

FINAL  
MINUTES OF THE CALGARY PLANNING COMMISSION  
HELD ON THURSDAY, 2018 MARCH 08, AT 1:00 P.M.  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

PRESENT:

Mr. Matthias Tita (Chairman)	Director of Calgary Growth Strategies
Mr. Ryan Vanderputten	Director of Transportation Planning
Ms. Jyoti Gondek	Councillor, Ward 3
Mr. Evan Woolley	Councillor, Ward 8
Mr. Colin Friesen	Citizen Representative
Mr. Andrew Palmiere	Citizen Representative
Mr. Doug Leighton	Citizen Representative
Mr. James Scott	Citizen Representative

ABSENT:

Mr. Melvin Foht	Citizen Representative
Ms. Lourdes Juan	Citizen Representative

Cllr. Gondek arrived at the meeting at 2:44 p.m., due to a previous engagement.

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA:

**AMENDMENT:** Move Item 5.07 (DP2017-3511/CPC2018-0247) to be heard as the first item on the Agenda.

**AMENDMENT:** Move Item 5.04 (DP2017-1814/CPC2018-0244) to be heard as the second item on the Agenda.

The 2018 March 08 Calgary Planning Commission Agenda was adopted, as amended.

**Moved by: J. Scott** **Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the meeting held on 2018 February 22 were approved.

**Moved by: J. Scott** **Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

RECESS

The meeting recessed at 2:38 p.m. to reconvene at 2:43 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 2:44 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

**Moved by: J. Scott**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: D. Leighton

Minutes prepared by: **Kimberly Holberton**

The minutes of the Calgary Planning Commission, held 2018 March 08, will be confirmed on 2018 March 22.

**ITEM NO.: 5.01**

David Mulholland

**COMMUNITY:**

Mount Pleasant (Ward 7)

**FILE NUMBER:**

LOC2017-0347/CPC2018-0249

**PROPOSED POLICY AMENDMENTS:**

Amendments to the North Hill Area Redevelopment Plan

**PROPOSED REDESIGNATION:**

From: Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling  
(R-C2) District

To: Residential – Contextual Grade-Oriented Infill  
(R-CG) District

**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:**

469 – 28 Avenue NW

**APPLICANT:**

New Century Design

**OWNER:**

Gurveen Kaur Biring  
Tony S Dhliwal

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:**

2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission recommended that Council:

- A. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed amendment to the North Hill Area Redevelopment Plan, in accordance with Administration's recommendation; and
2. Give three readings to the proposed Bylaw.

**Moved by: A. Palmiere**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

- B. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation of 0.05 hectares ± (0.12 acres ±) located at 469 – 28 Avenue NW (Plan 2617AG, Block 26, Lot 35) from Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling (R-C2) District to Residential –Grade-Oriented Infill (R-CG) District, in accordance with Administration's recommendation; and

2. Give three readings to the proposed Bylaw.

**Moved by: A. Palmiere**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

**ITEM NO.: 5.02**

Tom Schlodder

**COMMUNITY:**

Glendale (Ward 6)

**FILE NUMBER:**

LOC2017-0210/CPC2018-0260

**PROPOSED REDESIGNATION:**

From: Residential Contextual One Dwelling (R-C1)  
District

To: Multi-Residential – Contextual Medium Profile  
(M-C2) District

**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:**

4919, 4923, 4927, 4931 and 4935 - 17 Avenue SW

**APPLICANT:**

Carlisle Group

**OWNER:**

Rui Huan Lu  
Sing Wong  
Kathryn Leigh MacKenzie  
Collette Cote  
Rosaria G Marasco  
Salvatore Marasco

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:**

2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission recommended that Council:

1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation of 0.32 hectares ± (0.79 acres ±) located at 4919, 4923, 4927, 4931 and 4935-17 Avenue SW (Plan 6182HM, Block 5, Lots 43 to 47) from Residential – Contextual One Dwelling (R-C1) District **to** Multi-Residential – Contextual Medium Profile (M-C2) District, in accordance with Administration’s recommendation; and
2. Give three readings to the proposed Bylaw.

**Moved by: C. Friesen**

**Carried: 5 – 1**

Opposed: D. Leighton

Absent: J. Gondek

Reasons for Opposition from Mr. Leighton:

- I did not support this land use amendment because:
  - a) This is a very large “spot zoning” application.
  - b) It will likely trigger similar redevelopment in this area and impact on existing on infrastructure.
  - c) It does not comply with many (3 of 8) of the criteria for “Location Criteria for Multi-Residential Infill”.
- I would, however, support this application and proposed height and density **if** there was an approved area redevelopment plan in place. The

ARP process would also allow for an improved community consultation process and consideration of cumulative servicing and financial impacts.

**MOTION ARISING:**

To have the Development Permit for this site be reviewed by Calgary Planning Commission for decision as the Development Authority.

**Moved by: J. Scott**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

**ITEM NO.: 5.03**

Calvin Chan

**COMMUNITY:**

Killarney / Glengarry (Ward 8)

**FILE NUMBER:**

LOC2018-0010/CPC2018-0245

**PROPOSED POLICY AMENDMENT:**

Amendment to the Killarney / Glengarry Area  
Redevelopment Plan

**PROPOSED REDESIGNATION:**

From: Residential – Contextual One / Two Dwelling  
(R-C2) District

To: Residential – Grade-Oriented Infill (R-CG)  
District

**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:**

2040 – 29 Street SW

**APPLICANT:**

Civicworks Planning + Design

**OWNER:**

Clara LeBlanc

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:**

2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission recommended that  
Council:

A. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed amendment to  
the Killarney/Glengarry Area Redevelopment  
Plan, in accordance with Administration's  
recommendation; and

2. Give three readings to the proposed Bylaw.

**Moved by: A. Palmiere**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

B. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation  
of 0.06 hectares ± (0.14 acres ±) located at 2040  
– 29 Street SW (Plan 5661O, Block 9, Lots 21  
and 22) from Residential – Contextual One /  
Two Dwelling (R-C2) District **to** Residential –  
Grade-Oriented Infill (R-CG) District, in  
accordance with Administration's  
recommendation; and

2. Give three readings to the proposed Bylaw.

**Moved by: A. Palmiere**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

**ITEM NO.:** 5.04  
**COMMUNITY:** Rayner D'Souza  
**FILE NUMBER:** Bankview (Ward 08)  
**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** DP2017-1814/CPC2018-0244  
**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:** New: Multi-Residential Development (1 building, 6 units)  
**APPLICANT:** 2102 and 2108 - 17A Street SW  
**OWNER:** Aldebaran Enterprises  
Kerry Goulard  
Ryan Goulard  
Kathryn Shaw  
**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:** **APPROVAL**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:** 2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission **APPROVED** the proposed New: Multi-Residential Development (1 building, 6 units) at 2102 and 2108 - 17A Street SW, in accordance with Administration's recommendation.

**Moved by: A. Palmiere**                      **Carried: 4 – 2**

Opposed: C. Friesen and D. Leighton

Absent: J. Gondek

Reasons for Opposition from Mr. Friesen:

- I did not support this development permit for a number of reasons.
  - First the design itself shows limited merit at best. When asked if the opinion of administration was that the project represented good urban design the representative answering struggled to find much to say and was left with something like, the project is as good as it can be.
  - Next the drawings presented were quite technical in nature. The few 3 dimensional studies showed no relationship to the street or landscaping and were massing and colour studies only.
  - Finally, although there was apparently an architect associated with the project it is unclear how much professional involvement there was in the design. This type of involvement would not guarantee high quality design but it is generally accepted public policy that qualified design professionals should be involved in designs of this type from the beginning.
- These minimum standards along with other measures are put in place with the intent that good quality technical and aesthetic design should result.

Reasons for Opposition from Mr. Leighton:

- I did not support this development permit application because, despite assistance and advice from City staff:
  - 1) The design, drawings and supporting material was not of the quality of other multi-unit development permit applications of this scale (6 units) submitted to CPC;
  - 2) The design did not, in my professional opinion, support the MDP goal of “Good Urban Design”;
  - 3) The Bankview Area Redevelopment Plan (1981) places considerable emphasis on retaining an attractive streetscape and landscaping (especially in front yards);
  - 4) This is not apparent from the plans provided; and indeed, Administration supported a landscaping relaxation;
  - 5) There is a provision in Part 6 of the Land Use Bylaw (1P2007) for such relaxations in exchange for an “enhanced landscape option” (Section 558) that could be applied in this case;
  - 6) Further effort should have been expended in obtaining the comments of the Bankview Community Association beyond a simple email on 2018 January 16.



**ITEM NO.: 5.05**

Mona Ha  
(related to Item 5.06)

**COMMUNITY:**

Seton (Ward 12)

**FILE NUMBER:**

LOC2017-0047/CPC2018-0181

**PROPOSED CLOSURE:**

2.38 hectares ± (5.90 acres ±) of road adjacent to Main Street SE

**PROPOSED REDESIGNATION:**

From: Special Purpose – Future Urban Development (S-FUD) District, Special Purpose – City and Regional Infrastructure (S-CRI) District, and Undesignated Road Right-of-Way

To: Residential – Low Density Mixed Housing (R-G) District, Residential – Low Density Mixed Housing (R-Gm) District, Multi-Residential – Low Profile (M-1) District, Multi-Residential – Medium Profile (M-2) District, Commercial – Community 1 (C-C1) District, Special Purpose – School, Park and Community Reserve (S- SPR) District, Special Purpose – Recreation (S-R) District, and Special Purpose – City and Regional Infrastructure (S-CRI) District

**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:**

19600, 19651, 20606, 20607 – 56 Street SE, 20707 – 72 Street SE, 6599 Seton Drive SE

**APPLICANT:**

Urban Systems

**OWNER:**

South Seton GP Inc  
Carma Ltd

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:**

2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission recommended that Council:

- A. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed closure of 2.38 hectares ± (5.90 acres ±) of road (Plan 1810328, Area A), adjacent to Main Street SE, in accordance with Administration's recommendation; and
2. Give first and second readings to the proposed road closure Bylaw; and

3. **WITHHOLD** third reading pending Council's approval of the proposed removal of the Growth Management Overlay and amendment to Map 10 of the Rangeview Area Structure Plan.

**Moved by: E. Woolley**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: Mr. Leighton left the room due to a pecuniary conflict of interest and did not take part in the discussion or voting.

- B. 1. **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation of 76.42 hectares  $\pm$  (188.83 acres  $\pm$ ) located at 19600, 19651, 20606 and 20607 – 56 Street SE and the closed road (Portion of W1/2 Section 15-22-29-4; Portion of N1/2 Section 16-22-29-4; Portion of SE1/4 Section 16-22-29-4; Plan 1810328, Area A) from Special Purpose – Future Urban Development (S-FUD) District, Special Purpose – City and Regional Infrastructure (S-CRI) District, and Undesignated Road Right-of-Way to Residential – Low Density Mixed Housing (R-G) District, Residential – Low Density Mixed Housing (R-Gm) District, Multi-Residential – Low Profile (M-1) District, Multi-Residential – Medium Profile (M-2) District, Commercial – Community 1 (C-C1) District, Special Purpose – School, Park and Community Reserve (S-SPR) District, Special Purpose – Recreation (S-R) District, and Special Purpose – City and Regional Infrastructure (S-CRI) District, in accordance with Administration's recommendation; and
2. Give first and second readings to the proposed road closure Bylaw; and
3. **WITHHOLD** third reading pending Council's approval of the proposed removal of the Growth Management Overlay and amendment to Map 10 of the Rangeview Area Structure Plan.

**Moved by: E. Woolley**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: Mr. Leighton left the room due to a pecuniary conflict of interest and did not take part in the discussion or voting.

**ITEM NO.: 5.06**

Mona Ha  
(related to Item 5.05)

**COMMUNITY:**

Seton (Ward 12)

**FILE NUMBER:**

LOC2017-0047(OP)/CPC2018-0182

**PROPOSED OUTLINE PLAN:**

Subdivision of 248.63 hectares ± (614.37 acres ±

**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:**

19600,19651, 20606, 20607 – 56 Street SE, 20707 – 72  
Street SE, 6599 Seton Drive SE

**APPLICANT:**

Urban Systems

**OWNER:**

South Seton GP Inc  
Carma Ltd

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:**

**APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:**

2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission **APPROVED** the proposed Outline Plan for the subdivision of 248.63 hectares ± (614.37 acres ±), in accordance with Administration's recommendation.

**Moved by: E. Woolley**

**Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: Mr. Leighton left the room due to a pecuniary conflict of interest and did not take part in the discussion or voting.

**ITEM NO.:** 5.07  
**COMMUNITY:** Sunnyside (Ward 7)  
**FILE NUMBER:** DP2017-3511/CPC2018-0247  
**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:** New: Multi-Residential Development (1 building)  
**MUNICIPAL ADDRESS:** 916, 918, 920, 922 and 926 – 2 Avenue NW  
**APPLICANT:** Casola Koppe  
**OWNER:** Beverly Kim Guthrie  
Jones Technical Services  
Carolyn E Stone

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:** **APPROVAL**

**PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION:** 2018 March 08

The Calgary Planning Commission:

1. **RECEIVED AND ACCEPTED FOR INFORMATION** the proposed New: Multi-Residential Development (1 building) at 916, 918, 920, 922 and 926 – 2 Avenue NW; and
2. Recommended that the Development Authority, without having to return to Calgary Planning Commission, **APPROVE**, the Development Permit DP2017-3511, subject to Council giving second and third reading of Bylaw 291D2017, in accordance with Administration's recommendation.

**Moved by: D. Leighton** **Carried: 6 – 0**

Absent: J. Gondek

Comments from Mr. Friesen:

- I supported the Development Permit for this project with some reservations. It is clear that the community residents wanted a development that was more reflective of their sense of community character and I have similar feelings. Although we are told the design was modified to break down the massing and reflect the adjacent use of materials there appears to be no attempt at a finer grain of architectural detail that would be in keeping with the best historic and contemporary buildings in the area. This would be true regardless of any discussion of style.
- The residents however clearly want more. Their comments that the blocky rectangular nature of the design doesn't fit with the character of their traditional neighbourhood are not without merit. I do not object to the additional density or size of the development but do believe that there are many

other architectural vocabularies that could have been applied that would have been a better fit and made this large building more acceptable to the community. The City's continued attitude to style, which at best is 'agnostic' but often devolves to acceptance of shallow modernism or 'background architecture' or 'timeless values' or design described by any number of other labels that really mean barely adequate, is disappointing.

**ITEM NO.: 6.01**

**PROPOSED:**

Review of the list of Applications to be Reviewed by  
Calgary Planning Commission

**RECOMMENDATION:**

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

The Calgary Planning Commission discussed the  
potential amendments to the list of Applications to be  
Reviewed by Calgary Planning Commission.