




# Proposed Land Use Change to R-CG

April 22, 2024, version 3.0



## Equality of Outcomes

“A lot of people are afraid of what’s going to happen in their neighbourhood. The economics have to make sense. I’m not going to buy a \$2 million piece of property and build a fourplex. I'd be broke“

- Shameer Gaidhar, chair of the Calgary Inner City Builders Association:

If the City is interested in “equality” or “equity”, then the plan should include ensuring ALL neighborhoods result in “housing choice”, not just the “opportunity” to have it.

Otherwise, the less expensive neighborhoods will get all the “housing choice”, and these will replace the cheaper single/duplex homes available in the City.

Where is the plan to have an “equality of outcomes” across all neighborhoods?

## The City Posterboard – A poster child for selective information

### What it says–

#### “what could be built next to me” section –

It states R-CG, but fails to say rowhouses are 60% lot coverage where single/duplex are 45%

#### “84600 households cannot afford where they live and growing”

But doesn't say how many of the 750 net new homes (City FAQ for short term annual increase due to this policy) are affordable enough to reduce the 84600

### Or what it does not say

It does not acknowledge any impact. This must be a perfect solution. I'm wondering why not allow 5 storey apartments or 100% lot coverage. Is there no impact for those either?

## The City Posterboard – A poster child for selective information

### What the poster board says–

#### The City asserts the developments are “compatible”

Sounds like an opinion, not a fact. SDAB on at least one recent occasion, SDAB2023-0009, disagrees:

The Board’s decision is based on its finding that the proposed building has a very long and narrow built form that is inconsistent with other building footprints on this block face. The proposed footprint and building height create an imposing and dominant building bulk and massing, especially when abutting existing development. The proposed design fails to respect the existing contextual set back and rhythm of the street and will greatly impact the experience of the street whether or not one is exiting or entering the street.

Sounds like there needs to be more rules...or the rules adhered to (see suggestions later)

#### Has “development examples”

The poster board shows these ...

# The City Posterboard – A poster child for selective information



But have you noticed what the City never shows you, ever?



# The City Posterboard – A poster child for selective information

What the backyard looks like for older homes. With the City only ever showing the fronts of houses, perhaps the City thinks the front yard is where people spend their time?

2636 Morley Trail

Page 6

Land Details	
Land Use Designation	Residential - Grade-Oriented Infill
Assessable Land Area	6,003 sq. ft. / 558 sq. m. / 0.14 ac



# The City Posterboard – A poster child for selective information

What the backyard looks like for an older home next to a wider frontage.

1926-1942 19 ST NW  
5 Units, 1 building

Land Details  
Land Use Designation  
Assessable Land Area

Residential - Grade-Oriented Infill  
8,297 sq. ft. / 771 sq. m. / 0.19 ac



Property Designations  
Residential - Grade-Oriented Infill District, (R-CG)

## Suggestions for making it better

### 1. Require all developments to meet contextual depth average


- Average of existing adjacent houses + 4.5M.
- Will result in better equity of built form, not just the front façade as the City is promoting
- This may mean smaller units or less units on some parcels, however the City is advertising “housing choice” so this will be another choice. Administration may rebut with “those will be more expensive”. Perhaps, but administration is also arguing in their poster board that more supply will help even though many of the units on these 4 unit parcels are expensive. The fact is the City is promoting this rezoning as “housing choice”. Having less or smaller units on some lots will give more choice, including more amenity space.

### 2. Require all developments to meet contextual height rule

- The rule in R-C1 is average of existing + 1.5M, min 9.6M as measured from property corners (not built up grade next to building as is the case for rowhouses in R-CG)

## Suggestions for making it better

### 3. Require developments to obscure more windows



DP 2023-05959

- Currently it is only second floor windows past the rear of adjacent house when < 4.2M
- Some of these developments' main floors are substantially above grade, which means, in the case on the left, a person walking around the main floor has their eyes at approx. 9'8" above grade, which is well above the maximum 6' fence
- I would suggest requiring all windows beyond the adjacent home, looking into the neighbor, where the window bottom is less than 9', above Property Line grade, to be obscured, OR allow taller fences.
- Development authority could relax this if there is no impact.

## Suggestions for making it better

### 4. Require defined min area, width, length, screening for amenity areas

- DP2023-05959 has secondary suite amenity area as just grass next to the City boulevard, and includes the window well. Not sure what amenity one can do in a window well

### 5. The City to do as they want others to do

- As the City is defacto encouraging tearing down single/duplex houses for larger row houses, the City should consider the same approach and tear down City owned buildings and put up new ones (or build on top of existing). Have the City get a 99 year lease on the main floor. Heritage park front buildings? Pools? Bowmont civic building and those like it? Libraries?

### 6. Do what a “crisis” warrants and look at the sacred cows

- Calgary has 7 Ha of park per 1000 people. More than triple Vancouver (2.1), double Montreal (2.8) & Toronto (2.7). The avg for cities with 500k or more is 4.4. (CDN Parks Report 2021)

## Suggestions for making it better

### 7. Please stop developers from chopping down mature trees

- DP2023-05959 before the developer got ahold of it, and after. Note how the trees are actually close to the property line and could have been accommodated



## Suggestions for making it better

### 8. Mr Chahal's idea...incentivize secondary suites even more

- Buildings are existing / Zoning is existing
- Least cost to build / Least time to build
- Most affordable

### 9. Administration is asking you to vote to delete section 347.3

- Attachment 3, item 1(d) page 48 in the “public hearing planning matters apr 22.pdf”
- This section gives rules for the current permitted use Rowhouses
- Please, instead, make these rules, the rules for the R-CG district for rowhouses as it contains things like: i) limits main floor height above grade, ii) requires façade differences so there is not just a flat wall iii) requires some windows to be obscured iv) max building depth
- The City can then relax if they are not feasible, but if they are not there in the bylaw, no one needs to adhere to them

## Equality of Outcomes

“A lot of people are afraid of what’s going to happen in their neighbourhood. The economics have to make sense. I’m not going to buy a \$2 million piece of property and build a fourplex. I'd be broke“

- Shameer Gaidhar, chair of the Calgary Inner City Builders Association

How will council ensure this zoning change RESULTS in equity of “housing choice” across neighborhoods?