

Calgary Planning Commission Member Comments



For CPC2025-0675 / LOC2025-0056
heard at Calgary Planning Commission
Meeting 2025 July 24



Member	Reasons for Decision or Comments
<p>Commissioner Hawryluk</p>	<p>Reasons for Opposition to CPC’s recommendation to Refuse and Abandon the Bylaws</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I disagree with Administration’s recommendation to refuse this application. <p>Because the previous Residential – Contextual One/Two Dwelling (R-C2) District has been deleted from the Land Use Bylaw, there is no District that allows only semi-detached houses in the Developed Residential – Established Areas. A Direct Control District would be required to allow a semi-detached building without allowing rowhouses. This Direct Control District also sets a minimum density by requiring at least 2 units be built on this lot.</p> <p>If Council sought a compromise, Council could also set a maximum of 2 units on this lot. This would allow a semi-detached building that is the same size as adjacent detached houses. A small amendment could respond to neighbours’ concerns.</p> <p>Administration has recommended refusing this application because of the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan’s Single-Detached Special Study Area.</p> <p>The Single-Detached Special Study Area policy states: “Single-Detached should be the predominant low-density housing form within the Single-Detached Special Study Area until one or more Single-Detached Special Policy Areas are identified through a future amendment to the Plan” (2.2.1.6.e).</p> <p>The policy requires that low-density dwellings in the Special Study Area be predominantly—not exclusively—single-detached. According to the 2019 Municipal Census, 572 of the 625 dwellings (91.5%) in Rosedale were single-detached. If Council allowed this lot to have semi-detached dwellings, that percentage would reduce by 0.3% to 91.2% (571/626). Detached homes would continue to “be the predominant low-density housing form within the Single-Detached Special Study Area.” Approving this proposed Direct Control District would be consistent with the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan.</p>

	<p>During Commission’s review, Administration said that setting a minimum density by removing the option of a detached house would go against the Single-Detached Special Study Area policy. However, Administration’s report does not mention that Council directed Administration to “rescind the Single Detached Study Policy Area in the Guide to Local Area Planning and relevant statutory plans, immediately” as part of the Calgary Housing Strategy in September 2023 (1.C.2). And during Commission’s review, Administration agreed and that allowing semi-detached homes on this site, which is the Applicant’s intention, would still make detached homes “the predominant low-density housing form within the Single-Detached Special Study Area.” Instead of suggesting that the definition of “predominant” should be based on the number of dwellings in the area, Administration reported their preference to use the number of lots in the area. By Administration’s definition of “predominant,” 313 of the 625 lots could have detached houses and the remaining 312 lots could have fourplexes, which would mean that 50.08% of the lots would have detached houses and 20.05% of the homes would be detached houses. Yet in that situation, Administration would still consider detached homes the predominant low-density housing form.</p> <p>I find Administration’s perspective inconsistent and perplexing, which is why I voted against the refusal and would have supported approving or amending the proposed Direct Control District.</p>
<p>Commissioner Damiani</p>	<p>Reasons for Approval to CPC’s recommendation to Refuse and Abandon the Bylaws</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Direct Control District would remove a use that is specifically supported by policy in this area and should be refused. Though single-detached dwelling is not the only allowable residential form by policy, the subject site is within the Single-Detached Special Study Area. Removing the use of single detached dwelling contravenes the intent of the policy to allow the form in this specific policy area. <p>The use of the proposed DC does not align with policy 4.2 (n) Existing Caveats/ Restrictive Covenants in the LAP which states, “In some cases the caveats may not be in alignment with the goals and objectives of this Plan and where such conflicts occur, The City of Calgary supports the direction of this Plan”. In this circumstance the existing restrictive covenant does not contravene policy direction so policy 4.2 (n) does not apply. The policy also states it is landowners’ responsibility to discharge caveats.</p>