

# Engagement Summary and What We Heard

Administration undertook a targeted engagement strategy over a four-month period in response to Council's Motion's Arising outlined in Attachment 1 of this report. The following outlines the engagement, what we heard, and how it has informed the proposed Land Use Bylaw district and amendments.

## Who?

Over the course of the project, staff spent time listening to and reviewing previous Public Hearing recordings to understand citizen concerns, applicant comments, and Council's perspective on the different application types. This information has helped to inform the proposed district and amendments to the Land Use Bylaw.

Public engagement was not accommodated in the scope of this work for two reasons:

1. Citizens would not have the technical expertise to contribute to the writing of land use districts; and
2. Due to the urgency of Council's Motion Arising to return no later than Q3, 2022, public education could not be accommodated within the timeframe; however, given a delayed implementation date, Administration will be able to accommodate public messaging on The City website.

Citizens do, however, have the ability to participate in engagements and Public Hearings for any applications proposing the new district since it will not be applied to any parcels as a City-initiated land use redesignation through this report.

Due to the technical nature of the work, Administration engaged with a targeted group of stakeholders. Stakeholders included City staff (Planning, Urban Design, Safety Codes Officers, Development Engineering, Transportation Planning, Waste and Recycling, Housing Solutions, Real Estate and Development Services, and Law) and members of industry who plan and design these types developments in the established areas, all of whom have expertise in working with these districts.

Administration conducted architectural testing of the draft land use district and amendments to ensure the regulations enabled intended built forms, and to inform any further changes to the districts being finalised. Several industry volunteers participated in the testing to provide feedback. See Attachment 7 for more details.

## When?

Engagement was held through four phases commencing in April 2022 and wrapping up in July 2022. The phases included:

1. Identification of key issues and trends with current Direct Control districts
2. Proposed approaches and big moves
3. Review of draft district and amendments
4. Architectural testing

## What?

In responding to the direction from Council to provide a new district, the intent of these events was to ensure that Administration had a thorough understanding of the trends, drivers, issues, and barriers that

result in industry applying for these Direct Control districts. In all events, stakeholders were able to actively contribute to the conversation, and add their comments, questions, and suggestions. Feedback collected informed the proposed district and amendments.

## Summary of what we heard – internal and external workshops

Below is a summary of what we heard through the five phases of events:

1. The new district and amendments to existing districts will significantly reduce the number of Direct Control districts for missing middle projects.
2. Administration took a balanced approach to community concerns and industry feedback on these forms.
3. There is a demand for grade-oriented, three-bedroom housing in inner city and established communities. Affordability and attainability of these homes is improved by the inclusion of secondary suites as a mortgage-helper for the purchaser.
4. The new district and amendments to existing districts is innovative and will enable more housing choice in inner city and established communities. Development using these districts will help to support Municipal Development Plan goals
5. The new district needs to have a strong locational purpose statement that provides clarity for applicants, community, and Council on where this district is most appropriate in communities.
6. Support the shift to Dwelling Unit as a use and being clear on built form and the building envelope.
7. Support the opportunity to “un-lock” mid-block R-CG parcels for approximately 2800 under-developed parcels in Calgary.
8. There will continue to be a market for parking, but not at the current parking rates. Rates are a barrier to achieving good development outcomes. Stakeholders support a reduced parking rate that are more aligned with the Mixed-Use districts.
9. Support removing the contextual front setback in the new district and setting a minimum of 3.0 metres.
10. 12 metre building height with the use of chamfers for the new district would enable varied roof forms within a three-storey building and allow for basement secondary suites to have more natural light.
11. Support qualitative landscape and amenity rules with a design document to guide review and decision-making.
12. Support for reduced parking requirement making more space available to provide more amenity, space for waste and recycling, or other development requirements.
13. Support for clear setback rules.
14. Support for landscaping and amenity space that moves toward quality over specific metrics.
15. Support for a clear spectrum of districts. There is a clear difference between R-CG, the new district, and multi-residential districts.
16. The new district is not radically different, but it allows for innovation.

## Summary of what we heard – Public Hearings

---

Below is a summary of what we heard through Public Hearings since January 2022:

1. Concerns with spot-zoning and density increases that will result in buildings that will have rental units and will not encourage residents to live there long-term. Concerns with transient people who aren't invested in the community
2. Concerns with the number of parking spots being insufficient, and the impacts to traffic congestion. Public transit isn't an incentive to not own a car, and seasonal weather changes means people won't ride bikes in the winter.
3. Concerns with waste and recycling, and how bins will be addressed.
4. Concerns with lack of space for landscaping and room for trees to grow, as well as the loss of old trees to accommodate new development. These developments severely lack amenity space, access to sunlight, and mature trees.
5. Concerns with property values being impacted because of densification.
6. Concerns with developers circumventing the process by using Direct Control zoning.
7. Concerns about mid-block development, and that these parcels should remain R-C2 for duplexes.
8. Concerns about effective snow removal with increased desire to park on the street.
9. Support for continuing growth and infill development, with reduced parking requirements since more people do not own a car. Building a city for people of all abilities and incomes is important.
10. Concerns with the "micro dwelling unit" and whether these spaces are livable due to size and lack of access to sunlight. Size of units does not encourage families to live in them.
11. Concerns with a lack of privacy.
12. Concerns about the impacts to neighbourhood schools.
13. Concerns with units being used as short-term rentals, and not as places for people to live.
14. Concerns that these types of developments are not priced as affordable housing.
15. Concerns with the lack of accessibility for emergency services.
16. Support that these types of developments will bring more people to the community.