

B&A Planning Recommendations and Response February 2021

In 2018, The City of Calgary (hereinafter referred to as "The City") combined the 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay Area Redevelopment Plans (ARPs) into The Historic East Calgary Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) draft document. The goal for The Historic East Calgary ARP is to allow the two communities to share a similar approach to growth while recognizing the differences between the two communities.

Despite extensive public engagement on the two 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs, the character and intensity of future redevelopment in these communities remained unclear. In early 2019 The City hired B&A Planning Group to host public engagement and provide recommendations on the Local Area Plan. B&A was selected as a single-source contract due to their expertise, and to act as a neutral party in the process moving forward. We heard from community members concerns in the past about the creation of the LAP draft process, and the decision was made to hire B&A in 2019 based on this feedback and to address these concerns.

The purpose of this new phase of engagement was to balance stakeholder desires, provide guidance and create recommendations for revisions and refinements to the 2018 draft of The Historic East Calgary ARP (hereinafter referred to as "2018 Draft ARP"). The recommendations that surfaced from this process informed The City in the development of the ARP. Not all recommendations will be accepted as City policy, standards and/or technical reasons may prevent certain recommendations from being incorporated into the LAP.

With support from The City's Administration, B&A coordinated stakeholder meetings, public outreach, and information sessions on the 2018 Draft ARP. The process was vetted by stakeholders – both The City's Administration and the Inglewood and Ramsay Community Associations – to arrive at a process that targets numerous issues within a limited timeline and budget. Understanding that the area redevelopment plan process for the Inglewood and Ramsay communities has been underway for a number of years, feedback documented from previous engagement was used to focus themes and topic areas for the engagement process. The pressure for growth, change, and redevelopment is significant and given the diversity of opinions, detailed history, and the complexity of the issues, the goal for engagement is not consensus. Rather, committed to a transparent and professional process that will inform B&A's recommendations. The goal is to demonstrate clear rationale for our recommendations based on a balance of all stakeholder opinions, City policy and sound planning policy.

The B&A verbatim summary from January 23, 2019 town hall can be found here. Over 150 people attended the event. Panelists representing different stakeholder groups presented thoughts on three key topics: Height and FAR; Heritage and Character; and the ARP process. Topics were based on a review of feedback received from previous engagement on the 2017 Inglewood and Ramsay ARP drafts and the 2018 combined Historic East Calgary ARP draft.

Based on the engagement B&A undertook throughout 2019, they developed a <u>Recommendation Report</u>, which was provided to The City for consideration. The City's response to these recommendations are below.



B&A Planning Recommendations and Response February 2021

City Response to B&A's Planning Recommendations

B&A brought forward the following planning best practice recommendations for The City to r consider as part of the development of the February 2021 draft LAP. The table outlines the recommendation provided followed by how the project team has incorporated that input into the February 2021 draft is captured below for your reference. The February 2021 draft aligns with the Guidebook for Great Communities and the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan template.

Key Recommendations A.1: The ARP should adhere to the Guidebook for	Response: The LAP will align with the
Great Communities.	Guidebook for Great Communities (the Guidebook).
A.2: Expanded ARP areas and increased detail make maps difficult to read. The ARP should include detailed maps on focus areas such as the one shown in Figure A-2.	Response: Maps adhere to the corporate mapping standards for LAPs This information was shared with the mapping team.
A.3: More effort should be placed on explaining how and why the urban form classifications (the system utilized by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook) are applied in the communities, rather than what they are and how they work which can be referenced to the Guidebook for Great Communities and summarized in the ARP.	Response: Information provided in the LAP is consistent with the new LAP template. The LAP must be read with the Guidebook.
A.4: While ARPs are moving toward more concise documents that do not repeat policy, there is a need to avoid users from needing to access several documents just to understand basic policies. The ARP should reference, and possibly summarize key policy elements of other supporting policy such as the Guidebook for Great Communities, Transitoriented Development (TOD) policies, Main Street plans, and the MDP. In particular, the urban form classification summaries could be provided for ease of use. References and summaries should include the date of the referenced document and a caveat that amendments to referenced documents shall supercede any summary information provided in the ARP.	Response: Information provided is consistent with the new LAP template. As the Guidebook is meant to evolve over time, references to specific versions of the Guidebook will not be included in the LAP, rather the LAP must be read together with the Guidebook.
Heritage, Character, and Vision Key Recommendations	
B.1: Linking heritage to vision and character, a set of essential elements that define the two communities' character should be established, and serve as key indicators and criteria to help guide policy. These essential community character	



B&A Planning Recommendations and Response February 2021

elements can serve to communicate key elements of the two communities' vision as part of the design process for new developments.

- B.2: Through the historical narrative and in-depth public engagement, several themes have emerged that can be used to define the essential community character elements for Inglewood and Ramsay:
- 1. History and Historical Assets: Inglewood and Ramsay are built on an historic foundation. The history exhibited in their built form and historic assets should be preserved and integrated into future development.
- 2. Cottage Streetscape: The intimate porch-fronted, tree-lined, single-family streets create an identifiable and unique quality to the communities' lower density residential areas. As low density housing stock is improved, replaced, and intensified, it should seek to maintain this collective streetscape character.

Response: The LAP identifies heritage guideline areas based on work for Heritage Tools and Incentives program. This work will result in guidelines that are informed by the character-defining elements of heritage assess in these areas with the intent of ensuing that new development fits into the community context and historic fabric.

3. Mid-Rise Streetscape: Unlike other inner city areas such as the Beltline and East Village that are defined by high-rise corridors, the commercial core for Inglewood

and Ramsay is born out of the Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale of 6 stories or less) character. As intensification and redevelopment occurs in response to affordability and transit investment, this mid-rise character should be maintained along key corridors and as the primary character.

Response: Generally, the 9 Avenue SE Main Street maintains a character of six storeys, with approximately 13% of the street allowing for heights up to 12 storeys and one site allowing for heights up to 15 storeys.

4. Social Spaces: Starting from the front porches of the Cottage Streetscape, to the river edge and midrise main streets, to the many intimate neighbourhood green spaces; Inglewood and Ramsay foster sociability from a tight-knit network of public spaces interfacing with a fine-grained rhythm of shopfronts and porches. This network and the sociable character of building frontages should expand and replicate as new development and intensification occurs.

Response: Fostering and encouraging social interaction in parks and open spaces for all ages and abilities is one of the Core Values of the Plan.

5. Quirky and Eclectic: These are historic communities that have always responded to change: The old and new, the regional and local, the big industrial and quaint cottage, the traditional and the modern. Tied together by elements 1 to 4,

Response: The LAP's vision speaks to the communities' continuing to evolve while complementing existing heritage. Policies in the LAP also speak to preserving and re-adapting heritage.



this change can preserve and expand on the communities' eclectic character.	
B.3: Many of these elements may not be able to translate into specific policy and/or land use district requirements, but should at least be communicated as part of the narrative for the communities' vision and aspirational elements as new development is considered.	Response: The LAP has heritage guideline areas based on work underway with Heritage Tools and Incentives. This work will result in guidelines that are informed by the character-defining elements of heritage assess in these areas with the intent of ensuing that new development fits into the community context and historic fabric.
Heritage Preservation Key Recommendations	
C.1: Heritage preservation should be uncoupled from density.	Response: The LAP has heritage guideline areas based on work
C.2: The ARP should link to a City-wide solution to heritage preservation.	underway with Heritage Tools and Incentives. This work will result in guidelines that are informed by the character-defining elements of heritage assess in these areas with the intent of ensuing that new development fits into the community context and historic fabric. The LAP aligns with city-wide heritage policy and heritage policy within the Guidebook.
C.3: Where a bonusing system is proposed, it should align with a City-wide solution and policy. Bonusing should be tested for viability of system administration, developer cost-benefit of the bonusing approach, and the overall affect of increased intensities in a plan area. C.4: Should a bonusing system be adopted, mapping and policy should be clear on base	Response: A bonusing system is not planned for the LAP. As city-wide bonusing programs are developed, the LAP would be amended to algin with this work.
intensities and maximum allowable intensities. C.5: Heritage preservation bonusing should be localized to directly link the benefiting site to the contributing asset. The 9 Avenue S.E. main street is ideal for this approach.	
C.6: Bonusing for inclusion of publicly accessible outdoor amenity space should be localized to larger redevelopment sites, especially where municipal reserves are not required. If this is not achievable, then the communities should have a priority list for	Response: A bonusing system is not planned for the LAP. Appendix A outlines Implementation Options developed based on feedback obtained throughout the project.



public amenities. The establishment of a community enhancement fund should be explored to fund local initiatives. C.7: The preservation of Character Homes should not be part of a bonusing system, particularly when they are disconnected from the benefiting site. Other programs should be explored to address Character Homes as part of a City-wide approach. C.8: Preservation policies should be measured against the essential community character elements discussed in the previous section. C.9: Policies should be developed to preserve the	
character of the Mid-Rise (Low-Rise building scale of 6 storeys or less) and Cottage Streetscapes, providing a better chance for the preservation and renovation of Character Homes that are otherwise out of date and encouraging appropriate infilling. C.10: The preservation of historically significant Character Homes listed on The City's Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources should be identified as a separate, more urgent pursuit than the general stock of character homes. The City's heritage program should explore additional mechanisms to preserve these Character Homes.	The LAP has heritage guideline areas based on work underway with Heritage Tools and Incentives. This work will result in guidelines that are informed by the character-defining elements of heritage assess in these areas with the intent of ensuing that new development fits into the community context and historic fabric.
C.11: Registered Historic Assets and other significant potential heritage resources such as buildings and landscapes that are important to the Inglewood and Ramsay communities should be identified on a map in the ARP, noting the official Inventory of Evaluated Historic Resources shall prevail. Height, Density, Intensity Key Recommendations	
D.1: The ARP should base height and intensity on the Guidebook for Great Communities urban form categories rather than specific building heights and floor area ratio (FAR).	Response: The LAP aligns with the scale categories and urban form categories in the Guidebook.
D.2: The June 2019 Draft Guidebook allows for local area plans to modify and or qualify certain policies and elements in the June 2019 Draft Guidebook. In this way, specific outcomes recommended in this Report should be ensured through ARP policy as modifications to Guidebook for Great Communities policy.	Response: Policies and elements in the LAP are specified as required.
D.3: Floor area ratio is a clumsy indicator of intensity and provides no qualitative measure. Lot	Response: FAR is not included in the draft LAP, instead the LAP uses the



coverage, building and storey height, and other form modifiers such as setbacks and stepbacks are more precise regulators of form which can be guided by the ARP and enforced by the Land Use Bylaw. Floor area ratio should not be included as part of the ARP.	urban form categories and scale categories found in the Guidebook.
D.4: Buildings should be able to gradually transition between building scale categories within a parcel achieving the desired outcome through a number of building modifiers such as an upper storey setback. The specific setback should respond to the desired outcome, such as shadowing and the need to maintain a certain scale of a street.	Response: Building modifiers and specific setbacks and stepbacks would be considered at the development permit stage.
D.5: Building scale categories should transition sequentially to the next building scale category.	Response: The LAP generally adheres to this recommendation.
D.6: The historic heights along 9 Avenue S.E. ranging between 20.0m and 22.5m sets the threshold for "mid-rise" that can be used throughout the communities, establishing a corridor height for the Low Rise and Mid Rise building scale categories through either a stepback, or a full urban form transition as referenced in D.4 above.	Response: Generally, the main street is shown as being 6 storeys (the Guidebook for Great Communities does not use metres to measure, only storeys). There are specific areas such as the corner of 9 Avenue SE and 12 Street SE where more intense development has been deemed appropriate, those areas will be up to 12 storeys.
D.7: The High-Rise building scale category is not specifically mapped as it needs to be strategically designed into specific sites to minimize visual and shadow impact. Recommended sites for consideration are noted in the detailed plan recommendations that follow.	Response: Due to the scale categories in the Guidebook for Great Communities, the High (26 storeys or less) category has been used to indicate areas were buildings taller than 12 storeys would be appropriate.
D.8 Where permitted and mapped, the High-Rise urban form category should not exceed 16 storeys.	Further policy speaks to maximum heights in storeys for specific sites.
E. Land Use and Built Form Key Recommendations	
E.1: The ARP should base the land use and built form approach on the Guidebook for Great Communities	Response: The LAP aligns with the Guidebook for Great Communities.
Comprehensive Sites Generally Key Recommendations	
F.1: Master Plan: Through the Guidebook for Great Communities or another policy document, an option for a Master Plan process should be established for the June 2019 Draft Guidebook's "Comprehensive Large Sites." The Master Plan would describe a	Response: The City is currently undertaking a project to establish consistency in the purpose, scope and components of the master plan process. Future master plans would



comprehensive redevelopment concept for the site in support of a Land Use Redesignation or Development Permit application. For certain larger, more complex sites, it could also allow for incremental redevelopment to proceed without the requirement for a more binding site-wide Outline Plan.	follow the established process and scope.
F.2: Planning Principles: Master Plans should establish clear planning principles for walkable urban places including small blocks, connected walkable streets, active street oriented frontages, a mix of uses, and the provision for public space and green space, especially on large projects where no municipal reserve is due. F.3: The following sites should be identified in the ARP as "Comprehensive Large Sites" as defined by the June 2019 Draft Guidebook.	Response: The City is currently undertaking a project to establish consistency in the purpose, scope and components of the master plan process. Future master plans would follow the established process and scope. Response: Sites identified as comprehensive planning site include: the Brewery-Rail lands and the Blackfoot Truckstop.
Main Street: 9 Ave S.E. Inglewood	As Calgary Police Services is unlikely to redevelop, it has not been included as a comprehensive planning site.
Key Recommendations	
G.1: Generally, the scale of the 9 Avenue S.E. and 12 Street S.E. corridors should maintain a midrise character range between 20.0m and 22.5m in height with exceptions as noted below. G.2: The location at the west edge of 9 Avenue S.E. is a highly visible and traveled gateway into the entire community. A taller element at this corner provides a vertical entry statement and a gateway	Response: Generally, the 9 Avenue SE Main Street maintains a character of six storeys, with a few key sites allowing for development of up to 12 storeys. One site with a Council-approved land use allows for development up to 15 storeys.
compositional element. Limited width and varied heights will reduce shadow impacts.	Along 11/12 Street SE, development will be approximately six storeys at the north end towards Inglewood and will increase to above 12 storeys next to the 26 Avenue SE LRT Station.
G.3: The intersection of 9 Avenue and 12 Street S.E. allows for intensification and an iconic centering element - taller buildings marking the center of Inglewood's 9 Avenue S.E. and a place where Ramsay's new main street meets the 9 Avenue SE. corridor.	Response: Development will be up to 12 storeys at the corner of 9 Avenue SE and 12 Street SE.
G.4: Extra height can be achieved on redevelopable sections of the south side of 9	Response: Development to the south of 9 Avenue SE, to the west of 12 Street



Avenue S.E. through an urban form transition as referenced in D.4, but limited by shadow impact as illustrated in Figure G-2.	SE in the Inglewood Triangle will be up to 12 storeys. Policy speaks to demonstrating how design and massing responds to adjacent development, reduces massing on upper floors and provides stepbacks.
G.5: Height on the north side of the corridor should not increase shadowing to the north from a 20.0m height reference at back of lot, and should respect the mid-rise scale of 9 Avenue S.E. that ranges between 20.0m and 22.5m.	Response: Development will respond to the specific urban form and scale in the LAP. Specific heights in metres will not be included in the LAP.
G.6: Although the upper storeys on new buildings should focus on residential uses, these corridors serve as the commercial heart of the community and should be identified as Neighbourhood Mixed-Use, Commercial Major with Active Frontages along the ground storey as defined by the Guidebook for Great Communities.	Response: The Municipal Development Plan identifies 9 Avenue SE as a Neighbourhood Main Street. The LAP identifies the area as Neighbourhood Commercial and Neighbourhood Flex. The LAP also incorporates the Active Frontage along 9 Avenue SE, west of 13 Street SE which requires active uses at-grade.
Ramsay Main Street & Transit Oriented Developm	nent (TOD)
Key Recommendations	, ,
·	
H.1: Maintain a Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise	Response: Along 12 Street SE,
building scale of 6 storeys or less) and an Active	development will be approximately six
Frontage for 11 Street S.E., Mid-Rise Streetscape	storeys at the north end towards
(Buildings 6 storeys or less) scale can be	Inglewood and will increase to above
established interior to the blocks and off major	12 storeys next to the 26 Avenue SE
corridors.	LRT Station.
H.2: High-Rise building scale can be explored	Development in the 'High' category is
within certain areas as shown on the maps as part	generally limited to areas around the
of the Master Plan process. Land use should not	Crossroads Market area and along the
exceed sixteen storeys	Freight Rail line.
Inglewood/Ramsay Transit Oriented Developmen	t (TOD)
Key Recommendations	
14. The 44/42 Ctreet C.F. comiden about direction	Decrease Along 40 Chroat CC
I.1: The 11/12 Street S.E corridor should maintain	Response: Along 12 Street SE,
the historical scale of the Mid-Rise Streetscape	development will be approximately six
(Low-Rise building scale of up to 6 storeys), with taller buildings strategically located on interior sites.	storeys at the north end towards Inglewood and will increase to above
tanci bununiya atrategicany located on interior sites.	12 storeys next to the 26 Avenue SE
	LRT Station.
I.2: The old Brewery site should be master planned,	Response: The Brewery-Rail lands is
with careful placement of taller buildings to reduce	being shown with a comprehensive
shadow impact, safe and visible pedestrian	planning site overlay which will require
connections to the future station, inclusion of urban	p.sg s.ts svona, willon will require
Commodation to the ratare oration, moradion of arban	



public spaces and green space, and preservation	a master plan/outline plan process for
of Mid-Rise Streetscape (Low-Rise building scale)	redevelopment.
character along existing corridors.	
Bus Rapid Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) -	Blackfoot Truck Stop
Key Recommendations	
J.1: The entire site should be designed cohesively	Response: This area is being shown
under a Master Plan (F.1), including new streets,	with a comprehensive planning site
public spaces, and careful placement of taller	overlay, which indicates that additional
buildings.	planning work will be required through
banan gor	a master plan/outline plan process.
J.2: Master planning of the TOD should include	Response: The south side of 9 Avenue
both sides of 9 Avenue SE and 19 Street SE, and	SE across from the Blackfoot Truck
other areas as noted.	Stop is not included in the Future
Other areas as noted.	•
	Planning policy overlay, however the
	land use concept provides guidance for
LO. AV/DA. Danding AV/DA restrictions require	future redevelopment of this area.
J.3: AVPA: Pending AVPA restrictions may limit	Response: This area is being shown
development potential of the site and should be	with a comprehensive planning site
addressed in a Master Plan, including interim	overlay, which indicates that additional
development options should the need arise.	planning work will be required in the
	future.
J.4: Because of immediate development interest,	Response: This area is being shown
this site should be included in the ARP as a	with a comprehensive planning site
"Comprehensive Large Site" as defined by the June	overlay, which indicates that additional
2019 Draft Guidebook.	planning work will be required in the
	future.
J.5: Other recommendations as noted on the	Response: the LAP generally aligns
adjacent map to the right are recommended.	with these recommendations.
Central-West Ramsay	
Key Recommendations	
K.1: The majority of the residential areas of	Response: The majority of the
Ramsay are maintained as the Limited-Local	traditional residential areas in Ramsay
building scale, preserving a Cottage Streetscape	are shown as Neighbourhood- Local,
(B2.2).	apart from 8 Street SE, which is being
(52.2).	shown as Neighbourhood Connector.
	Heritage Guideline areas will also
	provide opportunities for preservation of
	community character.
K.2: 8 Street S.E. is shown as Limited-Minor	Response: After speaking with the CA
building scale but should be fine-tuned to a	and industry, 8 Street was moved to
character that limits height to 3 storeys but allows	allow development up to 6 storeys. This
for a mixed use street character including	
	will provide more opportunities for
residential, ground oriented multi-family and row	mixed-use development and retail in a
houses, commercial (retail, office, service) and	neighbourhood context.
institutional uses.	



Public Improvements Key Recommendations	
L.1: Identify an ARP section for which public improvement projects can be listed and referenced, and establish a process for which they can be updated over time.	Response: Chapter 3 includes key improvement projects. Appendix A also includes a Summary of Implementation Options with various options developed based on the feedback received during this process.
L.2: Provide a clear reference to other policies/studies related to public improvement projects.	Response: The Guidebook for Great Communities provides references to other City policies and Guidelines. The LAP will not duplicate this information as the LAP needs to be read with the Guidebook.
L.3: Once funded or partially funded, projects should be developed through a public design process.	Response: Community engagement processes will be evaluated on a project by project basis in accordance with The City's Engagement Framework.
Other Recommendations Recommendation:	
M.1 Vision Section 2.0: The long one-line list of policies identifying vision and core ideas is confusing and repetitive with other policy. Summarize key Guidebook for Great Communities' elements (identifying them as key Guidebook for Great Communities' elements), and then concisely identify vision and core ideas that are unique to the Inglewood and Ramsay communities.	Response: a concise vision and core values have been developed.
M.2 Separate Immediate Opportunities from Long- Term Opportunities: As shown in Section F, clearly identify redevelopment areas that are immediate to mid-term redevelopment opportunities as Comprehensive Sites and those that are long-term redevelopment opportunities, particular stable/well invested industrial areas.	Response: The comprehensive planning site overlay provides direction for development of large sites in the medium to long term.
M.3 Mapping Legibility: Provide clear mapping within the ARP, including lot lines and significant historic resources.	Response: The LAP adheres to The City's mapping standards for policy documents and mapping content. Lot lines will not be included on maps as the ARP maps are meant to provide general direction.
M.4 Plain, Consistent Language: The June 2019 Draft Guidebook is intended to use plain language, but is at the same time proposing a new planning approach and concepts. This will be a challenge in	Response: The LAP includes plain language consistent with the Guidebook for Great Communities.



the near term, demanding the use of plain language consistently across documents, including the ARP.	
M.5 Row Houses: Row Houses are a common challenge and opportunity throughout the inner city. They should be handled in a common way through city-wide policy. Inner-city neighbourhoods generally continue to gentrify, creating affordable housing limitations in low density neighbourhoods. Block-end row houses in particular utilize block-end on-street parking (up to 7 on-street parking spaces serving visitor parking for 4 units) and improve a streetscape that has traditionally been defined by side yards. This "gentle density" is critical for these neighbourhoods to maintain a mixed, eclectic character and resilience through diversity. The Inglewood and Ramsay communities are unique, but should be subject to a City-wide approach consistent with all city neighbourhoods. At the same time, Section B sets out essential community character elements that can be used to guide design in character with Inglewood and Ramsay, including sociable front yards (porches), maintaining the feel of the Cottage Streetscape, and preserving/integrating with historic assets.	Response: The LAP adheres to city-wide tools and approaches for rowhouses and urban form categories found in the Guidebook for Great Communities.
M.6 Secondary Suites: Similar to the Row House issue described in recommendation M.5, "gentle density" should be widely implemented providing much needed affordable housing and appropriate density in the inner-city and near transit services.	Response: The LAP adheres to city- wide tools and approaches for secondary suites and urban form categories found in the Guidebook for Great Communities.



B&A Planning Recommendations and Response February 2021

M.7 AVPA: There are many factors that can limit the development potential for a site or neighbourhood. These factors can include the market demand, environmental remediation, and servicing availability/cost. The AVPA Regulation that limits development density in Inglewood is just one more limiting factor. And like other factors. circumstances can change quickly making redevelopment opportunities surface. It is the job of the ARP to ensure that when opportunities surface, new development occurs in line with the communities' vision and policies. The ARP should both include policy to continue challenging the AVPA Regulation's restrictions in light of recent transit investments, and plan for the future regardless of the many potential factors that can limit the realization of that vision. M.8 Use and Purpose of Projections: The 2017

Response: The LAP adheres to citywide tools and approaches for development within the AVPA in accordance with discussions with The Province and Airport Authority.

The LAP provides direction for future development; rules of the AVPA may limit potential development that is shown in the urban form map within the NEF 30. As those contours change, the plan can be amended to provide accurate information.

M.8 Use and Purpose of Projections: The 2017 Draft Inglewood and Ramsay ARPs included development growth projections. The 2018 Draft ARP conspicuously omitted the projections raising questions on the nature of these figures. As discussed in M.7 there are many factors that can impact development potential, and predicting the private market is a challenge - especially looking out past 5 years. The projections were intended to provide a benchmark to measure the ARP's policies in response to a possible development scenario - a way to test assumptions and explore viability in light of public investment.

The confusion arises from the implied precision of

Response: The drat LAP aligns with the North Hill Communities LAP template, which doesn't include community projections.

The confusion arises from the implied precision of the predicted number, and failure to adequately describe how the information is to be used. It is recommended that this information can be useful - perhaps in an appendix- but should be tempered by rounding off predicted numbers and clearly positioning the projection data.

The LAP generally adheres to this principle.

M.9 80/20: The 2018 Draft ARP policy calling for 20% of the Plan Area's developable area to accommodate 80% of future growth should be carried into the new draft ARP, as it has been demonstrated as an acceptable policy and frame of reference for future growth.

The City is collecting feedback on the name throughout our online engage portal.

M.10 ARP Name Change: The name "The Historic East Calgary ARP" proved to be generally unpopular throughout the engagement process. It



is suggested here that it be named Central East	
Calgary ARP, but should be explored through	
engagement with stakeholders.	
M.11 TOD Circles: The Walk Sheds of TODs can	Response: The LAP will adhere to The
be confusing and should be clarified within the	City's mapping standards for policy
ARP. They simply provide a reference for general	documents and mapping content.
proximity to LRT stations, guiding how	
redevelopment opportunities might be matched to	
urban form intensity and density.	
M.12 Auto Uses Prohibition: The Auto-Use	Response: The LAP includes policy
prohibition was well received through engagement	around auto uses, and drive throughs.
and should be carried through to the new ARP,	
noting that existing facilities can continue into the	
future.	



