

**“The City promotes infilling that is **sensitive,**  
**compatible and complementary** to the existing **physical**  
**patterns** and character of neighbourhoods.”**

Page 37, MDP

Municipal Development Plan 2020

The Infill Guidelines key concepts for:


- Context: **“New development should be designed in a manner which is responsive to the local context.”**
- Building Mass, **“New development should respect the existing scale and massing of its immediate surroundings.”**
- Placement of Windows, **“The privacy of adjacent residences should be respected”.**

Brentwood Submission - Attachment 49, pages 216 – 219

Brentwood What We Heard Report - Attachment 49, pages 199 – 215

My submission - Attachment 45, pages 144 – 146

# The Reality on the Ground



## Examples from City Website



# Impact on Neighbours




## Infill Guidelines

- Building Mass, ***“New development should respect the existing scale and massing of its immediate surroundings.”***
- Placement of Windows, ***“The privacy of adjacent residences should be respected”.***


# Impact on existing areas



Infill Guidelines: 4.5 Privacy  
4.5.1 Placement of Windows  
*It is important to respect the privacy of adjacent residences and their access to sunlight. The excessive loss of the neighbour's privacy can generally be avoided through sensitive design. Windows and balconies should be carefully placed and oriented to face away from neighbouring yards to help protect their privacy.*



# Living below grade



Basement Suite




# Lot Coverage



Source: City of Calgary Imagery Maps,  
2019 and current

# Drainage / Stormwater management



# Attachment 02 - Best Practices & Permit Data Summary - CPC2024-0213

- Maximum parcel coverages
- Maximum FAR
- Regulated impervious surface coverage
- Specific landscape guidelines

Location	Parcel Coverage	Landscaping
Auckland	50%	20% landscaped, 70% Impervious
Minneapolis	Interior lot: FAR: 0.5-0.6/0.7 Corridors: FAR: 1.5-3 45%-60/70% coverage	60-70% impervious
Portland	1 unit: 0.4-0.5 FAR 2 unit: 0.5-0.6 FAR 3 unit: 0.6-0.7 FAR 4 unit: 0.7-0.8 FAR coverage:	~4 trees (Private Tree Preserv. Stds)
Edmonton	RS: 45%, RSF: 55%	30% landscape Rowhouse(unit): 1 tree, 4
Vancouver	FAR: 0.7 (*1.0 for affordable housing/rental) Building depth: 19.8m	1-2 trees
Victoria	Houseplex: Coverage: 40% FAR: 1 max. of 235sqm Townhouse: Coverage: 50%	35 m2 landscaped
Kelowna	RU: 55% buildings 75% impermeable area MF: 1.3-1.8 FAR 55-65% buildings 75-85%	≥3 units:1 tree per 10 linear metres of landscaped area
Toronto	Building depth/length is 19m	Front: 50-100% Side: 60% Rear: 25-50%
Ottawa	25-45% in lowest density res zones, N/A in higher low density zones	30% landscaped
London	FAR; 0.4-0.5	30-40% landscaped

# “Physical Patterns” in neighbourhoods

Distinct & targeted density and built forms

Examples from Panorama (existing developed) and Mahogany (still developing)

- Single-detached
- Semi-detached
- Rowhouse
- Multiplex



# Present Zoning Capacity

## Does the City Need to Rezone?



City of Calgary

### City of Calgary withdraws from the Annexation of Lands from Foothills County

Calgary City Council recently approved a recommendation from Administration to immediately withdraw from the process of annexing Foothills County lands into The City of Calgary.

The decision comes following the conclusion of the first phase of public consultation and the completion of technical analysis of the proposed annexation area, conducted to understand the development potential and servicing requirements of the area. It has also been determined The City has adequate land supply within its boundaries for the next 35-49 years, which is sufficient based on current growth rates.

Zoning in place in established areas for an additional 262,451 units

Greenfield sites vacant land capacity for 178,235 units

More than **440,000** units available without blanket up-zoning