

# Calgary Regional Land Use Plan Working Session Notes

## Development Forms

February 14, 2008

### Attendance

#### *Elected*

|                           |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Reeve Dene Cooper         | MD Bighorn    |
| Councillor Harvey Buckley | MD Rocky View |
| Councillor Miles Chester  | Cochrane      |
| Councillor Jim Ridley     | Canmore       |
| Councillor Maria Dunki    | Bighorn       |
| Mayor Phil McCracken      | Crossfield    |
| Councillor Norma Lang     | Crossfield    |
| Councillor Gordon Branson | MD Rocky View |
| Councillor Beth Kish      | Okotoks       |
| Councillor Hopeton Louden | MD Rocky View |

#### *Staff/Other*

|                   |                                     |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Guy Buchanan      | Centron                             |
| Guy Greenway      | Miistakis                           |
| Adrian Buckley    | Dillon Consulting                   |
| Aaron Aubin       | Dillon Consulting                   |
| Alan Kidd         | MD Rocky View                       |
| Amanda Cromar     | CRP                                 |
| Birol Fisekci     | Bordeaux Developments Corp          |
| Bob Clark         | UDI                                 |
| Bob Miller        | CRP                                 |
| Bob Orysiuk       | Medallion Development Corp          |
| Chris Hadwin      | Stantec Consulting Ltd.             |
| Chris Wolfe       | MD Rocky View                       |
| Colleen Shepherd  | CRP                                 |
| Craig Lawrence    | Chestermere                         |
| David Fishley     | Dundee Developments                 |
| David Poppitt     | Westcreek Developments              |
| Diane Visser      | Cochrane                            |
| Doug Olson        | O2                                  |
| Don McLeod        | Westcreek Developments              |
| Liz Breakey       | Action for Agriculture              |
| Emily Pepper      | MD Bighorn                          |
| Ernie Park        | Brown and Associates Planning Group |
| Gary Buxton       | Canmore                             |
| Gerry Barron      | United Communities                  |
| Gloria Wilkinson  | BRBC                                |
| Gordon McIlwain   | MD Rocky View                       |
| Grace Lui         | Calgary                             |
| Ian Fawcett       | MD Bighorn                          |
| Heather Hemingway | MD Foothills                        |

|                          |                             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Don Heron                | CPR                         |
| Rob Butler               | PMRA                        |
| Kim Goode                | Miistakis                   |
| Billy Oulton             | Diamond 7 Ranch             |
| Iona Sentes              | Qualico Communities         |
| Jacqui Lucas             | Qualico Communities         |
| James Robertson          | Calgary                     |
| James Scott              | Stantec Consulting          |
| Jennifer Lefevre         | OpenGate Properties         |
| Jessica Van de Mosselaer | Calgary                     |
| John Coulson             | Wardrop Engineering         |
| Jorie McKenzie           | MD Rocky View               |
| Jose Reyes               | High River                  |
| Julian deCocq            | Cochrane                    |
| Keith Crowder            | Western Irrigation District |
| Kelly Learned            | Cochrane                    |
| Ken Prusky               | Calgary Fire Department     |
| Kimberley Soutiere       | MPE Engineering Ltd         |
| Lisette Burga-Ghersci    | Genesis Land Development    |
| Lynne Dale               | Chestermere                 |
| Mandy Daviduik           | Medallion Development       |
| Marianne Wade            | Tamani Communities          |
| Marilee Hill             | Heritage Pointe             |
| Mark Steffler            | MPE Engineering             |
| Marley Oness             | Okotoks                     |
| Mary Axworthy            | Calgary                     |
| Maureen Boudreault       | UDI                         |
| Mike Jansen              | Harmony Park                |
| Mike Brander             | Remington Development       |
| Ben Lee                  | UDI                         |
| Paul Cochrane            | Calgary                     |
| Rick Butler              | CRP                         |
| Rick Wiljamaa            | MD Rocky View               |
| Ron Husack               | Wardrop Engineering         |
| Ron Laycraft             | MD Foothills                |
| Ron Zazelenchuk          | UDI                         |
| Scott Hooper             | Calgary                     |
| Sharon Wood              | Calgary                     |
| Steve Hanhart            | Okotoks                     |
| Tim Creelman             | Calgary                     |
| Tim Dietzler             | MD Rocky View               |
| Tim Mason                | MD Rocky View               |
| Verne Kemble             | Action for Agriculture      |
| Victor Kallos            | BKDI Architects             |
| Mike Ziehr               | Wheatland County            |
| Patrick Burke            | GLB Planning                |
| Rick Quail               | Okotoks                     |
| Mike Flynn               | UDI                         |
| Cathy Ashcroft           | Calgary                     |
| Jean Carlos              | Opengate                    |

## **1 Preamble**

The Calgary Regional Partnership is creating a regional growth management plan where each municipality's uniqueness and autonomy will be kept, while ensuring that we have a way forward to make decisions about sustainable growth in the region for our future. The plan that we collectively create, with all 18 municipalities aboard, will help us determine a logical process for the **sustainable** development of infrastructure, land and community services across the region. Put another way, we will determine where the next 1.5 million new residents to our region will live sustainably; and what areas or lands need to be preserved forever – be that for agriculture, recreation or environmental protection. Taking this regional approach will allow us to not only avoid potential inter-municipal and environmental conflicts in the region, but it will help us proactively plan. The plan is being built for citizens in the region, by citizens in the region. Opportunities for input have been created for expert groups alongside citizens. To date we have developed three growth scenarios that show what the region could look like if we made certain assumptions. The first being – what if we continued to grow as we are now? The second looks at growth management from an entirely environmental perspective and the third looks at nodes and economic and transportation corridors. These scenarios have been fully and spatially mapped out by our planning team and have been presented to all the Mayors, Reeves and Councillors across the region.

This working session is part of the evaluation process and is designed to explore all the key issues around the regional plan and in particular, with respect to the different forms of development. We will present an overview of the three growth scenarios mentioned above with particular emphasis on the different forms of development needed to be considered. Experts from around the region will join attendees to discuss the key elements of the scenarios as well as the essential criteria needed to move forward to the Draft Plan.

## **2 Welcome provided by Councillor Gordon Branson from MD Rocky View**

Councillor Branson welcomed all participants on behalf of the CRP Executive Committee. He presented via PowerPoint an overview of the background of the CRP and the history of the Regional Land Use Plan. This presentation is available in full on the CRP website or by clicking on

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/32073/crp%20overview%20feb%202008.pdf>

## **3 Session Presentations**

All presentations are available to view in full at [www.calgaryregion.ca](http://www.calgaryregion.ca) under the Regional Land Use Plan/presentations or by clicking on

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/projects/projects/regionalgrowth/presentations.aspx>

### **Regional Land Use Plan – an overview of three scenarios for regional planning By CRP Core Planning Team member - Doug Olson, O2 Planning and Design**

Doug Olson – planning consultant to the CRP on the regional land use plan core planning team provided a summary of the three learning scenarios that look long into the future and assume the same 1.75 million additional population. The first -Trend and Regional Predictions maps out what the region would look like if we continued with current policies, all approved ASPs, MDPs, and other contemplated projects currently in the planning stages. The second scenario looks at growth from the perspective of Nodes and Corridors – A network of connected nodes and corridors of intensified development that

provides for efficient infrastructure and transportation delivery whilst building complete communities that adopt the forms of towns and villages. The final scenario focuses on creating a future that assumes that we will identify an ecologically and culturally sensitive land base and that development is excluded from these areas. It will create complete communities that adopt the forms of towns and villages with non retail employment associated with all towns to reduce travel requirements. Each of these scenarios will be evaluated against the same set of impact criteria and the resulting “Plan” will be a hybrid scenario that includes critically important conditions/assumptions from each learning scenario.

This presentation can be viewed by clicking

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30727/o2%20crp%20develop%20workshopfeb14.pdf>

## **Regional Land Use Plan – Emerging Directions – summary of key messages and questions that we have been hearing.**

**By Project Manager – Colleen Shepherd**

The key messages and questions are summarized as follows:-

Over the past few weeks, we have heard from many people around the region and the following summarizes what we are getting strong and clear support for:-

- ✓ Doing regional planning together, especially connecting plans for land use, transportation, utilities and water
- ✓ Protecting the watershed and our region’s impact on downstream water conditions
- ✓ Looking at long-term possibilities around regional water, wastewater and transit systems
- ✓ Thinking regionally about economic development
- ✓ Minimize the “Region’s” footprint – considering more compact, mixed-use land patterns
- ✓ Really respecting and protecting key ecological features and systems
- ✓ The region’s economic competitiveness will be tied to it’s quality of life and attractiveness to new workers
- ✓ Understanding the cumulative effects of our activities
- ✓ Climate change needs to be taken seriously
- ✓ The political leadership being shown in doing regional planning together and being willing to address the big issues impacting the region AND being supportive of the involvement of citizens, stakeholder groups
- ✓ The culture and uniqueness of our communities is very important to us – how do we hold on to that sense of who we are as we change and grow ?

And what we consider maybe areas of tension, trade-off or choice:-

- ✓ How will this plan be implemented and what to do about those who would disregard it ?
- ✓ How to get jobs to locate in targeted areas ? (e.g. areas on the west side of the region, transit nodes and existing towns ?)
- ✓ Intensification makes sense - how to make it happen ?
- ✓ If and how to focus growth into areas that have the least impact on the environment / water?
- ✓ How to compensate landowners for their efforts in protecting the watershed and natural environment (e.g. transferable credits )?
- ✓ Are we willing to protect very long-term options for transit / train corridors ?
- ✓ How large do existing towns want to become ?
- ✓ How to move forward implementing a Regional Plan together - tension between clear interdependence, yet valuing local autonomy ?

The emerging directions...

### 1. Regional systems

The regional land use plan should define and build-on the regional-scale systems that affect and serve the region as a whole:

- Ecological processes and water / watershed
- Land use patterns integrated with regional transportation infrastructure
- Potable water / wastewater / stormwater utilities
- Regional open space

### 2. Regional land use patterns

Regional land use plan builds on, reinforces and *makes efficient use of the services* provided by the Regional Systems described above.

- Intensification of the existing regional land use footprint
- New forms of development encouraged closer to transit services and jobs
- New jobs encouraged in conjunction with population growth

### Discussion following presentations:-

- ? What's the assumption about population growth ?
  - Existing population based on census – updating continuously
  - Using a 50 – 60 year forecast (based on the Calgary Regional Economic Forecast – CREF) with an overall regional population of about 2.8 million in the 50 – 60 year timeframe
  - Exercise is “if the growth occurs, how best to locate the next 1.75 million people ?)
- ? Some suggestions for the regional planning that needs to be done:
  - Should identify sources of gravel and aggregate – map and protect as a regional resource to be taken out prior to development
  - Look at regional landfill requirements, locations
  - Lobby Province about recycling of water sources – need to promote efficiency and re-use of water
- ? How to deal with influences outside the region ? (e.g. emergence of the N/S Highway 2 corridor- will likely get more growth in the future)
  - Need to look at development opportunities along the corridor
  - Need to talk with the regions to the North and South of Calgary region – ensure alignment of approaches
- ? Soil types – what percent of the province's good soils are situated in the Calgary region ?
- ? Decision-making at CRP – how will they decide on a new regional plan ? Voting ?
  - Elected officials have a working committee looking at governance issues / approaches in relation to the emerging regional plan now
  - June's AGM of the General Assembly of the Calgary Regional Plan will include a vote on the directions for writing-up the plan, but not a vote on the plan itself. If specific directions can be agreed upon in June, staff will write-up a proposed plan over the summer, circulate the

proposed plan to the partner municipalities in the fall, Steering Committee may then make revisions, will then bring a proposed Regional Land Use Plan to another meeting of the General Assembly in early 2009.

- There is a parallel governance discussion now underway, which will eventually clarify the decision-making structure and governance issues for plan implementation
  - Province supports CRP's process and is giving it room to be successful.
- ? Is there enough emphasis on transportation e.g. use of biofuels ? if gas goes up to \$400 / barrel, have you looked at that ?
- Have been looking at transportation needs with the City Transportation staff and Provincial staff and putting more emphasis on transit, and how to make that a more viable choice and system for people in the region
- ? Are there transportation corridors missing ? the 2<sup>nd</sup> ringroad ?
- The second ring road facility is included in the assumed long-term road network, although there have been discussions about what exactly its role would / could be and whether certain elements of its route might be needed more than others.
- ? About the jobs and housing assumptions – has been a significant challenge to attract jobs into every community – what would it take to look at clustering those jobs ? or housing closer to jobs ? Can we do strategic locations for jobs rather than assuming there could be jobs in every community ?
- Expect that the hybrid will have employment areas; but is it reasonable to build very large communities of 60,000 without employment areas (besides local retail and population-based services) ?
  - Will be issues if we don't get the jobs in the assumed mixed-use areas – will put more pressure on road systems
- ? Haven't heard from people in the "protected" areas (e.g. watershed and ecologically sensitive areas, wetlands) – which won't really be protected 'till there is a way of paying for that protection
- Will eventually be looking at tools for compensation (TDR's) – can bring the issue into the conversation that way but it's not clear on how far the regional can go (without legislation) to create mechanisms
- ? How would the trend scenario impact the water quality ? Trend scenario should talk about impacts of trend on quality (especially phosphorus).
- Development is already having an impact on water – the issues will be water distribution / sharing, in addition to water quality and water quantity challenges
  - Bow River Basin Council will be proposing new water quality standards for the region in the near future
- ? Trend scenario needs to acknowledge intensification that has been happening.
- Trend has addressed reality of suburban growth and dwelling unit intensification, and builds-in existing municipal expectations for further intensification in context of currently approved plans and related expectations
- ? Importance of protection of the watershed (it will cost something to do it); importance of downstream water impacts; and the importance of stormwater management approaches (which goes into our drinking water – rivers) and into private water systems (e.g. Western Irrigation District

WID canals) – will only become more expensive for water as the region grows – and downstream users end-up paying to mitigate water quality impacts:

- Need to be recognized and planned for at the regional level, and need funding mechanisms developed for implementation
- Re: stormwater – looking at green network for stormwater cleaning, especially along Calgary’s east side
- Also looking at riparian buffer systems

? Some areas, like Inglewood community in Calgary, are intensifying with people aging in place. Maybe lifecycle losses is more of a suburban phenomena; open space – importance of an open space corridor along Calgary’s east side and East/West along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE to Chestermere; series of complete communities with transit services along 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE is a good idea – question – will the regional concepts be scaleable ? that translates nodal ideas from regional to local planning processes ?

- Intention is that the regional-scale plan will be implemented through local processes
- Will explore in the governance discussions how far the plan should / may go to suggest / encourage / require ?? realization of the concepts at different scales
- We hope it happens at the local level, but if it doesn’t what can be done ?
- Depends on conscientious good will – will need a really good plan and good relationships to implement it together
- May be any / all of 4 different ways to get some degree of alignment of local plans to the regional plan, including:
  - Regulation
  - Conscientious good will
  - Market changes (e.g. cost of gasoline, cost of services, changing consumer preferences, aging population with different priorities)
  - Expectations for alignment could be tied to provincial funding for regional systems, if requested

? So what happens when the Bow River flows eventually decrease ?

- We are looking at the research and will do a climate change workshop session in the near future
- Are assuming adequate license to draw from the Bow is already in place, so not assuming any significant changes to instream needs or flows
- Reminder that, very recently, the City of Atlanta was within 38 days of running out of potable water – shortages are a very real possibility – 3 messages – water IS important; the situation IS changing; the issue HAS our attention.

## **Transfer of Development Credits: Presentations and Discussion**

### **An exploration of land owner, development compensation tools By Guy Greenway and Kim Good – Miistakis Institute for the Rockies**

This presentation can be viewed by clicking

[http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30629/rlup\\_dev\\_forms\\_greenaway\\_miistakis\\_inst\\_presentatio\\_n.pdf](http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30629/rlup_dev_forms_greenaway_miistakis_inst_presentatio_n.pdf)

Transfer of Development Credits (TDC) programs are a municipal tool used for promoting land conservation when facing rapid growth and land conversion pressure. It can be initiated by council, community developer, conservationists, etc. and can support a community vision. These types of programs which involve designating land into “sending” parcels (conservation areas) and “receiving” parcels (development areas) and assigning “development credits” to each parcel. The developers then purchase “credits” from other parcels, which extinguishes development potential on the “sending” parcels. TDC’s have been used in the US since the 1960’s, in Canada since 2003 and are now gaining prominence in Alberta. A community needs to have a clear vision, it needs to recognize that there are trade-offs and a TDC program is one tool that can be used for managing land use.

### **Carraigridge – development in the MD Bighorn looking at transfer of development credits By Ian Fawcett from MD Bighorn**

This presentation can be viewed by clicking:-

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/32093/crp%20-%20carraigridge.pdf>

#### **Discussion following presentations:-**

- ? What happens when all the credits have been gathered and used ?
  - Boulder County was in that situation (all land in the county is now subject to the TDC program and at build-out)
  - Now looking at slivers of private land, situated among the public lands
  - Now moving from units (being traded) to floorspace
  - Not always clear what to do next (when pool of credits is exhausted) e.g. when built-out, do you rethink the plan and start over again with a new plan and new credits ?
  - In Carriage Ridge, the ASP locks receiving area / density in place (can’t intensify) and the sending area’s tied to easements (can’t develop).
  
- ? Are there examples of multi-jurisdictional systems ?
  - Boulder County has 7 interjurisdictional agreements; New Jersey Pinelands would be a second example
  
- ? Will TDR just exacerbate the checkerboard design that results from fragmented development ? will it get us where we want to go as a region ?
  - The pattern is not driven by the TDR tool, but rather by the plan (or lack of) that provides the framework within which the tool is used.
  - In Bighorn, talks about existing “rights” are more about rearranging where development occurs, not creating more rights
  
- ? What about ecological performance – is it enhanced because of TDR’s ?
  - Biggest challenge is not being specific enough about what you’re trying to achieve through use of the system
  - So the tool is used intentionally, and is understood to be just one tool, it is not a panacea

## Panel Discussion

|          |                  |  |
|----------|------------------|--|
| Members: | Jennifer Lefevre | Opengate Properties                    |
|          | Dick Ebersohn    | City of Calgary                        |
|          | Birol Fisekci    | Bordeaux Developments                  |
|          | Ian Fawcett      | Horseshoe Lands Development/MD Bighorn |

### Panel Observations and review of the following questions on building complete communities – approaches to planning and developing more complete sustainable communities.

1. What are we trying to achieve when building a "complete" community? What outcomes are we looking for?
2. What questions do we need to think about in regards to building complete communities as we develop a regional scale land use plan?

#### Dick Ebersohn – Senior Planner, City of Calgary

[http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30639/rlup\\_dev\\_forms\\_dick\\_ebersohn\\_city\\_present.pdf](http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30639/rlup_dev_forms_dick_ebersohn_city_present.pdf)

This is an overview of Complete Sustainable Communities in the Calgary context with the background to the “Calgary Plan” and the current work of “Plan It Calgary”. The presentation includes the City’s Sustainability Principles for Integrated Land Use and Mobility, their Smart Growth Rating System and an example detailed – Garrison Woods development. The Calgary Plan (Municipal Development Plan) aims to ensure that new communities become more sustainable through planning. Areas of focus include, minimal residential density of 7 units per gross residential acre, providing livable and complete communities, efficiently utilizing land and infrastructure, creating areas of higher residential density with a focus on pedestrian, cyclist and transit, rather than private automobile and provide attractive public spaces that encourages walking and promotes a vibrant community life. Plan It Calgary, the city’s new integrated land use and mobility plan is based on a number of sustainable principals that must be considered as a whole, not individually, in order to be successful. ***A smart growth rating system is being considered as an incentive program*** for the planning process of areas such as, residential density, streetscape appearance, transit service, environmental conservation, as well as other components.

#### Birol Fisekci - Bordeaux Developments

[http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30649/rlup\\_dev\\_forms\\_bordeaux\\_developments\\_presentation.pdf](http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/30649/rlup_dev_forms_bordeaux_developments_presentation.pdf)

This presentation looked at the benefits to logical nodes of development and things to consider when planning a complete and sustainable community. A regional vision that fosters intra-municipal cooperation, a shared destiny and progressive politics will result in complete and sustainable communities. Logical nodes of development provide numerous benefits including, a greater opportunity and necessity for developers to be more creative in their designs, alleviating stress on transportation networks and creating specific land use opportunities which are complimentary to one another. Planning a complete and sustainable community should focus on optimal land use, transparency in the planning process, enriching the lifestyle of those living or visiting the community, contributing positively

to municipality and region, and respecting the environment. He referenced Harmony Development which was a thoughtfully planned mixed-use family community.

**Ian Fawcett - MD Bighorn**

<http://www.calgaryregion.ca/crp/media/32083/crp%20horseshoe.pdf>

This presentation looked at the background to a proposed development off Highway #1 just before Canmore called Horseshoe Lands. Here they are proposing to create an integrated community that is socially, environmentally and fiscally sustainable.

**Jennifer Lefevre - Opengate Properties**

### **What is a Complete Community?**

When we start talking about complete communities, I think we need to view the question of “What is a complete community?” from the triple bottom line perspective. This means that the social, environmental and economic aspects are each addressed during through the community design and construction.

People in the industry are talking about environmental sustainability and we see lots of exciting examples around the region of what is possible in the realm of environmental sustainability. We are seeing the incorporation of alternative energy sources, water conservation initiatives and the preservation of valuable open space around the region.

However, OpenGate’s philosophy rests on the belief that sustainability is larger than just the environmental equation and we are exploring the concept of what creates social sustainability. We want to address what makes communities into places where people want to live and, better yet, are proud to live. We see that this is about creating a sense of place by building vibrant and diverse neighbourhoods, the traditional sense of neighbourhood, as opposed to some of the ways we have viewed communities in the past. We believe the question of social sustainability is about building a neighbourhood that supports the interaction of a diverse group of people. We are looking at opportunities to foster this through:

- Walkability and pedestrian friendly streetscaping
- Integrated housing mix that includes single family homes, different kinds of multi-family products and seniors’ housing and provides both rental properties and ownership alternatives
- Mixed affordability, from subsidized alternatives to market rate housing, which possible because of the variety of housing mix within the community
- Transportation alternatives that support the social structure of the community and improve quality of life

From a truly social perspective, we believe that a multi-modal transportation split is essential to creating sustainable communities. The environmental benefits of reduced vehicle miles travelled are obvious. However, there are social benefits to transportation alternatives that should also be considered. For example, creating a community along existing strategic development corridors allows access to regular

and, perhaps more importantly, frequent transit service. The benefit is that residents may choose to live without a car and are capable of living well. If, as a developer, you are committed to establishing affordable housing and trying to support individuals and families, in this environment of declining affordability, car ownership can quickly eat into household income. By contrast, in creating an environment where someone could choose to live well without a car, that household could support other basic and perhaps even more advanced needs with the money required to support the habit of the car. Creating a sense of place and allowing households to live well without a car is about ensuring that the daily support functions for individuals and their families exist within the community. OpenGate envisions that this would include childcare, learning environments, groceries, recreational opportunities for different age groups and restaurants.

At the end of the day, all of this is only feasible if the economics make sense. There needs to be commitment around complete communities in order to allow them to meet their full potential because complete communities cannot be the responsibility of any one party in the development process. It is the integration of several different, normally independent groups that have to come together to foster this type of development. The health regions, the boards of education, the municipality, the developer and the provincial government would all have to collaborate to make the elements truly integrated and economically viable. OpenGate believes it is possible to move community development from the philosophy of planned obsolescence into a lifecycle approach that has options for a diverse population and supports the ability of people to age in place.

### **Summary Comments and Questions:**

? Have developers looked at ecological footprint for their developments, especially travel to other locations and buildings (e.g. for work) ?

Harmony:

- We look at logical or optimal uses of land – need a logical node of employment
- Energy / electricity – at smaller development scales we can look at district heating possibilities

Open Gate:

- We are located closer to downtown, NE and SE industrial (job) areas; we are balancing affordability with footprint so are looking for affordable locations, connections to transit, nodes and corridors connections

Horseshoe Lands:

- Our development is a good example of a reduced footprint approach – how to be a sustainable community rather than a bedroom commuting community – know it will be hard to attract jobs there quickly – taking a long-term view – using a phasing approach and explicating linking amount / timing of residential development to the timing of creating of employment in the development

Calgary;

- Is about our impact of future generations – recognizing the costs we’d we imposing on them by decisions made now, how they might be able to pay for them later, and how we might be able to reduce those costs (and future obligation to pay) through different design decisions today.

? There are significant servicing costs in supporting development outside the urban areas. In Heritage Point, we’ve created a private water / wastewater company to service the development, but there are issues around getting the economies of scale needed. What is the “right” scale / size of a new community ?

Horseshoe Lands:

- Is as much about density as it is about size – to make the servicing efficient and viable
- Find ways of linking communities to corridors in closer proximity to each other, and linked with mobility.

Harmony:

- Can offset lower density with employment nodes and efficiency of on-site high-tech servicing systems.

? Good design intention to “do the big moves” regionally, but need to recognize that the “devil is in the details”. In the Horseshoe Lands proposal for example, shouldn’t the red area (commercial lands and Town Centre) actually be touching both the river and/or the train corridor ? Is there not the risk that development on the Horseshoe Lands will just create more traffic on the TransCanada Hwy ?

- Good idea – when the planning was started for the Horseshoe Lands the idea of a long-term commuter rail from Calgary was not on the table – perhaps it could be revisited if there is a serious consideration of commuter rail for the future.

? Economic viability of a walking / transit-oriented community vs. an auto-dependent form – should review the Metrolinx website in greater Toronto which suggests that a continuous auto-oriented approach reaches physical limits in road expansion possibilities (e.g. Toronto, Vancouver) and that transit is likely less expensive over the long-term in any event.