAB.

Prior to reaching a decision on the recommendation of this application, Administration discussed with the applicant the unresolved issues with the proposed DC District. Administration advised that the application could proceed with support from Administration utilizing the MU-1f5.5h50 District and the stock district parking requirements. The vehicular parking reduction required by the applicant could then be explored as part of the development permit. Administration has outlined to the applicant the Bylaw restrictions and flexibility the Development Authority may consider at the development permit stage as per section 15 (3)(d) of *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*. As long as the conditions of section 36 of *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007* are met, there are no upper limits to the relaxation power of the Development Authority at the development permit stage.

A Comparison of the Proposed DC District and MU-1 Parking Requirement

To further illustrate the differences in parking requirements between the stock MU-1f5.5h50 District with the proposed DC District, Administration has provided an evaluation of a potential development scenario for a proposed mixed-use development with 250 Dwelling Units and 1000 square metres of proposed retail and consumer service space. The applicant indicated in their parking rationalization letter that the future development may contain 250 to 295 units and ground-floor Retail and Consumer Service uses. This scenario accounts for this preliminary information provided to illustrate how the parking rates in the proposed DC District and the M-U1 District could potentially be implemented.

A summary of the comparison findings are detailed in Attachment 3. The findings further illustrate that the use of a stock district of MU-1 can accommodate the desired development outcome with potential relaxations at the development permit stage.

Alternative Land Use Options and Opportunities

During the review of the application, Administration provided the option to amend the application and discussed alternative solutions to a refusal recommendation, including:

1. Stock district MU-1 without a development permit;
2. Stock district MU-1 with a development permit and concurrent review; and
3. An alternative DC District structure that enables discretion by the Development Authority to determine parking requirement at the development permit stage.

As stated previously in the report, the applicant confirmed they had, and continue to have no intention of submitting a development permit until Council renders a decision on this application. Administration then requested the details into the proposed configuration of the parkade plan,

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 9 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE, LOC2016-0193

including the typical dimensions of an individual stall and number of stalls, but this was not made available for review by Administration. Administration is unable to rationalize the demand for a significantly lower parking rate to be written into the DC District at the land use stage.

Development and Site Design

Given the site's central location along a key north-south corridor in the community of Bridgeland, future mixed-use development will need to account for and address 9 Street NE with active commercial uses and/or active building design. The unique parcel shape will also require that design considerations ensure that all building edges enhance the public realm and address adjacent streets and park spaces. Any future development permit will require detailed shadow studies to understand and minimize their shadowing of the adjacent Murdoch Park's active use areas.

Environmental

No environmental issues have been identified at this time.

Transportation Networks

Pedestrian access to the site is available from 9 Street NE, McPherson Square NE, McPherson Road NE, and McDougall Road NE. Vehicular access to the site should not be taken from 9 Street NE. The subject site is located approximately 100 metres to the Calgary Transit bus route 90 on 9 Street NE. The walking distance to the Bridgeland-Memorial LRT station platform is approximately 200 metres from the southeast corner of the site.

A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was not submitted as a previous TIA that included this site was submitted and reviewed recently for an adjacent site as part of LOC2018-0059. A parking rationalization letter was submitted to support this application through outlining general trends and concepts in parking requirements. However, development permit level details, including proposed alternative mode and Transportation Demand Management measures that will actually be implemented as part of a development, are required to complete an assessment of the proposed parking rates.

Calgary Parking Policies (2017)

The *Calgary Parking Policies* outline specific criteria for zero parking or significant parking reductions for multi-family residential buildings. Applicable policy in section 5.2 of the *Calgary Parking Policies* states:

1. Applications for new multi-family residential buildings that propose no on-site parking, or significant reductions in on-site parking, may be considered by Administration when all of the following criteria are met. The determination of which proposed reductions are 'significant' is at the discretion of the Development Authority.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 10 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

- a) The building is located within the Centre City, a Major Activity Centre or directly on an Urban Corridor as defined in Map 1 of the Municipal Development Plan, and LRT or other Primary Transit Service (as defined in the Calgary Transportation Plan) is currently provided within 300 metres actual walking distance of the building.
- b) Publicly accessible surface or structured parking is located within 300 metres actual walking distance of the building. The parking must be accessible to the public, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.
- c) The building is located in or adjacent to areas where parking management practices are in place, including time restrictions, paid parking or permit-restricted parking. In areas where such parking management practices are not in place, a study should be conducted by the applicant to evaluate whether the potential offsite parking impacts would be unacceptable for the area in question.
- d) The developer must actively facilitate at least one alternative travel option for residents (including, but not limited to, monthly or annual transit passes, additional on-site bicycle parking, on-site car share spaces, car share memberships, live-work units, etc.) to the satisfaction of The City. Provision of multiple high-quality options is strongly encouraged.
- e) The applicant has completed a parking study to determine any potential short stay parking impacts, due to any proposed reductions in on-site visitor parking supply, when the building is located within or physically adjacent to a Business Revitalization Zone or other commercial area. The Development Authority may recommend against reductions to visitor parking if it is determined by the Authority that on-street impacts, or visitor accessibility, would be unacceptable.

This proposal does not meet all of the criteria as stated in this applicable policy. Specifically, the location is not within 300 metres walking distance of any publicly accessible parking. To assess the remaining criteria in the policy, a development permit is required to evaluate the quality of the alternative travel options and consider the effects of potential over spill of development parking onto nearby streets. For instance, subsection (d) identifies a requirement for a developer to facilitate at least one alternative travel option when considering reductions to parking rates. If the parking rate is prescribed in a DC District, the Development Authority may not be able to require alternative travel options outlined in subsection (d) or other enhanced parking and building design, to justify a reduced parking rate at the development permit stage. To further understand potential site layout constraints, the Applicant was requested to provide a parkade plan. The applicant elected to not provide a plan for consideration.

Mode Choice Split and Auto Ownership

Through investment in transit, active modes infrastructure and the cash-in-lieu program, The City has achieved great success in increasing the mode split for transit and active modes for Calgarians' commute to work. However, mode split for the commute to work does not generally equate to vehicle ownership in a linear fashion. Individuals may still own vehicles.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 11 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE, LOC2016-0193

The City of Calgary has on-going travel and household surveys (+15,000 surveys since 2010), with data suggesting that apartment dwellers in the "inner north" (where Bridgeland-Riverside is located) have an auto ownership rate of 0.94, with a variance of +/- 0.13. The City supports developments with significant reductions to *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007* parking requirements providing these developments have been through appropriate review and analysis. The City has demonstrated success in achieving reduced and/or zero parking by application of the *Calgary Parking Policies* at the development permit stage, including applications that were appealed to SDAB.

As such, significant parking reductions on new multi-family residential buildings that do not meet the *Calgary Parking Policies* and have not been through development permit stage parking review pose a risk for The City in the form of overflow residential parking from a development onto adjacent public streets.

Utilities and Servicing

Sanitary sewers are available to service the development. At the development permit stage, a sanitary servicing study must be submitted by the applicant to determine whether off-site upgrades are required.

Water mains are available to service the development. At the development permit stage, a fire flow calculation letter must be submitted by the applicant to determine whether off-site upgrades are required. Storm sewers are available to service the proposed development.

Stakeholder Engagement, Research and Communication

Communications

In keeping with Administration's standard practices, this application was circulated to relevant stakeholders and notice posted on-site. Notification letters were sent to adjacent land owners and the application was advertised online through Planning and Development Map (PDMAP).

Following Calgary Planning Commission, notifications for the Public hearing of Council will be posted on-site and mailed out to adjacent land owners. In addition, Commission's recommendation and the date of the Public Hearing will be advertised.

Applicant-led engagement

The applicant led their own engagement program, which included three meetings with the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association (BRCA) in 2018 July, 2018 August and 2018 October respectively, and one information session in 2018 November. The applicant delivered postcards to adjacent residents in advance of the information session, provided posters for nearby businesses, installed a bold sign at the BRCA hall, and developed a project website. Administration attended one of the meetings, and the information session to share information of the planning review process and answer questions. Comments heard during these

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 12 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

engagements paralleled key themes received directly by Administration as a result of notice posting and circulation that are summarized below.

The applicant has also provided a summary of their engagement efforts, which can be found in Attachment 4.

City-led engagement

Administration assessed the application and it was deemed that additional City-led engagement was not required. Administration received 15 letters regarding the application and three letters from the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association. Comments from the BRCA regarding the updated application resubmission were received on 2018 August 20. An additional letter from the BRCA was received on 2018 November 20 regarding the amended application and an email received 2018 December 3 regarding the proposed DC. The comments from the BRCA can be found in Attachment 5.

What we heard / what we did

In response to the notice posting, and circulation of the updated land use amendment application, 15 letters of objection were received regarding the proposed application. It is important to note that additional letters of opposition were received as part of the initial land use amendment application in 2016 by RE&DS. They are not directly referenced in this report as the scope and scale of the application has been updated.

The main reasons for opposition that were received by Administration are summarized in the table below. As no development permit has been submitted at this time, certain comments were outside the scope of the proposed land use amendment application.

Key Themes	What we heard (issue or opportunity identified)
Building Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridgeland is not intended for high rises as other communities, such as the East Village; • The community assumed the existing height would stay in place, and that expectations should be kept; • Allowing increased height would affect the unique character of the community; • An increase to the height from the initial proposed height of 30 metres is unacceptable; • The original vision for The Bridges called for medium density; • Low profile buildings fit the context of the existing neighbourhood; • A maximum height of 6 to 8 storeys for this site is adequate; • Applicant's proposal for a car-free development can be achieved without increasing the proposed height; and • Building height will overcrowd the neighbourhood.
Shadowing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential shadowing impacts on Murdoch Park; • Potential shadowing of buildings to the east; and • Proximity of other structures to the proposed future development with a height of 50 metres will create significant shadows across the community.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 13 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

**Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13**

**ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380**

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future development will block views of nearby residents; • Negative impact on property values of adjacent buildings associated with loss of views; and • Future development will impact sunlight for adjacent residents.
Parking Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to transit is very good in this location, however a reduced car dependency over the next decade or two is insufficient for the parking proposed; • The Developer's "commitment to transit demand management" needs more explanation and detail; • Unclear how car share parking will be implemented in a future development; • Unclear how developer's will regulate and ensure future tenants do not get additional street permit parking; • 'We aren't ready to be a car free city. The amenities don't make it easy to be car free'; • Visitor parking for future development will spillover onto adjacent streets; and • Adequate parking can be accommodated on-site if the number of units and height is decreased.
Parking / Traffic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implication of density on existing limited parking in the area; • Adequate parking is already difficult for existing area residents; • Existing traffic and parking problems exist already along 9 Street NE; and • Increased noise pollution and safety issues at nearby intersections as a result of increased density.
Property Values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns related to potential loss in property values due to proposed development, potential number of units and proposed height; and • Rental units will negatively impact the community and property values.
Commercial Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of commercial uses in this would negatively impact adjacent residents through increased traffic and parking congestion; • Infrastructure in this area does not align with an increase in commercial activity; and • Commercial uses in this area make sense, but not in conjunction with 20 storey building.
Other Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any future development in this area should provide new additional amenities or community benefit to support the already high density in the area; • Concerns regarding demand for these types of units; • Concerns that proposed development follow fate of adjacent development site, and have similar water table issues with any future underground parkade; • Concerns regarding separation distance between development along 9 Street NE; and • This proposal does not align with and undermines The Bridges and impacts the integrity of the larger plan area.

Strategic Alignment

South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (Statutory, 2014)

The recommendation by Administration in this report has considered and is aligned with the policy direction of the *South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (SSRP)*, which directs population growth in the region to Cities and Towns and promotes the efficient use of land.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 14 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

**Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193**

Municipal Development Plan (Statutory, 2009)

In accordance with the Urban Structure Map (Map 1) of the *Municipal Development Plan* (MDP), the subject site is identified as being located within the Developed Residential Area – Inner City Area. The land use policies in section 3.5.2 state that Inner City areas should maintain and expand, where warranted by increased population, local commercial development that provides retail and service uses in close proximity to residents, especially in the highest density locations. Buildings should maximize front door access to the street and principle areas to encourage pedestrian activity.

The MDP's City-wide policies, Section 2 and specifically Section 2.2 Shaping a More Compact Urban Form provides directions to encourage transit use, make optimal use of transit infrastructure, and improve the quality of the environment in communities. The intent of these policies is to direct future growth of the city in a way that fosters a more compact and efficient use of land, creates complete communities, allows for greater mobility choices and enhances vitality and character in local neighbourhoods.

The relevant policies within Section 2.2.2 are:

- a. Locate transit-supportive land uses, including higher density residential and employment developments, within Activity Centres and Corridors supported by Primary Transit Network.
- b. Increase development densities in proximity of the Primary Transit Network by targeting residential and employment intensities within 400 metres of transit stops, in areas deemed appropriate through the Local Area Planning process and in accordance with the Typology thresholds identified in Part 3.
- c. Locate land uses that will generate counter-flow transit ridership during peak-hour commuting times and support non-peak hour ridership.

The subject site is located within a 200 metres radius of the Bridgeland-Memorial LRT station. The proposed increase to the maximum building height and FAR supports mixed-use development that is transit-oriented and is in keeping with the above MDP policies.

Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan (Statutory, 1980)

The *Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP)* was adopted by Council in 1980. In 2002, a major amendment (25P2000) to the ARP was approved to include the Bow Valley Centre lands (former Calgary General Hospital). The amendments included policies and goals for The Bridges planning area. The policies were integrated in the *Bow Valley Centre Concept Plan*, which forms Section 9 of the *Bridgeland-Riverside ARP*.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 15 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE, LOC2016-0193

It should be noted that The City of Calgary is in the process of drafting a new ARP for Bridgeland-Riverside. Since 2002, major infrastructure improvements have taken place in the area and new MDP policies were adopted in 2009. Draft policies and land uses are being developed and reviewed.

As part of LOC2018-0059, amendments to the existing ARP were brought forward to Council in 2018 December. The subject site is identified as within the Transit Supportive Mixed Use area in Map 3: Generalized Land Use of the ARP and aligns with applicable policies.

Bow Valley Centre Concept Plan (BVC), Section 9 of the Bridgeland-Riverside Area Redevelopment Plan (Statutory, 2002)

The *BVC* is Section 9 of the ARP written for The Bridges planning area. The subject site is located within a Transit Supportive Mixed Use area as identified on Figure 19 – Conceptual Land Use map of the BVC. The subject site is also located adjacent to an Active Frontage corridor, which encourages active uses and/or active building design along 9 Street NE. As such, the proposed land use amendment aligns with the applicable policies of the BVC.

Social, Environmental, Economic (External)

The proposed land use amendment will implement policy goals of providing more compact, compete communities with a diversity of housing and a mix of uses that meet daily needs. Sustainability measures will be further evaluated at the development permit stage.

Financial Capacity

Current and Future Operating Budget:

There are no known impacts to the current and future operating budgets at this time.

Current and Future Capital Budget:

The proposed amendment does not trigger capital infrastructure investment and therefore there are no growth management concerns at this time.

Risk Assessment

If Council approves the proposed DC District, the specifics of the parking requirements cannot be further refined during the development permit review stage. This approval would limit the discretionary abilities of the Development Authority to request additional Transportation Demand Management measures to justify the parking supply. If the context of the larger plan area changes significantly after the approval of the land use amendment, the proposed DC District does not allow the Development Authority to further reassess parking demand and requirements for the site for future development permits. Further, approval of the proposed DC District would remove the ability for affected stakeholders to appeal parking requirements at the development permit stage when the actual development outcomes are better understood by all individuals.

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

Page 16 of 16
Item # 7.2.16

Planning & Development Report to
Calgary Planning Commission
2018 December 13

ISC: UNRESTRICTED
CPC2018-1380

Land Use Amendment in Bridgeland-Riverside (Ward 9) at 950 McPherson Square NE,
LOC2016-0193

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

While Administration supports the outcome of increased density, greater building height to allow flexibility in built form, and a mix of uses in close proximity to an existing LRT station, Administration is not in support of this application based on the use of a DC District and the proposed parking rates at the land use stage.

The intent of a DC District, as outlined in section 20(2) of the *Land Use Bylaw 1P2007*, is not to provide certainty for relaxations that can be considered by the Development Authority at the development permit stage nor is it to reduce the ability of any affected person to appeal future development permit(s). The use of a DC District is inappropriate for the purposes of solidifying a proposed parking relaxation and avoiding potential appeals.

The proposal generally aligns with applicable policies in the *Municipal Development Plan* and the *Bridgeland-Riverside Area Structure Plan*, and Administration is in support of an alternative stock district to the proposed Direct Control District to assist in achieving the proposed development outcome. The specific parking requirements for this site could then be more appropriately evaluated and assessed at the development permit stage.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Applicant's Submission
2. Proposed Direct Control Guidelines
3. A Comparison of the Proposed DC District and MU-1 Parking Requirements
4. Applicant Led Engagement Summary
5. Community Association Letters

Approval(s): K. Froese concurs with this report. Author: F. McLeod / C. Leung

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 1

Applicant's Submission

O2 Planning + Design Inc.
510 255 17th Ave SW T2S 2T8
Calgary | Alberta | Canada

T 403 228 1336
F 403 228 1320
E info@o2design.com



Applicant's Submission

On behalf of Jemm Properties, O2 Planning + Design is submitting this application to redesignate the parcel located at 950 McPherson Square in the community of Bridgeland-Riverside from Direct Control (2002z41) to a Direct Control based on the Mixed Use – General (MU-1 f5.5h50) district with a density modifier of 5.5 FAR and a height modifier of 50 metres. The proposed redesignation will allow for the development of a mixed-use purpose built rental building that takes advantage of the site's strategic location within 150 metres walking distance of the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT station.

The subject site is approximately 3,790 square metres. In addition to its proximity to the LRT, the site is less than 300 metres from the shops and services located along the 1 Ave NE Main Street. Immediately north of the site is Murdoch Park, home to the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association building. To the west is an ongoing development project intended to be a 6-storey residential building. To the east is an 8-storey residential building and to the south is a 6-storey mixed use development.

The proposed land use district will facilitate the development of a mixed-use building that will be designed with a variety of heights up to 15-storeys and will offer the following key attributes:

- **Transit Oriented Development:** The proposed development will contribute to Bridgeland-Riverside's ongoing evolution into one of Calgary's most complete transit oriented communities.
- **Mixed Use:** The addition of ground floor commercial uses along 9 St will add vibrancy to the neighbourhood and further incentivize residents to walk to the LRT.
- **Diverse Housing Options:** A purpose built rental development provides diverse housing options for residents of Bridgeland-Riverside.
- **Reduced Car Dependency:** Through a variety of transportation demand management measures, the proposed development will offer an alternative to a car dependent lifestyle.

The proposed parking count of between 0.3 stalls per dwelling unit reflects current trends in urban living and the associated shift away from car-dependent lifestyles. Given the site's proximity to transit, the walkable and cycle-friendly community, and Jemm Properties' commitment to transit demand management, the proposed development offers the opportunity to showcase a sustainable approach to urban planning.

A new Area Redevelopment Plan is currently being developed for Bridgeland-Riverside. The proposed development conforms to the intention of the draft ARP, which designates the subject site as Community – High Density, allowing for high-rise mixed-use developments with permitted building heights of 10 storeys and above.

Throughout the application process, Jemm Properties, along with O2 Planning + Design, has worked collaboratively with officials at the City of Calgary, representatives from the local Councillor's office and residents of Bridgeland-Riverside. Public engagement activities have included four meetings with the BRCA planning committee, a public open house and along with a project website.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 2

Proposed Direct Control Guidelines


WHEREAS it is desirable to amend the Land Use Bylaw Number 1P2007 to change the land use designation of certain lands within the City of Calgary;

AND WHEREAS Council has held a public hearing as required by Section 692 of the *Municipal Government Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c.M-26 as amended;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CALGARY ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Land Use Bylaw, being Bylaw 1P2007 of the City of Calgary, is hereby amended by deleting that portion of the Land Use District Map shown as shaded on Schedule "A" to this Bylaw and substituting therefor that portion of the Land Use District Map shown as shaded on Schedule "B" to this Bylaw, including any land use designation, or specific land uses and development guidelines contained in the said Schedule "B".

SCHEDULE A




CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 2

Proposed Direct Control Guidelines

SCHEDULE B



DIRECT CONTROL DISTRICT

Purpose

1 This Direct Control District is intended to:

- (a) accommodate transit supportive mixed-use *development* in compliance with the policies of the applicable local area redevelopment plan;
- (b) allow for high *density development* in close proximity to the Bridgeland-Memorial *LRT station*; and
- (c) implement the provisions of a *density* bonus system to achieve a maximum bonus *floor area ratio*.

Compliance with Bylaw 1P2007

2 Unless otherwise specified, the rules and provisions of Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Bylaw 1P2007 apply to this Direct Control District.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 2

Proposed Direct Control Guidelines

Reference to Bylaw 1P2007

- 3 Within this Direct Control District, a reference to a section of Bylaw 1P2007 is deemed to be a reference to the section as amended from time to time.

General Definitions

- 4 In this Direct Control District:

- (a) "**publicly accessible private open space**" means outdoor or indoor space located on the **development** site that is made available to the public through a registered public access easement agreement, in a location, form, configuration and constructed in a manner approved by the **Development Authority**.

Permitted Uses

- 5 The **permitted uses** of the Mixed Use – General (MU-1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the **permitted uses** in this Direct Control District.

Discretionary Uses

- 6 The **discretionary uses** of the Mixed Use – General (MU-1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the **discretionary uses** in this Direct Control District.

Bylaw 1P2007 District Rules

- 7 Unless otherwise specified, the rules of the Mixed Use – General (MU-1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 apply in this Direct Control District.

Floor Area Ratio

- 8 (1) The maximum **floor area ratio** is 5.3.
- (2) The maximum **floor area ratio** referenced in subsection (1) may be increased by an additional 0.2, to a maximum of 5.5, with the provision of a **publicly accessible private open space** no less than 150.0 square metres.
- (3) A **publicly accessible private open space** for which additional **gross floor area** has been achieved in accordance with subsection (2) must be maintained for the life of the **development**.

Building Height

- 9 The maximum **building height** is 50.0 metres.

Motor Vehicle Parking Stall Requirements

- 10 (1) The minimum number of **motor vehicle parking stalls**:
- (a) for each **Dwelling Unit** is 0.3 stalls per **unit**, and
- (b) for all other **uses** is 0.
- (2) There will be no further reductions to the required number of **motor vehicle parking stalls** set out in subsection (1).

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 3

A Comparison of the Proposed DC District and MU-1 Parking Requirements

Table 1: Proposed DC District Parking Requirement – Development Scenario

Proposed Direct Control District			
Use	Gross Usable Floor Area or Number of Units	Rate	Requirement
Dwelling Unit	250 units	0.3 resident stalls / unit including visitor parking	75
Visitor	250 units	0.00	0
Retail and Consumer Service	1000 m ²	0.00	0
Total Parking Stalls Required			75

Table 2: MU-1 Parking Requirement – Development Scenario

MU-1 District				
Use	Gross Usable Floor Area or Number of Units	Rate	Pre Reduction Requirement	Post Reduction for Transit Supportive Development (-25%) ^a
Dwelling Unit	250 units	0.75 resident stalls / unit	188	141
Visitor	250 units	0.1 visitor stalls / unit	25	19
Retail and Consumer Service	1000 m ²	2 stalls / 100 m ² of GUFA	20	15
Total Parking Stalls Required			233	175
Total Parking Stalls Required Post Reduction for Bicycle Supportive Development (-25%)^b				128

- a. Reduction for Transit Supportive Development – 25% off required parking when development site is located within 600 metres radius of an existing or approved LRT platform or within 150 metres of frequent bus service.
- b. For 250 units, 125 Class 1 Bicycle Parking is required (0.5 stalls / unit). If additional 188 Class 1 Bicycle Stalls are provided in addition to the 125 Class 1 Bicycle Parking required (total of 313 Class 1 Bicycle Parking Stalls provided), a maximum of 25% (47 stalls) of required parking for units provided can be reduced. This equates to approximately 1.25 bicycle parking per unit required to receive the full reduction.

As outlined in *Table 1 and Table 2* above, by using the MU-1 District's Transit Supportive and Bicycle Supportive reductions, a total of 128 parking stalls are required, including 94 residential parking stalls. This scenario results in a residential parking rate of 0.376 stalls per unit, which equates to a difference of 19 residential parking stalls from the proposed DC District.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

950 McPherson Square NE
What We Heard

Engagement & Communication Overview | November 2018

The graphic features a blue background with white text. Below the title, there is a grid of images showing public realm elements: Outdoor Seating, Wide Sidewalks, Street Trees, Active Retail Frontage, Active Residential Frontage, and Street Lighting. To the left, there are several sticky notes with handwritten feedback, such as "Grocery store", "Height is too much for ground use", "Provision for more resident parking off street", "CMT safety Cars - Trees? not enough signage.", "Too Tall Parking? What happens to the 49 bus.", "Looks like a residential square", "Could help to get across", and "MAYBE A LITTLE TOO TALL".

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Jemm Properties intends to develop the parcel located at 950 McPherson Square NE into a purpose built rental building that takes advantage of the site's proximity to the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station, the designated 1 Ave NE Main Street, and the Bow River Pathway.


As the first step in the approval process, O2 Planning + Design has submitted a land use amendment (rezoning) application to redesignate the land from the existing Direct Control District (DC 41z2002 – Site 13) to a Direct Control based on the Mixed Use – General District with a density modifier of 5.5 FAR and a height modifier of 50 metres (MU-1 f5.5h50).

The site is located on the west side of 9 St NE between McPherson Rd NE and McDougall Rd NE, within 130 metres of the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station.

The proposed development will showcase best practices in Transit Oriented Development and contribute to Bridgeland-Riverside's evolution into one of Calgary's most complete communities.

Project Highlights:

- Increase density closest to the LRT Station
- Activate 9th St NE to promote walking to the LRT
- Increase safety by adding eyes on the street
- Support a progressive, car-free lifestyle
- Activate McDougall Rd NE adjacent to Murdoch Park
- Diversify the housing stock with a purpose built rental building
- Introduce new retail and service amenities in the community



CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

To keep residents of Bridgeland-Riverside informed about the project and to provide opportunities for feedback, the project team engaged with the community at key points throughout the application process. Engagement activities included three meetings with the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association and one public open house.

ENGAGEMENT TIMELINE

July 3, 2018

The project team presented the proposed redesignation showing massing models representing 5.5 FAR and 40 metre height (12 storeys). The BRCA suggested that they would like to see different massing options with the same FAR.

August 7, 2018

The project team presented an alternative massing option with more variety in building height including 6 and 7 storey podiums and an 18 storey tower.

October 1, 2018

The project team presented a third massing option with 6 and 10 storey podiums and a 15 storey tower.

November 12, 2018

The project team hosted a Community Information Session, attended by more than 30 residents. Participants had the opportunity to view a series of information panels and ask questions of the project's developers, planners and architects.

WHAT CHANGED?

After each of the 3 meetings with the BRCA, the project team took action on the issues raised and amended the application to the extent possible, as described below.

- Following the July 3rd presentation, the design team began exploring alternate massing options while remaining with the target 5.5 FAR
- Two additional massing options were prepared and presented to the BRCA at separate meetings in August and October
- The massing option that was presented to the community on November 12 was the result of a series of changes made at the request of the BRCA
- In response to concerns about parking, the proposed parking supply was increased from 0.25 stalls per unit to 0.3 stalls per unit
- In response to concerns about density, and to provide the community with some certainty regarding public realm improvements, proposed density provisions were changed from 5.5 FAR to 5.3 FAR with 0.2 FAR available via bonusing by incorporating a minimum of 150 square metres of publicly accessible plaza space within the northeast corner of the site

During all of the engagement activities, the project team communicated to the community that 5.5 FAR is the target and that they are prepared to work with the BRCA and the City in determining the appropriate massing option at this density.

The project team did not receive endorsement from the community on any of the massing options.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

COMMUNITY INFORMATION SESSION

The project team hosted a community information session on November 12, 2018. To maximize attendance at the session, several advertising methods were adopted:

- **200 postcards** were distributed throughout the community including in adjacent buildings and in businesses along 1 Ave NE
- **20 posters** were placed in businesses along 1 Ave NE between 4 St NE and 11 St NE
- A **Bold Sign** was rented and placed opposite the south side of the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association Hall
- A **project website** included a banner directing visitors to the Community Information Session





What We Heard Summary | 3

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary



CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

COMMUNITY SESSION SUMMARY

On Monday November 12, 2018, residents of Bridgeland-Riverside were invited to share insights, feedback, and perspectives on the proposed 950 McPherson Square NE development.


The community information session provided residents with the opportunity to learn about the proposed development and speak directly with the project's developers, planners, and architects. Activities included information panels and a dotmocracy exercise.

Information Panels provided attendees with information about the proposed land use amendment, the planning process, and a preliminary design concept. Participants were encouraged to provide feedback by placing sticky note comments.

Dotmocracy allowed participants to identify the potential public realm improvements that they would like to see around the proposed development by placing a sticky dot below the associated photo.

Goals of the community session:

- Provide people with information about the proposed development
- Obtain local knowledge about issues and opportunities related to the subject site
- Gain feedback from residents that will assist in the decision making for the proposed development



What We Heard Summary | 5

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

PANEL COMMENTS SUMMARY

Participants at the information session were encouraged to leave comments on the various information boards. The following is a summary of the comments that were received.

HEIGHT & MASSING

- Height and massing is too much for the context of the community
- Building height is too tall around the park, resulting in shadowing impacts
- Consider reducing height from the tallest portion of the building
- Stepped design mitigates many of the height impacts, including view concerns

PARKING & ACCESS

- Concerns related to limited parking supply
- It is already difficult to find on-street parking in the area
- Need to consider cut-through traffic congestion and controls at 9th St NE and McDougall Rd NE
- Should consider options for loading zones for deliveries, drop-off/pick-up. Currently, people park on the McPherson Place and Bridgeland Crossings driveways for these purposes

SITE OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS

- There are lots of empty parcels in the neighbourhood. Once they are built up there will be lots of density in the area. There are 4 vacant lots in this 2-block area. If all the lots have high towers the community will feel like living downtown

UNIT MIX

- Development should support family friendly living, i.e., 2- and 3-bedroom units. There are several families living in adjacent buildings
- Proposed unit sizes (~500-1000 sq.ft.) could support families

- Proposed Dominion building (Bucci) is considering mostly small units (studios and 1-bedrooms). It is nice to see this development considering larger units

LANDSCAPE INTEGRATION

- Concerns that the area is starting to feel like a concrete jungle
- The development should provide street trees, plantings and green space

SERVICE & AMENITIES

- Development should consider amenities such as shared rooftop patio, fitness centre, car-wash, dog-wash, preferably accessible to all members of the neighbourhood

PUBLIC REALM

- Outdoor seating should be placed on the northeast corner to avoid noise on McPherson Rd NE
- There is strong support for the activated streets and proposed plaza spaces
- It will be great to have the final Bridges parcel developed

TRANSIT

- The low ridership numbers for Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station are the result of trains being full at peak times
- Bring back the #9 bus
- The development could trigger improvements to the Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station

6 | 950 McPherson Square NE

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4


Applicant Led Engagement Summary

SAFETY

- Concerns about safety around the LRT Station
- Development could trigger improvements to the drop-off area at the LRT Station, which is currently hazardous
- Development could help make the north side of the river safer

COMMERCIAL USES

- Development should encourage commercial uses such as a grocery store and a bakery
- Consider commercial uses that do not attract more drug users and transients



What We Heard Summary | 7


CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

DOTMOCRACY ACTIVITY SUMMARY

Participants at the information session were also given the opportunity to place sticky dots below corresponding images to indicate the potential public realm improvements that they would like to see.



The public realm improvements that received the most support were **street lighting** (5), **street plantings** (5) and **street trees** (4). This reflects the comments related to safety concerns along 9th St NE and near the LRT, as well as the desire for more trees, plantings and green space around the site.

Other public realm improvements that received support from more than one participant were **public benches** (3), **active retail frontage** (3) and **wide sidewalks** (2). These speak to the desire for a vibrant streetscape, particularly along 9th St NE, to encourage walkability and an active public realm.

Outdoor seating, **active residential frontage** and **bicycle parking** each received support from one participant, while **public art** did not receive any support.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

PROJECT WEBSITE

A project website was launched to provide information to residents who were unable to attend the engagement events. The website provided an additional opportunity for people to provide feedback.

In total, feedback was received from 4 residents via the website. These are summarized below.

PARKING & ACCESS

- It is already difficult to find parking in the area within the restrictions of the permit. Adding a development of this magnitude, with a limited parking supply, will reinforce this issue
- There is support for efforts to reduce car dependency, but concerns regarding how effective they will be
- Residents may be required to use up parking spaces in Bridgeland that are otherwise intended for local businesses
- With increased vehicle and pedestrian density in this area there needs to be safer ways to cross the streets. A pedestrian overpass or a signaled crosswalk at a minimum
- The proposed development should enforce a policy similar to McPherson Place, where on-street parking permits are only available to residents with ground floor units. This would help deter car owners from renting in a car-free building

SHADOW IMPACTS

- Any decrease in sunlight in Murdoch Park has a big impact on enjoyment of the park. This park is the heart of the neighbourhood

AFFORDABILITY

- There is support for making efforts to reduce the cost of renting a unit. An increase in density should result in units for all income levels
- 10-20% of new units should be dedicated for low income people

LANDSCAPE INTEGRATION

- All roof tops in the development should be green as these form a part of the viewscales for units around the park

COMMERCIAL USES

- While there is a big variety of businesses in the neighbourhood, there is no easy access to a moderately sized grocery store

HERITAGE

- Concerns regarding the spread of tall buildings dwarfing single family heritage homes. The City recognizes these as important but we are overvaluing the price of land and undervaluing the buildings around it

What We Heard Summary | 9

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

VERBATIM COMMENTS

Below are the verbatim comments received at the community information Session and via the project website.

How could this type of development best contribute to the neighbourhood?

- Grocery Store
- Height is too much for around the Park. Prefer the current zoning of 7 stories
- Like the activated streets and plazas and stepped design
- Provision for more residential parking off street
- LRT safety. Cars. Trees?? Not enough organics
- Too tall. Parking? What happened to the #9 bus
- Improve drop-off area for train. Hazardous as is!
- Too tall along 9th St
- Looks like a concrete jungle
- Could help to get the C-Train station renovated + north side of river made safer
- Maybe a little too tall
- Need to consider "type" of commercial development to not attract more drug users and transients
- Need to consider cut-through traffic congestion & controls at 9th St and McDougall (which is endemic to the whole area)
- Bakery
- Happy the unit sizes could support families (unlike Dominion)
- Trees for oxygen
- Development should support family living, i.e., two- and three-bedroom units – we have a number of families in Bridgeland Crossings

Do you have any additional questions or comments regarding this land use redesignation?

- Knock a few stories off the tallest tower
- Would be good for the developer to finish this Bridges project
- (Is the) Rooftop patio for residents?
- No Parking? Not here now
- Too tall and too much shadowing
- Happy its not going to be 20 stories! A few shorter would still fit the Bridges better
- How will you contribute to the overall community?
- Loading zone for deliveries, cabs, dropping people off, Canada Post/UPS. Right now ppl park on McPherson Place and Bridgeland Crossings driveways

10 | 950 McPherson Square NE

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary

Additional Comments

- Bridgeland/Memorial LRT Station has the lowest ridership because trains are packed at peak times
- Outdoor seating on the NE side to avoid noise on McPherson
- I provided comments on sticky notes regarding height of development, type of commercial development, traffic problems in Bridgeland/Riverside and importance of the development to not worsen this problem. Some units should be amenable to family living, i.e., 2 or 3 bedrooms
- Towers are too high for this community. There are lots of empty lots in the neighbourhood. Once they are built up there will be lots of density in this area. There are 4 vacant lots in this 2 block area. If all of the lots have high towers the community will feel like living downtown. I did not move into this community to have that confestion

Website Feedback

- Car Free concerns me, and I will fight it. There are many of us who live in the area who must use street parking. It is already an issue in the area. It is often difficult to find parking within the restrictions of the permit. Through promoting car free, and not having parking available for residents, you are going to be adding the vehicles of hundreds of units to the surrounding streets
- I attended the community consultation on Nov. 12th. Here are a few of my concerns that I raised with the JEMM reps.
 1. Parking - I don't believe there is enough parking spaces for a building of this size (0.3/unit). I do applaud efforts to reduce cars and the cost of units in the city. What is stopping renters from using parking spaces across Bridgeland that would otherwise go to people using the businesses in the neighbourhood?
 2. Crossings - I cross McDougall and 9th street almost daily with young children. It's not easy with all the traffic to and from Memorial. With increased vehicle and pedestrian density in this area there needs to be safer ways of crossing these streets. A pedestrian overpass or a signakled crosswalk is a minimum with the increased density.
 3. Low income housing - I think it's great that the developer is making efforts to reduce the cost of renting a unit. If they want to increase the density of a neighbourhood it should be for all income levels. A portion of the units (10-20%) should be dedicated for low income people if this zoning change is going to go ahead.
 4. Rooftop gardens - I think all the roofs in the city should be covered with greenery. The drawings show gardens on the middle level but it should really be on the lower level as well. This will be part of our viewscape for the units around the park.
 5. Commercial space - Our neighbourhood has big variety of businesses but it does not have easy access to a moderately sized grocery store.

What We Heard Summary | 11

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 4

Applicant Led Engagement Summary


6. Shade - I use Murdoch Park almost daily with my daughters, including in the winter. Any decrease in sunlight in the park has big impact of our enjoyment of the park. This park is the heart of our neighbourhood.
 7. I own a small heritage house on the West end of Murdoch Park. I am most concerned with the spread of tall apartment buildings dwarfing the single family dwellings that have been around for over 100 years that the city already recognizes as important. If the developers can't afford to build in this neighbourhood without increasing the height of the buildings maybe they are not the right buildings for our neighbourhood. We're overvaluing the price of and undervaluing the value of the buildings around it.
- Hi there, I live across the street in McPherson Place. The agreement our building has is that if you do not live on the main floor you do not get a permit for street parking. So, if you live on floors 2-6 and have a second car you cannot get a street parking permit. With your building proposed as car free, I would hope the city looks at that as well. You know people are going to move into your building that own cars. We aren't ready to be a car free city. The amenities just don't make it easy to be car free. By not being allowed permit parking, it would deter those with a car. You already know that parking is a premium in our block. By making your building taller and less parking for it, it will cause major parking headaches. Thank you.
 - In your diagram picture you have Bucci Dominion as being two towers. This has not been finalized yet? Also, who is the architect firm you went through and name of your lawyers? Also, did anyone in your company donate money to Carra or the two councillors on the City Planning committee? Gondek and Woolley?


12 | 950 McPherson Square NE


CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 5

Community Association Letters

 Mon 12/3/2018 4:05 PM
Planning Director <planning@brcacalgary.org>
[EXT] Re: LOC2016-0193 proposed DC

To:  Leung, Christine N.

 Click here to download pictures. To help protect your privacy, Outlook prevented automatic download of some pictures in this message.

Action Items + Get more actions

Thank you for circulating this DC to us.

We were not aware JEMM was applying for a DC. We assumed it was MU stock district. There has been no engagement on a DC and its implications or rationale for why they are going that way - especially with no concurrent DP. It is very concerning to us that they have no visitor or commercial parking. The risk to the developer is on the residential parking. However the risk to the community is on the commercial and visitor side. We firmly believe parking is still essential for retail to be successful here and the community to not be adversely impacted. Especially since they are already asking for substantially less parking for residential and a height and density increase that is so substantial with no DP. Do they have more bike parking? We are lacking sufficient information to support this and support the City's recommendations for refusal at this point.

Furthermore permitted uses were also a sticking point we thought we negotiated with the developer. We didn't want any non-active uses in this location such as medical - see our letter about this.

It seems the information has changed quite significantly since we last spoke to the development team and hope you can take these concerns forward to CPC on our behalf.

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 5

Community Association Letters



Planning Committee
917 Centre Avenue NE Calgary AB T2E0C6
brcacalgary.org

20 Nov 2018

Circulation Control
Planning, Development & Assessment #8201
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P2M5

Attn: CPAG.Circ@calgary.ca
cc: Christine Leung, File Manager (christine.leung@calgary.ca)
Ali McMillan, BRCA Planning Director (planning@brcacalgary.org)

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: LOC2018-0193 (950 McPherson Square NE)

Thank you for the opportunity to update our last letter on this file which we submitted in August 2018. The applicant held an open house this month in the community. Our updated comments reflect feedback from our Planning Committee as well as a general sense of what BRCA has heard in and around the community with respect to the captioned application for a Land Use Amendment. We have not conducted any fresh engagement of our own since the date of the Applicant's open house. Please read this letter in concert with our previous letters to ensure you have the full picture of community feedback to date. This letter is not intended to replace feedback in previous letters but is a supplement.

The strongest design statement we might make is that there is some general support for a "less monolithic" design (for lack of a better way of expressing the point) and a related sense that the 50m height is more appropriate. That said, there are still those in the community who feel the building is still too tall and out of scale with the original Bridges Master Plan and existing buildings. And the broader context, of course, is some awareness within the community as well about the other active proposal by Bucci for two 50 m towers also in Bridges. Depending on what happens with that other application, some feel that the nearby sense of scale should be reconsidered; again, conversely, though, there are those who think that the same debate about appropriate height and the original vision for the Bridges should apply to that Bucci project just as it should for this proposed project, too. Speaking contextually, we have also heard some make the suggestion that the height profile of Bridges should take into consideration the 60m Calgary Housing tower to the southwest of Murdoch Park. Suffice to say it will be important to consider the scale of all of these buildings in relation to one another when looking at this application and what will best fit.

There is a knotty problem built into this file, which is that FAR goals are necessarily driven by price / land value. At one point in recent history, Real Estate and Development Services approached BRCA advising that it was proposing to apply for a higher FAR for this site to make its sale more attractive at

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 5

Community Association Letters

the listed price. There was discussion about a need to get this fallow land into development (a point about which all agree). Then the applicant appeared on the scene and responsibility for the FAR application was transferred from REDS to the applicant. The applicant has been very clear with BRCA throughout that the proposed FAR is needed to support its conditional deal with the City at the pricing levels assumed, and that it would struggle to achieve the applied-for FAR except via a "monolithic" approach, and thus changes in height and parking are being proposed. It bears emphasis, however, that all of this conversation about height and parking being driven by commercial FAR assumptions commences with City-led expectations or assumptions about pricing. The City as landowner obviously controls its asking price and expectations, but doesn't it go without saying that if those expectations are set at a certain level, then the issues of FAR, height, and parking are necessarily triggered? What we have never had an opportunity to be "engaged about" in our community is what size and sort of building in this particular TOD location might best build our community, and from which the City might build its approach to price and marketing, rather than the other way around.

Shadowing on Murdoch Park, the Community Association, lands and the pathway system is a very big concern for both residents and BRCA. We understand the City has done additional shadow studies to analyze these impacts. If the massing of the tower were pushed as far to the south / closer to the train as possible that would be preferred, from a shadowing perspective.

We also continue to hear many concerns expressed from residents about the proposal for reduced parking. Calgary Parking Authority states that there is, at present, not enough demand to monetize street parking but that they will continue to monitor this issue moving forward. Our constant refrain is that street parking must be kept available for visitors to the community and there must be parking to support the commercial businesses desired in a complete community. Perhaps carshare options could be helpful.

We can appreciate the applicant's commercial desire for additional FAR consideration and, in consequence, the applicant's willingness to contribute to developing a superior public realm. We look forward to working with the developer to achieve this at the DP stage and work collaboratively to improve public amenities in the area.

It is unfortunate that given the variety of larger asks by the developer – greater height, significant parking reductions and increased FAR – that they are not able to submit a concurrent DP application in this case. We feel that such an approach would help build confidence within the community.

We understand the developer is considering a broader mix of unit sizes? We hope this will be pursued since the community has few 3 bedroom options in TOD condos for families.

We would appreciate if the uses permissible on the site were limited at this land use stage to preclude proliferation of non-active uses down the road. We would prefer to see land use outcomes that might encourage retail and consumer services, breweries, wineries, distilleries, outdoor cafés, restaurants, and supermarkets, etc. As previously mentioned we tend to oppose medical uses in this location given their predominance elsewhere in the community already.

Sincerely,

BRIDGELAND-RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Per: BRCA Board of Directors
Planning Committee

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 5

Community Association Letters



Planning Committee
917 Centre Avenue NE Calgary AB T2E0C6
brccalgary.org

20 Aug 2018

Circulation Control
Planning, Development & Assessment #8201
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary AB T2P2M5

Attn: CPAG.Circ@calgary.ca
cc: Christine Leung, File Manager (christine.leung@calgary.ca)
Ali McMillan, BRCA Planning Director (planning@brccalgary.org)

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: LOC2018-0193 (950 McPherson Square NE)

Thank you for the opportunity to comment again with respect to the changes to application for a Land Use Amendment affecting land at 950 McPherson Square NE (LOC2018-0193).

This Land Use Application was most recently discussed at a meeting of our Planning Committee convened August 7, 2018. Notice of that meeting was given to neighbours adjacent to the subject parcel through the Condo Boards and previous concerned residents via email. Approximately 4 neighbors attended, as did many regular Planning Committee members. The applicant attended the meeting along with 02 Planning and Design and did a presentation overview. The City File Managers also attended.

In our pre-application meeting with the applicant, the applicant presented a 13 storey building concept massed to fill the entire building envelope, based on a presumed increased F.A.R. of 5.5, that the City itself (Real Estate and Development Services) had been proposing to make, apparently to increase the marketability of the proposal. Based on the monolithic massing of the proposed building shown at that pre-application meeting, and while assuming a changed F.A.R. in light of the City's own plans in this regard, we had asked the applicant to explore other architectural possibilities to reduce the heaviness and lack of character of the proposed massing as first presented.

The response by the applicant has been a 60m height design, that although most probably consider aesthetically more appealing, especially as rendered, has very significant issues with height and if built would create a landmark height visible from every point in the community. The true impact of this proposal cannot be fully determined without a

CPC Report (CPC2018-1380) Heard at 2018 December 13 CPC Meeting

CPC2018-1380
Attachment 5

Community Association Letters

correlating building design, and except alongside the outcome of other proposed towers in the community that would exceed in height the original intentions of The Bridges master plan. We firmly believe that given that this idea is such a departure from the original master plan, a concurrent DP is essential at the least. Further, all the massing and developer objectives are based on a F.A.R. that is proposed and not yet deemed as suitable for the site.

We feel that this developer is asking for a lot. A huge parking relaxation, a large height increase, nothing on the table by way of guarantees, and little or no benefit to the community for all the financial benefit they are looking to achieve.

Parking is always a mentioned issue in an established community's planning response, and in this instance we do not see any substantiated rationale for such a low amount of parking in an area un-serviced by major amenities like grocers, shopping malls and the like. Commercial or retail uses would also be starved of parking in our understanding, a problem in an area that is not a "destination" shopping area, and where vehicle access is likely. Further, we would also like to see a mix of unit sizes and ownership models for broader demographic uses.

We would like to see at Transportation Impact Assessment done for the entire Bridges area considering the applicant's request for a dramatic reduction in parking. Our main concern remains commercial and visitor parking options both on site and within the community on the street and its impacts. We are still a winter city and our experience with reduced parking in the Bridges in general has been mixed. Commuting aside, many people own cars for recreational use—to travel out of town to the mountains, etc. Further since the City has provided special permitted parking for two condos in the Bridges on McPherson Rd and Center Ave NE, there are additional limitations on street parking in the area. This seems unfair to the area as a whole.

A discussion of how this development brings community benefit has not happened. The desire for a community-scale grocery store is high but the applicant stated this is not possible on this site. How will the applicant contribute to improving the public realm/ community assets in the area?

Further we would like to limit non-active uses in the application, and see the addition of more active uses to further encourage retail and consumer services, brewery, winery, distillery, outdoor café, restaurants, and supermarkets. We oppose medical uses in this location given their predominance elsewhere in the community already.

We are also unaware of any public engagements to date. We understand the applicant is planning to undertake one in early September. We think there will need to be significant online and in person information presented for feedback to the broader community due to the broad implications the scale of this development has.

Sincerely,

BRIDGELAND-RIVERSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

Per: BRCA Board of Directors
Planning Committee