



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## Project overview

Communities are in a constant state of evolution and growth. The Developed Areas Guidebook (Guidebook) is an important tool – together with the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), local area plans, and the Land Use Bylaw – that supports growth and change, and building great neighbourhoods. The purpose of the Guidebook is to provide a consistent planning approach through a land use framework (Building Blocks) to guide development and the local area planning process. The goal of the Guidebook is to provide a tool that can help us to achieve our outcomes in the MDP by supporting healthy communities, transit and infrastructure investment, housing choice, increased density in strategic areas, and mobility choice.

## 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

Stakeholders participated in workshops on the Great Neighbourhoods for Everyone with a focus on five topic areas including the new draft Building Blocks, draft Special Policy Areas, draft Scale and Transition, draft Implementation, and draft Common Policies. Stakeholders had the opportunity to participate in a World Café-style event where they could get information on each topic, ask questions, and provide feedback. Stakeholders were also able to comment on options for naming conventions for various aspects of the Developed Areas Guidebook.



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## What we heard

The following feedback was received, and represents verbatim feedback.

### Building Blocks

#### *What is working?*

- Guidebook can be specific to identify best practices & allow for flexibility
- Transition piece is good to get for res to ind
- Prod – Comm, secure campus needs (IT)
- Light industrial can be integrated w/mu – not just segregated to industrial

#### *What isn't working?*

- Prod – office/c – still car focused; uncomfortable w/ parking upfront; why prioritize parking
- (comment on above note) Be cautious here. Not all office, all location is transit friendly. Need parking still
- P-O/C – landscaping is good but where are benches and greenspace; ops to go outside; amenity space
- Prod shouldn't just be auto-oriented – not everywhere
- Industrial areas – hard to walk around
- Perception; street = road; sidewalk; active transo
- Prod. Res – adding res to prod muddies the water; is this really in neighbourhood?
- Production BBs – do we choose 1 of the secondary bullets? (re: comm, general, office, heavy, Res); seems too specific
- N; Is there a separation where commercial is not allowed? ie: cul-de-sac away from major area
- The definitions of building blocks have a lot of overlap. Some examples or clarity?
- Where res. gets added to prod really what your looking at trans. to neigh
- Is there a strong enough distinction between minor and Interior? Appear to be many shared elements
- Could campus be called "institutional"?

#### *What is missing?*

- Economic bonus to have active frontage; intimate space; connections; (Fairview) supported by residents but uncomfortable to walk there
- As City grows – need to convert housing to mixed use; how do we transition to mu from H
- (related to previous comment) Mixed use is difficult for financing & building and fire codes. Needs to be economically viable. Not viable everywhere
- How does cycling integrate w/ walking and other active modes?
- When is it not acceptable to have a site designated as a Future Planning Area? ie any areas too important to the CA



- 1) Policy to focus commercial (commercial as a benefit), 2) Drive focus to node, 3) Extend “MU” attributes to more residential, 4) Focus districts
- Residential in production is confusing. Is it a different type of mixed use?
- Office district (production) – only for secure campus otherwise direct to neighbourhood
- Make sure to integrate urban design principles into the bldg blk policy. Help to consider it as integral to dev’d (comment accompanied by diagram of MU on one side of activity with H on the other, with a note to express cross-over in terms of Ac., B/W, MU + H)

## Special Policy Areas

### *What is working?*

- Need a way to focus on unique needs of area
- Active frontage/commercial flex combo good for transitioning areas
- Heritage – Great approach to community-led definitions of character & boundaries; need flexibility to consider mini areas or pockets & influence new builds adjacent

### *What isn't working?*

- Heritage – not enough heritage awareness & incentives/tools; needs to be in DAG; need to educate/roll out heritage DAG policies
- Heritage district work needs to be done city wide – should be overlay district policy in MDP – not only DAG
- Heritage – way behind on heritage district identification; missing ‘having’ already done some heritage district
- Heritage – it will not work to wait to identify heritage districts at the local area plan; way to late
- Are we over-promising re: future planning areas/comprehensive large site? Communities will feel let down w inevitable constant amendments
- Is the onus on community to ID heritage value? It is dependent on area of the city – some communities have heritage experts but average residents may not know
- Is the only difference between “Comprehensive Large Site” and “Future Planning Area” use of the base building block? If so, do we require two S.P.A.’s
- Not enough detail of specific tools defined in the Heritage S.P.A.; need a list of tools within D.A.G.
- If a local area plan process identifies significant community heritage assets and a more detailed process is needed; is there heritage experts or staff to support this?

### *What is missing?*

- Heritage – Ensuring that a heritage overlay district is not general policy – needs to cover the critical points of development for heritage & new development and how they integrate. Heritage Districts should have their own building blocks as bldg. block concept as presented will not achieve what’s best for heritage bldgs.



- Heritage – scale does matter for heritage when new development is proposed on a street; scale and transition are critical
- Heritage – to view it only on the street level & think that storeys above don't matter is incorrect on streets w/ historic building whereby new development is proposed; the building block concept may work for new development streets but should not be applied to historic streets or even streets w/ a heritage bldg. of significance; Reason need for clear historic districts
- Active frontage high standards like a mall good but – need to be realistic on length
- Need “menu” of options for bonusing to match specific needs of S.P.A. (ie heritage or public space)
- Implementation
- Commercial flex & active frontage – need to somehow reference market demand & more clearly articulate limited & strategic use
- Commercial flex – if requiring commercial grade at-grade need to balance w/ scale; bw rise vs 3 storeys
- Need to consider building code implications for “commercial flex” (different code sections)
- Without being too prescriptive, list the factors that could help define a heritage or a character area (re:survey?) eg. Architectural elements, materials, scale, setbacks, age, people history, green space, use, etc.; Refer to Standards & Guidelines for Heritage Conservation
- Park & Open Space Frontage – need mechanism to discourage parking along park frontage unless by park users (ie parking on public streets)
- Make it clear that w/in Active Frontage some flexibility w/ use – about performance & design that supports higher ped volumes
- Would want to be specific in limiting park frontage to man-made parks, not wild ones esp. w. wildlife corridors
- Want to be sure that the Heritage property is not so developed that it loses its’ “specialness”
- Could you build office in a way that could transition
- Semi-active frontage

### Additional Notes:

- Use sparingly!
- Re: Future Planning Area – it's not clear what this is. What is an example that exists today?
- Heritage – Use very sparingly
- Heritage; Components & Tools, point 1 – Broad areas should be incredibly rare! Otherwise residents will treat as an actual designated property
- Heritage; Components & Tools, point 3 – Don't use as a tool to try and sidestep Provincial requirements for compensation
- Active Frontage – Need medical at grade sometimes (and bankds, chains, dentists, etc.)
- Commercial Flex; Components & Tools, point 3 – may be unrealistic at this scale. Special cases? Low scale may work. Limited unlikely.
- Local Commercial; Overview – pubs



- Local Commercial; Components & Tools, point 3 – crossed out ‘minimal’, limited not minimal. Set expectations for successful retail
- Park & Open Space Frontage; Components & Tools, points 3 & 4 – Maybe. Not automatic. Hard to lease /finance

## Scale & Transition

### *What is working?*

- Mix of new/old to interface w/ heritage breaking up larger building into multiple (ex Boston)
- The heights chosen for scale are well chosen. Good job
- Compatibility within scales (ref to example of photo of TO)
- Allowance for compatibility within scales

### *What isn't working?*

- Consideration of scale/transition in relation to heritage buildings
- Bankview – what not to do! Abrupt transitions
- Relates to importance of pedestrian realm
- Transition w/ maxing – heritage building being mostly bungalows ie: Inglewood
- Residential – restrictions on building depth & lot coverage impact built form
- Example of Waltville NS – against energy code and glazing requirements
- Relationship to building code
- Too aggressive w/transitions across lane ie: Mainstreets
- Transitioning to scale of building rather than intent
- Privacy issues – orientation of units
- Sensitive transition b/w heritage homes and surrounding infill

### *What is missing?*

- Not being able to skip more than one scale in adjacent buildings
- Concern w/ not being able to “opt out” of certain scales within areas of ARP
- Mid/High scale – reduce requisite for entrances/doors (artificial doors etc)
- Transition on both side of street not just block so don't have same street feeling everywhere
- Look at geographical scale/size of community
- Balance diff scales on diff types of streets re: collectors vs neighbourhood
- Toolkit – guidance of applicability depending on context
- Within/muted – specific design w/ flat vs peaked roof – put into policy wording
- Big difference from limited to low. Missing 4-5 scale
- Tools to understand interaction b/w ie: limited – high
- Consideration of other elements: ie: loading, waste & recycling reqmts (opp to be more innovative w/ lane interface)



- Concern w/ applicability of scale/ transition before new local area planning exercise
- Limited – this would include rowhouse, townhouse, all other 3 storey variations? (re: R-CG, M-CG, how...)
- Transition language is good – language about corner parcels? (limited)

## Implementation

### *What is working?*

- Starting to simplify things – creating more certainty for development
- Different conversations with communities
- Calgary code means building blocks = Land use districts. How do we transition?
- Simplify districts, make them easier to understand

### *What isn't working?*

- Why 1.2 & 2.0 (multiple documents) – confusing
- Dated policy should not be taken to community – no new district planning until its completed
- Note re: above comment: Disagree. City's aren't static, need to have tools today and tomorrow
- Why only portions of LUB changing? Will it work?
- Implementation (current practices) not working
- Too much change. Why so many documents?
- Should urban design guidelines be separate from DAG?
- Timing of policy & development ie/ heritage, urban design; developed areas; policy lagging behind development

### *What is missing?*

- What policy is going/ referring to which DAG?
- Implementation – this title is missing a big component of how does DAG/ citywide policy actually implementation guides such as: (1) funding amenities, (2) funding infrastructure upgrades, (3) land use
- Existing engagement w/ community – Does there now have to be a different conversation?
- How is the transition going to work? DAG 1.2 – 2.0 – LAP – LUB – Existing Building blocks to Calgary Code?
- Are we evaluating the implementation properly? How is the implementation going to work when staging changes/vision? How will the transition work?
- Can we integrate some of the documents?
- Confusion around the vision
- Clarity of alignment around Mainstreets, DAG 1.2, Bylaw, etc.
- \* Common policy discussion – what happens for areas w/ no LAP? [connected by an arrow with \* point below]



- Collaboration/ Community Engagement
- What happens to DAG 1.2 & how does it affect existing policy?
- How is the amendment process going to work?
- \* Timing of plans & development ie/ heritage: developed areas - ? City wide implementation (DAG & Policy @ one time); not just at local area but all-encompassing for City [connected by an arrow with \* point above]

## Common Policy

### *What is working?*

- Making the policy plain language & concise; The categories are also good
- Good to think about parking as a whole – we need to change the conversation about parking and do more education

### *What isn't working?*

- Parking policy needs to connect to on-street parking management
- Would prefer 'Urban Design' not be a separate entity (if it is, it can be forgotten)

### *What is missing?*

- Can the Heritage Common Policy section be considered outside only applying to LAP's & that timing
- Need general understanding of amenity funding
- Frame things in a 'how to' frame so that residents can understand what's on the table when they get to LAP conversation
- Identify what is common through heritage areas (e.g. unique windows) and what is case-by-case for communities (e.g. porches)
- Where have the infill guidelines gone? Not in draft ARP & DAG!

## Additional Notes:

- Round 1:
  - Parking needs to be more clear
  - Operational language is coming out. What is it? Answer – transit (illeg) be in all areas in operational. How are we going to assess, end serve the LAP
  - Objective or narrative that the neighbourhood may not be perfect but it will be a transition – recognition of evolution that development proposals may move to towards the desired end, but may not begin that way
  - Cities are never static and will always change
  - Heritage – will be a conversation at the LAP. General policy for Heritage will be in the guidebook – tools such as density tracker, on site conservation will be at the LAP – what tools work best in the community



- There is no definition for Heritage or character – we need to start w/ the definition – we should define the elements
- We should be cautious to define character areas/heritage areas
- How often do we need to assess our community? How do we dictate when demographic changes at different times
- How do we assess “parking” areas and make our assessing consistent?
- Round 2:
  - Policies (illeg) be not integrated in old DAG
  - Once you work w/ current DAG realize that it needs to change – it will be challenging – biggest struggle is that it is too late! Needs to be an amendment to MDP – the LAP may not be changed anytime soon ie Heritage
  - Urban Design – something that has to be looked @ citywide
  - Feel the Heritage will fall short – Building Block philosophy may not work
  - Challenge of defining what heritage means in each community
  - Could heritage planning go broader than LAP?
  - UD – to what extent are we including in the DAG. A – will be added to building blocks, scale & transition height, massing, street walk (BB) – will be thinner, will provide guidance, balancing act w/o being statutory, but enough to be statutory
  - UD – shouldn’t be too prescriptive but not too general
  - Too prescriptive = builds barriers
  - Likes what’s in mobility, community amenities, open space & parks
  - Infrastructure is hard
  - Direction is good though
- Round 3:
  - Communities will be cyclical – would we want to generate a flexible policy – a baseline A – is there anything we can do to make changes or assess to update to serve the needs & the DAG will inform the LAP
  - Should be able to do something we “modularity” – be I hope we aren’t redoing
  - Those spaces that don’t work and are identified as not working – but did they ever work
  - How are some city policies integrated into the DAG ie play charter A – (illeg) came through Building Blocks – reviewing the needs, aspirations of the community
  - How is all the work we are doing at the City ie walk 21 get into policy to be statutory? A – MDP
  - Reference other work in the guidebook
  - How does this integrate with the LUB? The LUB enforces certain policies etc
  - The Calgary Code is important
  - If we have guidelines, policies aren’t enforceable then its another piece of paper
  - LUB isn’t working so it is future work
  - Recommendations to council out of this work to look at Land Use Districts





- Infill guidelines are helpful – now that you have taken it out – no legal grounding to stand on – leaves us in a worse position – reference in ARP is gone – can we loop this in the DAG? It is helpful.
- Round 4:
  - Heritage is a big topic
  - Should be able to put multiple uses in one space – look for opportunities
  - Finding there is a lot of constraints when looking at community, ie mobility as opposed to site specific
  - No vision for the community for changes/infrastructure & the effects of other aspects ie parking
  - How do we ensure what's in the DAG gets done?
  - When UD is separated it never gets integrated – needs to be integrated
  - Don't like UD separate
  - Is Heritage policy changing? A – adding content adding Heritage tools ie heritage Density Transfer
  - Does all of this stuff have to happen in the LAP? What if we don't have a LAP?
  - City should just make it a Citywide policy – if communities don't get an LAP for 10 years then “heritage” for example will be gone; A – how we are moving forward for implementation still happening
  - How do we implement DAG 2.0 w/ recently approved & to (illeg) policies? Want 2.0 to be applied
  - Citywide (illeg) – will be put it as an option Council would tell us city admin can do it
- Round 5:
  - Common policy sets the stage for UD for BB
  - Seems like common policies will inform parking; A – Guidebook will look at the parking asset of the surrounding area as a whole, looking at synergies between uses
  - Elements that provide alternate parking solutions/options
  - Should look at on street management
  - Needs to lead to action
  - Can we use DAG to codify that street parking is for visitors? Could use the “on street parking strategy”
  - Will look into how to integrate on street policies – to understand from a LAP perspective

## **Feedback Forms**

### **Question 1: Who do you represent? (i.e. community, industry, interested citizen, etc)**

Community – 2 (Haysboro, Inglewood Community Association)

Industry – 2 (Industry, Evil Developer)

Interested Citizen – 1 (City of Calgary)



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## Question 2: Did the workshop help you to better understand the concept of Great Neighbourhoods for Everyone? Why or why not?

- No – 1 “No. But I understand the process better of how the work being completed to move towards a cohesive document that informs great neighbourhoods.”
- Yes – 2 “Yes, great convos.”  
“Pretty decent – appreciate the handouts which explained it well.”
- Sort of – 2 “To an extend. There is still a few thing that are confusing but I am sure it will all be more clear once we see the first draft.”  
“Not really, I had a fairly good understanding coming in and the conversation focused primarily around the 5 stations we were discussing today. That’s not a bad thing!”

## Question 3: Did this workshop help you to better understand the building blocks are used as a tool in the planning process? Why or why not?

- Yes – 5 “Yes.”  
“Yes.”  
“Yes, because the blocks have been changing, it was great to get an update and a detailed explanation on each of the revised blocks.”  
“Yes, and lots of comments left.”  
“Yes, the concept generally reads well (terms t/b determined). The use and applicability needs to be specific to location.”

## Question 4: Did this workshop help you to better understand how the Special Policy Areas relate to the building blocks? Why or why not?

- Yes – 2 “Yes.”  
“Yes, most productive table.”
- Other – 2 “It certainly helped to explain them but I am still not sure I understand the requirement for all of them... some of the special policy areas seem to be direct reflections/duplications of what we are seeing in the building blocks.”  
“A lot to take in – on the surface looks decent.”
- N/A – 1 “Didn’t attend”

## Question 5: Did this workshop help you to better understand how scale and transition relate to the building blocks? Why or why not?

- Yes – 3 “Yes.”  
“Yes, again, the scales have been in flux and it was great to see where the definitions have landed. I am thrilled with how the definitions worked out!”  
“Yes, great selection of storeys that define scale.”
- No – 2 “Big question marks here – applicability seems to be left a lot to the individual ARP determination. This flexibility does NOT seem to be given to communities in practice.”  
“Still have questions on transition.”



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## Question 6: What else would you have liked us to cover in this workshop?

“?”

“Timelines.”

“I think a separate presentation on implementation would have been useful. How all this info will be implemented is key.”

“I don’t see how you could have covered more given the time constraints.”

## Question 7: Do you have any additional feedback?

“Look at strategy docs – walk, playcharter, climate action, etc – put these into policy.”

“Enthusiasm of staff was great.”

“I would have appreciated another hour to have given this a bit more thought – so much to cover, so many important points yet to make.”

## Sticker Board Feedback on Naming Conventions

### Community Function

- ‘community’ crossed out, ‘zone’ written above.
- ‘zone’ crossed out, ‘multiple functions w/in a community’ written

### Mixed Use (Green – 2, Red – 0)

- This is the verbage the majority of the world (especially the planning world) uses!

**Multi-function** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

**Flexible Urban** (Green – 0, Red – 2)

**Active Mixed** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

### Neighbourhood (Green – 0, Red – 0)

- ‘Neighbourhood’ crossed out, ‘Housing’ written above.

**Neighbourhood** (Green – 6, Red – 1)

**Live** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

**Local** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

- o ‘Residential’ with arrow to ‘Live’

- Comment re: Mixed Use and Neighbourhood proposed alternatives – Combine these! (mixed-use/neighbourhood) control outcomes by defining activity, not use

- Comment re: Mixed Use Neighbourhood proposed alternatives – Residential is essential ingredient, but: - residential focus, - employment focus, - shopping/retail/ent. Focus

### Production (Green – 1, Red – 0)

**Production** (Green – 1, Red – 1)

**Employment** (Green – 4, Red – 0)

**Industry** (Green – 0, Red – 0)



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## Activity

- Borrow more language from ASPs (eg NAC, MAC, etc)

**Major** (Green – 5, Red – 0)

**Primary** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

**Destination** (Green – 4, Red – 0)

**Hub** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

**Minor** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

**Link** (Green – 1, Red – 1)

**Inter-connector** (Green – 0, Red – 2)

**Minor** (Green – 7, Red – 0)

**Interior** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

**Local** (Green – 9, Red – 0)

**Interior** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

**Green** (Green – 0, Red – 1)

- o 'Localized' maybe?
- o Not necessary

## Scale

- Put pictures with words

**Limited** (Green – 1, Red – 1)

- Too fuzzy. Define.
- 1-3 Storey?

**Limited** (Green – 5, Red – 0)

- o Too protectionist, but better than ground-oriented

**Ground-Oriented** (Green – 1, Red – 2)

**Low** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

**Low** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

- Max 6

**Low-Rise** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

**Max-6** (Green – 0, Red – 1)

**Small-Scale** (Green – 2, Red – 1)

- o Comment re: Proposed alternatives: Be clear. Ppl perceive 'low', 'small' differently. Use heights/stories (Green sticker)
- o Comment re: Proposed alternatives: Branching from above comment, use storeys, not meters



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## **Mid** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

- Max 11

### **Mid-Rise** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

### **Mid-Scale** (Green – 2, Red – 0)

### **Mid-Height** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

- o Comment re: Proposed alternatives: Be clear!

## **High** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

- 12+

### **High-Rise** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

### **Tower** (Green – 0, Red – 1)

### **Max-Scale** (Green – 2, Red – 2)

- o Too value based
- o Comment re: Proposed alternatives: Be clear!

## **Special Policy Areas**

### **Comprehensive Large Site** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

### **Future Planning Area** (Green – 2, Red – 0)

### **Heritage** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

### **Parks Frontage** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

- Does timing primarily differentiate these two? (re: “comprehensive large site” and “future planning area”)

#### **No alternatives planned at this time**

- o Heritage Overlay or District (with a Green sticker)

### **Active Frontage** (Green – 4, Red – 0)

#### **Active Frontage** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

- o Does this mean retail required at grade?

#### **Active Uses** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

#### **Commercial Frontage** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

### **Commercial Node** (Green – 0, Red – 0)

- o Crossed out and “Local Commercial” added

#### **Local Hub** (Green – 1, Red – 1)

#### **Commercial Node** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

#### **Local Commercial** (Green – 5, Red – 0)

### **Commercial Flex** (Green – 0, Red – 1)

#### **Commercial Flex** (Green – 1, Red – 0)



# Developed Areas Guidebook

Stakeholder Report Back: What We Heard  
March 20, 2019, Developed Areas Guidebook Workshop

## **Work-Live Flex** (Green – 3, Red – 0)

- This is its own 'thing' – in by-law requires commercial district (but ARP level may want within 'residential' areas)

## **Optional Retail** (Green – 1, Red – 0)

- Comment re: Commercial Flex proposed alternatives: Commercial ready
- Comment re: Commercial Flex proposed alternatives: Semi-active frontage
- Comment re: Commercial Flex proposed alternatives: I struggle with this idea overall, I LOVE the use flexibility but it is doubtful that building code would actually allow for it... work/live flex might be the best option