

Calgary Planning Commission Discussion

Comment/Question	Administration's Response
<p>1.0 New Approach – Discussion of three options on how to address infill development in the Land Use Bylaw:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Status Quo 2) Clean Up Existing Land Use Bylaw 3) Develop new districts based on the Guidebook 	
<p>If option 3 is chosen will we be abandoning the technical amendments outlined in this report?</p>	<p>No, will recommend these changes but cease any further technical amendments and in Q3 2019 propose to pursue option 3 for a new conversation on shaping and creating great communities, using a new planning approach/system.</p> <p>New planning/system approach should reduce the number of follow up reports (over 40 reports to address infill development to date, with limited success) and will allow resources to be directed towards this new approach.</p> <p>There is recognition that the Land Use Bylaw 1P2007 regulations were developed prior to policy changes in the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and the creation of the Developed Areas Guidebook (the Guidebook). Consequently, regulations and policy may not be aligned, thus the recommendation of option 3.</p>
<p>If Calgary is looking to adopt a form-based code, thorough research should be conducted (by both CPC members and Administration) to ensure implementation is effective and efficient. Cities in the United States that have implemented a form-based code have had several challenges with implementation.</p>	<p>Calgary is considering a hybrid of a form-based code and land use code with complementary documentation (How to Guides). No other jurisdictions have adopted this approach at this time.</p>
<p>Miami is a well-known case study of adopting a form-based code, are there any other jurisdictions that</p>	<p>In addition to Miami, research has been conducted on plans and codes by Denver, Minneapolis and small areas within various cities. The review is not to fully adopt the</p>

<p>Administration has researched that CPC members can review?</p>	<p>approach of one jurisdiction but to adopt the elements that would work for the Calgary context.</p>
<p>What is the status of the Guidebook and how will this translate to districts in the Land Use Bylaw? If the concept is a hybrid code, then the use of modifiers to respond to the varying contexts will be necessary.</p>	<p>Modifiers will be utilized, and local area plans are key to the overall planning system being proposed.</p> <p>Detailed conversations of building great communities will be reflected in local area plans.</p>
<p>The City must engage specific stakeholders when developing local area plans, the Guidebook and the Bylaw to ensure policies and regulations are practical.</p>	<p>There will be a cross-section of stakeholders helping inform local area plans, the Guidebook and the Bylaw.</p>
<p>How will option 3 support Direct Control Districts?</p>	<p>Districts will be responsive and the overall approach to planning will be different. For example, some Direct Control Districts are a result of wanting to be innovative and may alter standard parking requirements. Option 3 will enable Administration to look at parking and several other planning related elements in a different, “out of the box” manner.</p>
<p>What are the timelines for each option?</p> <p>Option 3 would take the longest.</p>	<p>Option 1 will continue as normal, with limited connections to the new Guidebook.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 have the same timelines with different end results.</p> <p>Option 2 would be a clean-up of the existing bylaw within its existing framework, which may still not be able to align well with the policies of the Guidebook.</p> <p>Option 3 will create new districts that are aligned with the Guidebook.</p>
<p>2.0 Technical Amendments</p>	
<p>2.1 Height</p>	
<p>Changing the way height is measured may create confusion. There is confusion currently with the way height is measured.</p> <p>Any changes should be simple and not complicated.</p>	<p>Proposal is to have all duplex, singles and semi-detached dwellings in the Developed Area be measured from grade to be consistent with the way the same built forms are measured in the R-CG District. This will create a consistent measurement for all low density forms in the Developed Area.</p>

<p>2.2 Tree Requirements for Discretionary Duplex, Single and Semi Dwellings</p>	
<p>No comments provided.</p>	
<p>2.3 Green Landscaping – Option to Plant a New Tree in an Adjacent Boulevard to meet Tree Planting Requirements</p>	
<p>How will the allowance for tree planting in the boulevard be implemented? Urban Forestry faces challenges with existing processes and maintenance.</p>	<p>If the option of planting a tree in the boulevard is feasible, it will be done through the existing development permit process through a condition in the permit. Urban Forestry is supportive of this amendment.</p> <p>This amendment is likely to impact multi-residential development more than low density developments.</p>
<p>Would an option for cash-in-lieu be a consideration?</p>	<p>As this is a new concept, Urban Forestry prefers an applicant or homeowner to plant a tree rather than provide a monetary contribution. However, this is something Administration is willing to investigate in the future.</p>