



Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

June 24, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Share Back Session

Project overview

Communities are never static, they are constantly evolving and growing. As communities grow, change, and adapt over time, the choices and opportunities for its existing and new residents should increase. Increasing choice allows residents to age in their community and families to thrive; choice allows people to try different food and shops that suit their individual style and tastes; choice allows people of various abilities, ages, and skills to play, relax and recover in a way that meets their needs. Communities benefit and become more vibrant and resilient by offering choice.

The Guidebook is a set of planning policies based on the following core values that support a community conversation about how great communities for everyone can be achieved in Calgary. The policies found in this Guidebook direct local area plans, planners, communities, residents and industry members to implement these core values. Great communities for everyone function as cohesive places, often consisting of several traditional neighbourhood areas, where residents and visitors can work, live, recreate, get what they need and want, and feel welcomed.

Engagement overview

Since the approval of the Guidebook in 2017, Administration has been actively engaging with communities and stakeholders to use the Guidebook through local area planning processes and applications. Collaboration and feedback have given staff a lot of great information that is being used to inform the next-generation Guidebook. Phase 1 included engagement with communities and stakeholders through local area plan engagements, online surveys, and meetings with various groups. Phase 2 engagement includes targeted engagement with representatives from communities, the Federation of Calgary Communities, developers, and other stakeholders to help us refine the tools that were informed by the Phase 1 engagements.

What we asked

The Multi-Stakeholder Share Back Session was held to provide clarity on:

- Great Communities for Everyone
- What is going on and why
- Feedback that we heard through engagements, circulations, and reports to committees and Council
- Big moves that we have made

Staff shared with stakeholders the “what” and the “why” of the next generation system of planning. Administration researched more than 75 engagement reports, meeting minutes, feedback documents, and letters dating back to 2015. *Please see the *Great Communities for Everyone – Summary of Planning Engagements* for more details.



Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

June 24, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Share Back Session

Staff shared with stakeholders details about the system change, the new Guidebook structure, Guidebook content and policy, and the next steps for a renewed Land Use Bylaw. Discussions were held on each of the topics, and this report outlines the feedback received from attendees.

What we heard

The following feedback was received and is themed below.

Planning System Change

- Agree with the system change but need to get all departments involved, not just Planning and Development.
- Like the human-centric approach.
- Overall, when receiving feedback for the Guidebook, ensure that development continues to occur. Requested changes may result in several “tip points” that may make development difficult as it is already difficult to build in the established areas.
- Develop, not preserve these areas.
- The system “fails” toward the end of the process – at the approval stage – so we need to make sure that the “system change” gets carried through the entire process.
- Ensure documents are useable and will decrease mis-interpretation of the policy. Ensure a common understanding of what is expected.
- The graphics are the same (uniform) so it may seem as all development needs to look that way. Possibility of doing different graphics or photographs to illustrate the outcome? The graphics make it look as though all existing development is gone.
- Consistency across documents all the way through to approval (the action end of the continuum)
- Don’t bog down development potential with too much policy/rules

Guidebook Structure

- Have the urban form categories been tested against a current or currently reviewed LAP?
- Are the building blocks to stand on their own or do they overlap?

Guidebook Content and Policies

- Are school sites part of the parks policy?
- Schools, CAs, etc – there are a number of facilities that communities have to maintain on behalf of the city and yet there is funding gap. Need to address the idea of investment for intensity to help address the already large funding gap.
- Like the content and policies. There is a bit of a gap as the policies are what we want in the future but interim policies seem to be missing. One example is setbacks and how are we moving forward with contextual setbacks? There is not a lot about trees either and there is a significant loss of trees in the established areas.
- Most of the areas for the Parks UFC are those that the City maintains. If there is increased density, this leads to increased use of these sites. This may impact community associations by needing more assistance with maintenance. Which in turn may impact the level of investment needed for these sites.

- Parking
 - Will there be as many restrictions as there are today?
 - Worried about min becoming max. number of surface parking and yet development sees that as being the opportunities for future growth (on surface parking). If there is limited parking, this could impact the overall success of the building or attraction of industries that may need more parking
 - If we get underground parking wrong then it's wrong forever and there is no fixing that.
 - Current RFPs from investors and multi-national companies come in stating that they want XXXX parking so we need to be flexible to allow for that if we want those companies to come here.
 - Minimum parking today may not meet our future needs – how are we ensuring we are meeting future parking requirements?
 - There can't be an attitude that we shall not provide any parking – wrong attitude.
 - Flexibility for parking should go both ways – sometimes more parking at the beginning of a project can allow for more flexibility in the long run as the project evolves
 - What is wrong with providing more parking? To cap parking based on uses doesn't make sense.
 - If we allow for surface parking and then there is opportunity for it to be something else in the future – isn't that a good thing?
 - As long as we are meeting other goals? Like environmental, etc.?
 - Social engineering of it all is what's frustrating – no one wants to build too much parking.
 - Let's right size parking
 - Need to ensure that parking does not dominate the overall picture as it needs to be considered with the other policies. Should not look at parking in isolation as there are environmental considerations as well.
- Would like a review of the heritage section as there are cultural elements that should be considered, not just the built-form (look).
- Concern regarding the continued use of DCs to determine heritage bonusing. There are background negotiations, but if you use the DC as the tool, then Council could undo agreements between the two affected parties. The commenter was then asked to provide alternatives to using DCs when providing additional comments that may enhance heritage transfers.
- Are the heritage bonus policies final? Is it a viable tool? Is this the right system?
- Heritage density transfer bonusing - Council can't be fettered by any negotiations or deals to transfer density. Who would ever even enter into this negotiation? Is there a better way to do it?
 - It's been used in Beltline.
 - Heritage advocates feel like this is one of the only tools they have and they like it.
 - Any application is in the same position (council can't be fettered)
- For the Special Policy areas, the difference between a Comprehensive and Future Plan area is not that clear. Need to differentiate with more clarity. Is there another tool such as a "Master Plan" that could be considered and determine the items that would be part of this plan, like an Outline Plan. The Master Plan provides a general concept but would not be as detailed as an outline plan. What instrument is anticipated to be used? Is it a master plan? Should we not be clear about that. What if there is no outline plan yet? What tool? And if we do not currently have a tool – we need to think about creating one to be used.

- The 1 hectare area notation may not be the best criteria. 1 ha sites are typically a standard multi-residential area whereas the Comprehensive and Future Plan areas are likely to be larger.
- Like the overall perspective of the building as being part of the overall outcome, not the building being the end in itself. It's the city we want to build.
- Language is still complicated. Needs to be in plain language for more people to understand.
- Community amenities are the responsibility of the City. Would this then download to the developer.
- The vehicle oriented policy may make the overall development difficult, and will cause issues for other departments. The transition of gas stations serving a region rather than local area is likely. To reduce access points and minimize the width of curb cuts doesn't allow tankers to service the gas station. This section may also create increased tensions and timing on development because of conflicting requirements between departments.
- There is may be a gap on edge conditions for the vehicle oriented policy.
- Caution around restricting the number of (number of gas stations for example) as if they are limited in number the ones left become more of a regional draw which also has consequences.
- Is there an opportunity to see how the Guidebook may work with a local area plan that is underway? This would help determine if there are gaps. This could also determine if policies in the Bridgeland/Riverside ARP and/or Inglewood Ramsey ARP could be incorporated into the Guidebook instead of having standalone ARPs.
- Need to be clear on the expectations and what is happening in the next steps. Not sure where all of this is going.
- Policy missing – setbacks. Concerned about contextual setbacks – are our front lawns way too big?
- Policy missing? Trees – flexibility to keep when we can?
- What about natural environments/cultural landscape inclusion?

Next Steps for a Renewed Land Use Bylaw

- Who is the “audience” for the LUB? If it is for a broader group, then plain language needs to be used. Agree with the 9 principles and 5 concepts.
- What does bold mean? What does the new infill district look like? Like the concept of being bold but in order to be bold, need to be different than the current structure, etc. of the LUB.
- Quote “it will have to be a bad ass bylaw”
- Will it be smaller? Will it be more permissive? One participant noted that if the LUB is smaller, that would lead to less regulation and be more permissive.
- How will this impact SDAB? We know appeals are low cost but have big impacts on development.
 - are we aiming to achieve it where we are able to say ‘if it aligns with what we want to achieve, then it is not appealable’?
 - Can we?
 - Outcomes being promoted are being implemented – is that ultimately what we want?
- Is the idea to redesignate all of the land within an LAP when the LAP has been adopted?
- When will the LAPs be completed so the city will be under the new districts? A: 2023
- Like this approach as this is what should have been done when 1P2007 was developed.
- Super aggressive timelines. Should take the time to get it right.
- New districts should be applied everywhere, not just for the areas with the new LAPs.



Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard

June 24, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Share Back Session

- Is there a possibility for one district for infill? This would be a supported option.
- Success of this new approach will be determined by infill development. Agree with the ideas and concepts but may get resistance from the general public. We will need to build up a case for change, since at the moment, the benefit isn't there. Also, the timelines are ambitious.
- Need to be clear on the intent and what people will benefit from what we are trying to achieve.
- Need to be mindful that the timeline bumps up to an election year.
- The new LUB may take too long to implement, where it should apply right away.
- New district
 - We have seen these things go wrong.
 - Be honest. 'new conversation' if it is then say it, be upfront. Don't hide it. What do you really mean by that – say it, do it
 - Otherwise, feel like you are punting some stuff down the road and we lose trust
 - If you intend to do something – and it's the right thing to do – then say it, do it
 - Commensurate with benefit and we are not there yet.
 - Choice isn't density
- Future risk with upcoming election. This could be politicized.
- Most contentious work we are doing right now is 4 unit R-CG.
 - Get that right first. Get that ahead of the election? Then shift to the rest?
 - Take the next 20 steps down the road (?)
- Concerned that this way of implementing through MCP is going to take too long. Liked 2P80 to 1P2007. Just get the new bylaw on the ground.