

# **Haven vs Income Generation**

**HOME IS HERE?**

**In favour of Councillor Chabot's motion  
Repealing R-CG blanket rezoning**

**To R-C2**

# Historical Rezoning Debate

- Federal Housing Accelerator Fund offer of \$228 M for creating additional housing
- Specifically in Calgary, \$129 M was withheld pending passage of citywide rezoning, for reasons not made clear ... about \$21/person current pop.
- Councillor McLean moved for a rezoning plebiscite but it was rejected by Council
- A substituted public hearing heard 62% speakers nix the proposal and 88% written submissions opposed it
- In spite of overwhelming rejection by Calgarians Council passed it
- Many councillors and the Mayor were elected in 2025 on a platform to repeal the Blanket Rezoning
- In 2025, Calgary received \$23 M additional boost
- Outstanding is \$129 M original holdback. Some fear financial reprisal if blanket rezoning repealed; other progress measures are being sought

## **Times have changed...**

**Blanket rezoning took away owners' democratic input to issues that affect the haven aspect of residential property**

**It put a finger on the scale in favour of income generation both for owners and the City**

**The \$129 M grant money which may or may not remain withheld from Calgary without blanket rezoning, amounts to about \$ 81 per person or about 2/3 of the tax I pay for one month. It has already been offset by an extra payment Calgary received for excellent early progress**

**I value my democratic rights a lot more than \$ 81 or less it is being valued at by the City...**

# **The promises of Blanket Rezoning**

- **Increased density to satisfy federal grant policies**
- **Increase in affordable housing availability**
- **Faster administrative turnaround by cutting red tape**
- **Lowered infrastructure costs through using excess capacity**
- **Assurances of green space retention and maintained tree canopy**

# The Results of Blanket Rezoning

- **Increased density to satisfy federal grant policies**  
*minimal directly as a result of blanket rezoning - most density increases came from city owned property*  
*(media interview)*
- **Increase in affordable housing availability**  
*actually affordable houses were torn down to allow more expensive developments rather than more affordable accommodation - no daisy chain effect*  
*more expensive units inflated surrounding units*
- **Faster administrative turnaround**  
*some improvements but still long* *(media interview)*
- **Lowered infrastructure costs**  
*proved to be a myth - costs spiralled because of intensive labour costs and repair of oft-deferred replacements extended timelines*
- **Assurances of green space retention and maintained tree canopy**  
*not even close!!!*  
*plus insurance companies refusing overland flood coverage due to increased building coverage*  
*causing probable storm system overload*

# **Negatives of Blanket Rezoning**

- **Loss of another democratic check**
- **Ill will. Partly reflected in Calgary's declining satisfaction ratings**
- **Decrease in affordable and accessible housing**
- **Infra-structure savings turned out to be a poorly informed premise**
- **Home owners next to expanded and towering developments have less recourse to defend their access to light**
- **Calling what is effectively the size of an apartment building a permitted unit on the basis of unique entrances for units**



## **What's wrong with this, built 2023?**

**There are no trees, despite the requirement for 2 on such a lot.**

**In the front yard there is only a low hedge common with the north side neighbour. The spruce trees are in the neighbours' yard. No tree canopy replacement. Almost total non-absorptive coverage.**



**And this, in progress since 2026**

**No room in front for tree(s) without overhanging city sidewalk.**

**Little chance of success for trees in 15' shaded between home and garage, on north side of the house.**

**Only room for columnar trees along lane side of house**



# Systemic Infrastructure

Rod Sykes	/69 to /77	*** failures began to appear in other
Ross Alger	/77 to /80	*** cities
Ralph Klein	/80 to /89	***
Don Hartman	/89 to /89	
Al Duerr	/89 to /01	
Dave Bronconnier	/01 to /10	** 2004 failure of McKnight feeder main
Naheed Neneshi	/10 to /21	
Jyoti Gondek	/21 to /25	

**Although the failures of these pipes in the US during the 1970's, together with the supposed "improvements" necessary to avoid failures have not been discussed or elaborated satisfactorily in the context of the City of Calgary, it is plain from the dates of failures in other jurisdictions that the replacement of the Bearspaw feeder main should have been considered long before the recent 15 year window being currently discussed.**

- Deferred maintenance in an infill area must be considered before densification in the area receives a green light. Approved infill building areas rather than blanket zoning policy makes infrastructure financial planning sense and clarity for developers. Blanket rezoning leapfrogs this essential step.**
- Digitizing underground plant is highly advisable.**

# **The fallacy of lower infrastructure costs for infill building**

**When systems such as supply pipes, cables, storm and sanitary sewers are planned they are designed for expected loads, not an elastic infinity.**

**Digging up and adding capacity is a protracted and labour intensive additional cost when compared to greenfield construction. Due to construction disturbance, it can also shorten the life of in place systems.**

- there should be two sources of funding for these systems, one for repair and maintenance of existing, and the other for additions to the systems.**
- systemic expenditures like the feeder mains should be borne by the city budget adjustments rather than water price increases or passing off responsibility. Given the mains failures appear to be due to work long deferred in favour of above ground amenities,**

**CANCEL OR DEFER SOME EXPENDITURES ABOVE  
GROUND TO BALANCE THE BUDGETARY  
SHORTFALL .**

## **Developer infrastructure expense recovery**

- **adding capacity to existing systems because of infill building should be borne by the contractor, including homeowners acting as primary contractors, who add connections of their infills to the load on existing systems.**
- **if addition to a system requires necessary systemic upgrades, these expenses should not be borne by the contractor.**
- **costs to contractors should realistically reflect material and labour costs updated allowing for development timelines**
- **flagging previously unauthorized connections of gas and sewer for purpose of inspection and for cost recovery, before property sales are finalized, a plumbing report should be required similarly to the real property report. Unauthorized connections should be billed against the sale.**

# **What is missing from both blanket rezoning and the reversal ...**

**Preservation/city acquisition of single floor and mobility modified dwellings in each district to address critical shortage.**

- AISH recipients are having their benefits clawed back by the province. Result: many more unable to keep pace with rents and an abrupt increase in already large numbers unsafely housed or unhoused with medical issues**
- current market infills are almost exclusively “Mountain Goat” homes totally unsuitable for families faced with mobility issues because developers cannot charge as much for single storey homes**

