

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments presented here include all feedback, suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online through the engagement described in this report.

Any personal identifying information has been removed from the verbatim comments presented here. Comments or portions of comments that contain profanity, or that are not in compliance with the [City's Respectful Workplace Policy](#) or [Online Tool Moderation Practice](#), have also been removed from participant submissions.

Wherever possible the remainder of the submitted comments are presented verbatim, as they were received. No other edits to the feedback have been made - as a result, some of the content in this verbatim record may still be considered offensive or distasteful to some readers.

Engage Portal comments

We asked: What is most important to you in the application process?

Options were:

- Rules that are different depending on the context of immediate neighbours
- Rules that are clear and provide certainty of built form
- The ability to appeal the development
- Get information on what is being proposed
- Comment on what is being proposed
- Clear info on what can be built
- Making it easy to get things built
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Contextual, sensitive redevelopment that takes into account the impact on neighbours, such as overlooking windows, loss of sunlight and privacy, shadowing, massing, etc. Plus stop letting developers have so many relaxations -- residents need the right to appeal these.

Please reject the Calgary Plan. It is such an ideological word salad that will only cause harm in order to benefit select groups. Any document that talks about "equity" so much is Orwellian in the sense that the pigs in charge view themselves as more equal than others.

Effect on the neighbors if building a 6 story apartment & the lack of sunlight. How will people behind the apartment get access & egress to & from their place.

A more proactive notification and engagement process required of developers — not a passive approach where a sign is posted referring us to the city. I feel there should be more onus on developers to engage proactively.
What should not be built
It's very important to the immediate neighbors what is being proposed!
Access to important public infrastructure remains/is accessible
Giving existing residents an actual voice to say no.
At LEAST ONE parking stall per unit built, ABSOLUTLY NO EXCEPTIONS.
Stop over building in residential areas listen to people and don't allow developers to come in and buy up a ton of residential properties this is unfair to home owners in the area !
Get rid of H-GO - this is destroying neighbourhoods and peoples lives, literally
Clarity on the capacity of the building and appropriate parking associated with potential number of people
Basement units to be included in the overall density calculation instead of additional to it. It's confusing and leading to strange outcomes.
Clarity around backyard suites
Respect for community context, protection of the urban canopy,
Stop the stupidity....building designs that DON'T fit the neighbor
Fit within Community plan
More quality, less quantity
no change to zoning; want zoning that allows neighbourhoods with schools, single detached housing, no three storey or higher buildings in crescent heights, want heritage, no high density in this community because it brings crime, low income bracket, reduction in services like pools, gyms, quaint cafe spaces, nice walking areas, beautiful views, wiht high rises and three storey houses and no control on what can be built beside me does not make for a friendly family and professional neighbourhood, the high stories and three rise houses also block out the sun that is needed for psychological health and for gardens and general light into a home; STOP squishing multi-density into inner city neighbourhoods as those times are over; look to Europe in the cities they have built hubs and there is no downtown core where everyone congregates too for work which is very good as there a large city like Calgary those hubs need to be formed so to also prevent crime in a central area like the downtown core, we will not setup offices there also because once was a thriving beautiful work place is no longer and with the high concentration of highrise apts the status has decrease drastically and the crime increased, the beautiful Calgary i knew no

longer exists, there is no western theme anymore even though that western theme brings in over \$1Billion annually, so to change from that theme just puts Calgary on the same stage as every other major city - central impoverished downtown riddled with drugs and crime and dense apartments, monotonous buildings that compete with other cities that have no theme, and the loss of heritage. NO to change in zoning bylaw that allows anything and everything to be built anywhere; that is not planning; build the burbs as hubs, revitalize light industrial areas with housing, make housing lots such that they have sunshine so to be able to allow growing of food such that a family can sustain some of their food in their garden; that is sustainable.
Preservation of Calgary's urban forest on private land. Creativity to provide affordable housing, not just more houses.
Loss of urban forest and permeable land
we need our comments to ACTUALLY MEAN SOMETHING - often there are easy mitigations suggested, but the file managers do not incorporate them. The current process is 99% developer biased... we need rules that respect context, rather than flippantly claim 'that context won't be there' - there is a huge lack of respect for communities in that 'context doesn't matter' attitude (that a city employee expressed in a presentation)
That engagement feedback is actually heard and considered and not just collected and then discarded to check a box to ram through something anything. City engagement needs to improve and be authentic
The city doesn't listen to us
No blanket rezoning where you can build anything anywhere
For the concerns of directly affected neighbours of the developments voices and concerns to be given more weight than someone not directly affected.
Listen to residents and don't ignore their concerns. Respect the existing characteristics of the neighbourhood.
Actually listen to homeowners and stop pushing your new zoning laws against our wishes.
The ability to appeal a development proposal is very important to me. A minimum of 1-parking-stall per dwelling unit should be required for all R-CG designated lots. **Because R-CG and H-GO will be 'renamed' (to either H-1I, H-1G, H-1Gm, H-2 or H-3), a minimum of 1-parking-stall per dwelling unit should be required for all of these designations.
Basic rules are clear while still allowing for context.
Attention to the implications for local infra-structure: water, sewage and especially electrical with particular concern for condos and town/row housing
Tree protection of adjacent public trees that can be enforced

Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
A sense there is a point to even engaging anymore because it does not seem the city listens to its taxpayers. Many hours go into local area plans that everyone can get behind and now they are worth nothing and some new wonderful plan will be developed that ignores the plan people were bought into.
Not tearing down low rentals to build million dollar condos!
Consideration for the neighbore hood - Parking and blending in with Heritage homes and current homes.
Big issue with being dependent on neighbours is what happens when they rebuild something bigger what that means is I just finished Development would be disadvantaged
Please stop building massive housing projects beside bungalows in historic communities. Please do this on busier streets versus quiet neighborhoods. It's so unfair for the people who bought houses to have a massive 20 unit person beside them with not enough parking.
The ability of the builder to construct a quality building
Having a City leadership team that can be trusted.
A study of the existing infrastructure (electric, water, and sewer) to ensure that existing homeowners are not negatively impacted. For example there are over 60 new units being built within a block of my house and though only 8 are currently occupied we are already experiencing lower water pressure.
This survey is typical City fake engagement. Pick from a list of predetermined items without any real engagement on substantive issues. Propaganda like this is far worse than no engagement at all.
Choose areas that should be developed with increased density as a priority, engage on those areas and make it very clear what the outcome will be so there is no wonder or worry.
The ability to provide feedback that actually impacts the design instead of the dismissive approach the city has taken thus far.
Community Development Committee input is very important
A government that can be trusted. The current government is dishonest and financially irresponsible. Significant changes is needed at the highest level of this government before any survey like this has any chance of being a useful exercise.
I do not support 'by-rights' approval
alignment with community 5-year plan and street by street infrastructure capacity
Not irresponsibly increasing density in established neighbourhoods that change the type of place long term owners agreed to live and invest in



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Having a city that listens to the citizens, currently we do not
Minimize risk to builders = affordable housing
existing land owner feedback is respected and actually impacts decisions
Protecting our tree canopy instead of clear cutting mature, carbon capturing trees in pursuit of oversized HGOs.
A government that can be trusted. A survey like this just avoids discussing the real problems with this government
repeal blanket upzoning citizens never wanted this WEF UN SDG agenda garbage
Feeling exhausted
Eliminating “climate emergency”
Easy to apply, infrastructure construction and development
Neighbor and community member input. Developments in agreement by most of the community.
Stop bull dozing the current zone bylaws, older neighbourhoods are being destroyed by buildings that are too big for the area, way too much on street parking. Not to mention that our infrastructure is old and buildings are being built that house numerous households where there was one home... did the city not learn from last year where our water infrastructure could not keep up?
A cap on density by total zones. All the density should not be forced into a few areas. And density should be supported by infrastructure prior to allowing it.
Remove blanket R-CG zoning that effectively is a green light to “build anything anywhere”. This is ruining our city.
make it harder for developers to take over mobile home parks and displacing residents

We asked: How would you want to be notified by the City about new development in your area? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Online through the Development Map (DMAP) (www.calgary.ca/development)
- Physical signs posted on the site of potential developments (Notice Postings)
- By letter if I am an adjacent property owner or renter
- Through my community association
- I don't need to be notified
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Social media advertisements
Letters to nearby addresses
I'm not sure notice really matters in light of this government's approach of: (i) making most serious decisions behind closed doors without meaningful engagement with those impacted; (ii) use of propaganda to pretend there is meaningful engagement; and (iii) bully tactics to avoid any procedural fairness. I doubt many working at the government have any idea how gross this municipal government culture currently is in terms of lack of service, accountability or financial responsibility.
The larger the change or precedent, the more advanced the notice and the more responsive the engagement.
In person. If there is a proposed new build beside me, I need to see and talk to the person, people involved
Email&flyers
Allow input and objections for not only the immediate adjacent property owners but include all existing neighborhood residents before approvals are granted.
By letter if I am on the same street as the development.
Should not be allowed to get that far with out residential owners know and they should be able to speak out and decide whats best for the area and development municipal overreach an upzoning should be stopped !
Email through my property account for full neighbourhood development.
Neighbourhood flyers should be sent out to those within a 1 block radius, not just immediate neighbours.

Social Media! Development and density are important in Calgary, and should be celebrated!
By letter if I'm within, say, 1 km of the development
Community residents should be able to sign up for a listserv and receive notifications automatically via email.
DMAP is ok, but there needs to be a way to sort by date. It's too much work to figure out what's new.
All developments within 5 houses each side of proposed properties on both sides of the street.
Emails and snail-mails both
door knocking, phone call, community hall meeting for the property, notice in mailbox
I would like the option of a weekly email subscription listing all new developments (commercial or residential) in my area. 'My area', in this context, means my community and adjacent communities.
Why do renters need to be notified for ?
Every time the developer changes the application, a new physical sign should be posted and online it should identify the adjustments or changes made compared to the most recent application
Overall community plan in the mail, with clear consistent opportunities for community engagement EARLY in the process and before it's rubber stamped by the city
Physical signs might be important but they don't seem to work. There are dozens in my neighborhood and I've sent comments on several over the past months. No response from the city and no changes to what has, apparently, already been decided. Responsiveness to public comment is as important as the means by which it is elicited.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Applicant-led engagement
Since this municipal government cannot be trusted to provide honest, accurate information, there is no reason to be informed each time the City's propaganda is updated.
A letter to ALL HOMEOWNERS that share the electrical, water, and sewer infrastructure
Since this government cannot be trusted to provide honest, accurate information regarding development, there is no point in notification - aside from City leadership trying to create the false impression that they care about laws and due process.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

If this development is typical, simple notice. If this development is not typical or allowed today, the community should be able to provide feedback without having to take time off work to attend a public hearing
through my City Councilor
Letter if immediately affected in the community that I live.
There should be a notification via postal mail of the changes and how to object if necessary.
Opt-in emails
Don't want multi units, carriage houses or suites period in my R1 neighborhood it's causing an incredible amount of conflict
social media and emails to people affected by the development
Through email of my cityid
Direct phone call or email if I am away on vacation. If a property owner adjacent to a proposed development can't respond, then development should not move forward.
In person, including pop-up events, one-on-one, conversations, invite-only meetings, information sessions, or town halls. Infrastructure development in the area
By letter but at least 2 months ahead of time. Define adjacent as anyone on the same street.
The notification process has become a joke. The City puts up a sign and doesn't listen to feedback unless it tows the City line.
Mail



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

We asked: How would you want to be informed or engaged by an applicant (developer) about new development in your area? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Print materials and advertisements, including postcards, brochures, flyers, handouts, fact sheets, articles, information panels, and information in monthly community newsletters, TV, radio, or online
- Online, including project websites, online surveys, email feedback, project email newsletters, or social media.
- In person, including pop-up events, one-on-one conversations, invite-only meetings, information sessions, or town halls.
- Public displays or kiosks at the project site or in high-traffic community locations.
- I don't need to be informed
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Again, when you can't trust the information the City provides, the information the City provides is not of any real value.
I just need the facts and the opportunity to say yes or no
Full plans, including inside design, should be posted on the development.map site with clear instructions on timeframe for feedback, approval date, and appeal by date. This should be available even once approved.
Discussion et al BEFORE it is a done deal.
at the first moment that an application is made to the city, we ought to receive a hardcopy that application and of what was made; and that hardcopy dropped at our door within 3 business days by the developer; hardcopy to also include when and where comments can be made and heard with consideration given to those comments and not just misplaced or plaquered that the comment was given but real action as to whether that development can proceed or not for this is our home and our comment matters and next election we will not be voting for these massive changes to zoning for anything, anywhere
For something directly within a defined radius, a registered mail or other traceable method needs to be used/sent so that people directly impacted are informed and able to provide feedback within the posting time frame
The in-person events appear to be for show and do not actually listen to citizens concerns
Through the CA where possible

As many forms as possible....and don't rely on social media or websites. Lots of us don't go there.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Emails to surrounding title owners from developer with clear building design and project timelines.
Each homeowner that will be sharing infrastructure like water, sewer, electrical, and parking
When so much of government's communication is dishonest propaganda, it's probably better for all if there was just no communication. The City's current approach of dishonest propaganda (see, for example: Green Line) is far worse than no communication at all.
personal hand delivered letter to my house so we can tell them what we think to their face
emails!!! also social media
So scared
Infrastructure and related services and facilities required for the project
hard copies in the mail box of everyone in a 1km radius.

We followed up with the question “Why did you make these selections?”

I must be informed. Tragic how little info available
It's important for people in the affected area to be aware of what's being proposed
I would like to see more housing options, especially in established neighbourhoods
There is a property with a proposed redevelopment in my neighborhood that should not get approval to be built as it does not fit the current home type at all, there is already an extreme parking shortage in our neighborhood and this proposal would introduce a possible new 12 cars to the existing problem. The existing property is not even 30 years old yet and is in good condition. Also to build it would cause a safety issue for the four families with small children in this neighborhood.
These responses come from my current experience with a proposed land development in my community that residents are actively fighting. Zoning rules must be clear and consistent to give certainty to both residents and builders. Growth should benefit everyone, not just developers. The city must prioritize real community input and ensure residents are properly informed—more than just a sandwich board on a lawn. Predictability and transparency matter.
Print/displays to make sure I don't miss that it's happening. Online to comment. In person to ask clarifying questions.

While I believe dissemination of information online is most efficient, follow up conversations in person are more effective.

1. Discretionary permits allow for input but first, people have to know about it! The more methods used, the better.
2. Not everyone uses DMap or even internet, but they will likely see a sign posted next door.
3. Developers should NOT be allowed to substantially change their project without a new DP. Initial DP is often ""nicer"" (smaller, more contextual) than the final build. Every revised version should be posted. Neighbours should be notified if there is a substantial change.

Neighborhood engagement needs to happen to ensure the ACTUAL persons and places that form "neighborhood" and community can interact and and inform on where they are situated. A neighborhood is not just a district. It is comprised of people, homes and businesses that choose an area due to its appeal.

For major developments, opportunities to provide feedback must be open and accessible.

I think making construction easier to do creates the ability for more affordable housing to be built. Affordable housing is extremely important for the city because we are in a cost of living crisis. Outreach to residents is important, and being able to be heard by the parties that are engaging in construction is important. At the same time, we should also focus on improving our current city structure, and ensuring that city development benefits Calgarians.

I believe the process is cumbersome and needs to be sped up but not at the cost of allowing any and all construction. There should be clear guidelines that allow for neighborhood considerations. The 10 unit multiplexes currently being approved in older area are an abomination - crowded space with no privacy or even a small green area for a garden. Likewise there are some mid-block buildings that have caused problems for neighbors- eg a less than 2 foot walkway to go from front to backyard.

The City has failed in engagement.

Frustration with a government that has been functioning at an embarrassingly low level for the last decade.

I feel very strongly that area residents who will be affected should be informed in a transparent, clear & inclusive way. Dialogue must be allowed & respected. Navigating the City website can be very challenging for some people. Too much is being hidden. As a result of their opinions being ignored, residents have stopped engaging. People are tired & fed up with INFORM only engagement.

Consultation and flexibility frequently acts as a major impediment towards the fast creation of housing, further compounded by a frequent desire for increased property values which run contrary to increasing the housing supply in the city. Though property is treated as an investment, the municipality should aim to be as pragmatic as possible in getting its residents homes rather than allowing speculation to impede this goal of allowing the housing supply to increase.

The DMAP is very difficult to see and understand for the lay person. The signage on the site is easier to read; however, you never give the residents enough time to get their comments in.

Because The City isn't taking into consideration everything that needs to be considered. Example if they build a 6 story apartment building, where houses were, & have people with kids living in the apartment, what about schools to accomodate the kids? What about garbage pick-up? What about parking & the extra congestion that having extra people living there? Also why do this in Varsity when they are already many apartments being built in the University area that are not yet rented?

Even if information is available online, I'd like to be informed to look.

thorough review needed by development in my area, options to be informed are important

While there do need to be clear rules and rapid processes, buildings and neighbourhoods are about where people live and this needs to be taken into account. There need to be protections against frivolous complaints, and also the requirement for developers to accommodate the needs and interests of their context.

I don't agree with the blanket rezoning. Critical for residents and neighborhoods to have a say in what gets approved nearby. The blanket rezoning, left unchecked, will cause complete havoc with respect to parking, water use, garbage disposal, general utilities, and community safety - both criminal activity and traffic patterns / density.

The demographics of a community range and so must the way we reach out to inform the residents. Transparency and working with the community to create safe and respectful homes is important to everyone and all types of information and communication must be applied to each build.

Information is always had to find and if you do, there is always little or no information available. Where is the transparency?!

I'm concerned that the pendulum has swung too far too fast... that there will be a 'everyone can build to the maximum, without adequate requirement for adjustment to the context of what exists. Existing neighbours and adjacent owners should not be able to veto everything, but neither should they not be permitted to have influence on size, number of units, shade, parking. The city should require more parking capacity of developers than they do.

I (and the entire block I live on) fought the city and a developer (WHO DID NOT LIVE IN THE COMMUNITY) on a development that would ultimately change the look and feel of the street! Developer won and the community lost. Frustration at the lack of clear rules (not guidelines) of what could be built would help immensely, however there's also no consideration for how the community feels! It seems the city just plays 'lip service' when disputes are raised! They ALWAYS side with the developer!!!!

I am opposed to blanket rezoning, and feel that specific rules can be appropriate for certain areas, but not appropriate in all cases. I only just happened to hear from a neighbour about a proposed development on my street via word of mouth.

My neighbour is being decimated!
Our opinions are being integrated into the plan, not being informed of proposed development. Blanket Rezoning has made it inconsistent. When you speak to developers, they are shocked that you question the proposal and ask question of why here, why that design. They are even more shocked when you tell them that design will not work because of traffic, daycare on the corner, the LRT station the church next door or what happens to that back alley in the Spring when there is an underground spring.
Developments should be proposed and approved on a case by case basis
Developments should be proposed and approved on a case by case basis. Developments should make sense in the area.
It is very important, respecting the affected neighbours/neighborhood that the developers take the time to talk, to listen
Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Maximum amount of reach to those affected.
Not all developer proposals are right for the community. They are about money for the developer
Important that surveys and in person events truly consider concerns being shared - consultation means consultation. It does not mean, lets check off that we consulted and ignore the concerns shared.
I live in Glenbrook and the development is awful lately. Big four story multi houses one lot with no parking. Trees are being cut down. It's horrible. I hate the way the street is looking.
Depending on size and impact I want as many touch points as possible
I don't think in-person stakeholder engagement on a by-development basis is necessary. Just notice is fine, as long as city bylaws provide clear guidelines on what can and cannot be built. If developments follow these clear bylaws, engaging in in-person town halls and feedback sessions needlessly slows down and adds cost to the development process, which impedes the swift action needed to address the housing crisis.
There is too much density being built up with little parking in Altadore. All the tree canopy is disappearing and replacement trees can't built planted when a ten plex for example replaces 2 residential plots. Everything is built on the entire footprint of the land which does not make it residential anymore. Plus city council never listens to the voters once they are elected. They should build up closer to downtown like lower Mount Royal or Kensington
Making an informed decision as a tax payer only makes logical sense. The residents closest to a potential development are the ones who can accurately give feedback on safety, congestion, noise, privacy concerns

As a taxpayer, I have a right to know what is being built in my community, especially if it is near my house. The City does not have a right to ruin neighborhoods! This engagement process is a shame as The City has already decided to densify neighborhoods.
Though there needs to be "rules" that allow for consistency and to give people/developers a known process, each neighbourhood and home is unique so that a cookie cutter approach can not be applied. It must be acceptable to the immediate and surrounding neighbours
The process for developments needs to be within the communities it affects. The proposed law changes put way too much power in the hands of for profit developers.
It is best to prioritize speed of development, but not at the cost of quality -- particularly at the street level. Inner-city neighbourhoods should be built with future density in mind, which does not necessarily mean large apartment buildings. It could (and should, I think) mean a mix of rowhouses, low-rise apartment/condo buildings, and daily retail.
I feel like the City is putting policies in place to make it harder to make comments or oppose specific proposed developments. The policies technically satisfy the regulatory requirements of public notification, but the information is sometimes hard to find and the process to contact respective file managers and/or oppose hidden. Kind of like burying the complaints department beneath 9 or 10 button clicks on an automated call system. The offer to hear complaints is disingenuous.
People find different ways to connect. Ex: you might live on a busy street. A development may really impact you but you generally don't walk past the physical site (ie you walk the other direction to the bus) so I do think some printed materials are important vs. just signs located on site. Also people rarely understand development issues until something is built so filtered through a community organization event is helpful.
Any project in an already developed area must have sufficient notification to allow all invested parties, especially the current community to thoroughly vet the project.
A notice of sign of a new development was not properly displayed to provide what a development was about to the neighbors.
Given neighbours too much ability to comment leads to NIMBY.
I strongly object to DP2025-01825 and to the decision of blanket rezoning voted on by city council without due process and input by affected neighborhood residents. Let the people of Calgary democratically vote on this subject and not just City Council members.
Communities need to be informed well in advance of proposed developments in order to review, assess and respond.
I want the residents of areas being developed to be fully engaged in any decisions

Currently it is up to nearby residents to keep on the outlook for development sandwich boards on properties and then dig deeper themselves to learn about what is being proposed. The builder should have to activity communicate to a large area around the development what is planned.
"There is a proposed development across the street from me that is an absolute shock that it's being developed. No one as accounts for the lack of parking, location of 18 additional garbage and recycling bins, the destruction of nature trees and a 30 year old home, lack of access to emergency vehicles, safety, noise,
Light disruption. As residents it feels as though we have no say in our community and I'm completely disheartened by this"
Need to be informed on changes that affect neighborhoods
I believe that community residents who have purchased homes before bylaws change, should be respected and part of any proposed changes to the "rules". There must be clear concise notification as well as open, clear communication between all parties involved.
The new blanket reasoning is NOT good.
Id like to be kept informed
Clear rules and faster approvals
I feel that while the community should be informed, it is the right of each individual land owner to do as they please. Community feedback should shape and inform change, but not be able to make or break a project. I don't need my neighbours consent to plant a tree, paint my house, or buy a new car. Why would I need their consent to add another unit to the home I own?
There is very little information available - sometimes on DMAP, sometimes no. TIA and Shadow are guarded and only available by FOIP - secretive, rushed process that profits the developers only.
Too much of rush now for development
The City (and its employees) has done a terrible job listening to residents. The communication and notification has been abysmal - despite the pat on the back City employees like to give themselves. Residents need to be consulted earlier, more often, and need to genuinely have a say in what is being built in their community - not lip service from bureaucrats.
Developers need to be accountable for their proposed development rather than being able to build whatever they want for their own desire to make as much money as possible at the expense of the residents around them that are negatively impacted.
Having watched significant ongoing development in the area, and having lived near or adjacent to development, very limited engagement by developers has been seen, and/or they are unresponsive to questions (often they have been belligerent to community members who approached them). Also, once a

development is approved, the DMAP no longer lets a user see what was approved (you can during the approval process, but that disappears once approved - that should definitely be fixed in the DMAP)

Nation needs more homes without a doubt, however denser homes come with their lien set if problems that seem to be ignored. Parking, neighborhood traffic, shared spaces, zero lot lines lead to more conflicts between residents impacting the quality of life for people who live there. A home is a life long dream and investment (both emotional and financial) for many calgarians. As such, changing the environment around a residential neighborhood should not only prioritize the city's point of view.

As a taxpayer, I have the right to influence how Calgary grows since my taxes are partially used to fund redevelopment inc. infrastructure.

I am a concerned and engaged citizen who cares about my community and how new builds affect me and the rest of the community. There needs to be at least one parking stall per unit built. insufficient parking availability creates many problems for the members of the community particularly for those who are elderly or handicapped. These people often are neglected as they are marginalized members of the community.

No up zoning or rezoning in residential areas there is enough residential units already we are sick of seeing it all and we're never told or even asked. Enough already !

The City process is not transparent, misleading, and Local Area Plans are not being administered nor enforced. H-GO needs to be removed.

Calgary's beautiful peaceful neighborhoods that hard working people did to become homeowners are being ruined by out of control mass building. No thought to parking infrastructure including water was given before the city went ahead with rezoning. What thought has been given to these long time property tax payers. Throwing up cheap ugly rentals! Shame on you !

Your blanket refining was not what the people wanted and you didn't listen then. Will you listen niw

Residents and neighbouring residents who will be impacted should be clearly aware of what is going on in their neighbourhood. In addition, architectural control and uniqueness of inner city community has been destroyed.. by planners who do not understand the core unique features of these communities.

I think more housing needs to be built in Calgary and that means things need to be able to have fast approvals but there needs to be some standards or checks in place for those looking to over build in a particular neighborhood. I also think parking and traffic issues for these new higher density builds is a huge issue that doesn't seem to be discussed enough

We need to make this a city for people. Not cars. People need affordable housing our kids need some hope for the future. If we can speed up the process that is a win.

A new development was proposed in my neighbourhood that was advertised as a 4-plex, but the designs of the building show it will function as an 8 plex due to the basements functioning as independent suites.

The lot and parking could not support that, but it was not clearly advertised as it was designed. I also only knew about it through the signage, I would not have known if I wasn't driving by.
Stuff needs to get built faster. I have NO CLUE why the city insists on getting so much community engagement when the vast majority of people who respond are nimbys. Most normal people just want housing built.
I'm concerned about the demolition of solid homes for oversized, profit-driven builds that don't suit our communities. These developments reduce parking, strain services, and erode neighbourhood character. The City must prioritize long-term planning and responsible growth.
Because a large carriage house has been built in the backyard next to mine. I have zero privacy, zero and I am not allowed by the city to put up any thing to provide me privacy. I sent in my concerns to the city when a notice was posted and never heard a word back regarding my concerns. My property value has decreased and I feel like a prisoner. Very disappointed.
Calgary needs to densify, and fast! For the fiscal health of the city and the social and physical health of the residents.
Existing residents should have more of a say in their own neighborhoods.
Since people get physical mail, the chances of a notice being seen is higher than pretending that people are always online or will be in the right website at the right time!
Upset by the destruction of existing communities and loss of adequate parking and landscape space.
Providing a clear set of rules for what can and what can't be built in what areas is very important as a baseline for everyone. I also believe that physical materials providing information is not flexible enough to keep up with the pace at which developments should be open for consultation, while public displays and in person sessions provide the ability to continuously be up to date with the latest information.
While it is important to have proposed projects go through to increase density, there needs to be a way to allow for a more holistic view of how a neighbourhood will change. As lots within communities are privately developed a broader plan for the neighbourhood is unlikely to be on the developers mind. Spreading density out, as well as considering sunlight, views, and traffic congestion along with other factors to maintain community character while modernizing and increasing density to housing.
I care about the city of Calgary!
Because I'd want to know and want every available means to get information
I would like to be informed about what is proposed in my neighborhood
The current city council and development is destroying what Calgary once was.

It's being built for mass new comers to the city but born and raised Calgarians are being disregarded and losing the city they had. No where to go except high rises, high density buildings and no parking.
Once we had parks and trees, now we have one next to the other high rises. Come on council, you can do better to serve the Calgary that once was.
We have seen a big influx of oversized developments coming into our neighbourhood since the change, 8 and 12 units on single family lots on roads already full of parked vehicles. Totally support density on through routes where they tend to amalgamate anyway, but it's a little surprising to see such things pop up between two small bungalows. Not great for property value, growing gardens in now completely shaded back yards, etc.
Developers have too much power in this city. Developments often don't serve the needs of Calgarians.
The current Blanket Rezoning is a complete disaster that the majority of Calgarians were were opposed to. Having area plans as we had previously took I to account traffic, infrastructure, and respected what made neighborhoods great places. Tearing down homes and placing 8 plexes on 50 foot wide lots in single family neighborhoods destroys what made those neighborhoods so desirable.
I generally feel uninformed about happenings in my neighbourhood. Developers should expand the area of residents that they notify.
City Council ONLY cares about DENSITY!!!! City Council does NOT CARE about citizens who purchased their homes because of the zoning (RC-1). City Council does NOT care about AFFORDABILITY they only care about DENSITY and more PROPERTY TAXES collected!!!! Insane and quite DISGUSTING!!!!
Seems things are different and lacking transparency when it comes to development and city zoning
The city of Calgary is clearly not looking out for the citizens they represent. I would like to see each councillor hold public town halls in their ward and then bring those results back to the mayor.
Anything less is unacceptable.
Nobody wants the rezoning in our communities - yet you guys ram it down our throats.
Quite disgusting what you are willing to do for the developers to get your kickbacks. Shameful behaviour and I hope you are all held accountable.
I want more housing asap and and I'm taking my communication preferences into account
New developments need to happen, and the approval process should be increased, however, there needs to be a way for the public to voice their opinions.
Strongly against blanket rezoning

Calgary City Council is driven by dollars not quality. It is essential to allow the public their say in their area as this is not a Marxist commune. The developers are only in it for cash and will do as much as possible to develop land to their advantage. The recent zoning changes have taken away the public access to object protest and simply be considered, all to the advantage of the council and the developers.
I think clarity is important to help us understand what is allowed. We can't make informed decision without chasing the info.
And the city desperately needs more housing (affordable) and easier access to age in place options. I'd also like to see restrictions ease around tiny homes and mobile or manufactured homes on existing property. IE. my structure built in 80's is no longer meeting needs and I want to put a manufactured dwelling in its place."
Because they are sensible options that don't delay well thought out, consulted with community, and sensible rules.
There should be more freedom for people to build what they want on their own property. There should be more predictable rules around what can be built and where.
People decide to settle into communities based on how the developments have been managed over time. When things change this rapidly, the communities lose appeal and value and neighbours are the ones who are negatively affected. This should not be something the city of Calgary supports.
I think that developers need to be given flexibility to create designs that make sense within the context
Because the rules should be fair and the same for everyone. The idea that it ships be case by case is offensive to me, and robs average people of the rights afforded to those with the time and money to engage in case by case analysis. It's also very inefficient for everyone involved
It is important that all those affected be informed and have the ability to appeal. This is a democracy and in the last several years the city seems to be making a lot of decisions without informing or getting input from those most affected. I am all for affordable housing and density, however, not at the cost of schools, infrastructure, parking, green space and chaos.
Provide all opportunities for citizens to engage. Provide clear and non biased surveys and questionnaires and proper/non biased analysis of noted data.
The destruction of neighbourhoods cannot be allowed. The cheapness, poor quality buildings with 4 to 8 units is appalling. Parking and traffic is critical to safe areas. People drive at high speeds!
Building seems to be a big bureaucracy
I will use any method to learn more about what is going on around me and to be able to speak on it
Good quality and meaningful communication is essential

As unclear as everything the city says
Increasing density for the sake of increasing density doesn't allow for thoughtful development and leads to a glut of unwanted properties - look at all the empty micro-condos in Toronto and Vancouver! This doesn't solve the housing problem. It adds to it. It also adds to more suburban sprawl because people ultimately want space, a yard. They don't want to fight over where to park. Homeowners must have a say in how their community is changing.
It's important, it's respectful. My home and location are so vital to me
Calgary is a great city. Residents views should be listened to and heard. All cities evolve. All communities are different and we should celebrate that rather than force communities to be the same. Many systems of government around the world enforce that all communities must be the same. Here in Canada that is not who we are.
The current process is abysmal. People shouldn't be surprised by a massive development going up beside their house. The developers should spend more time working with residents before they submit an application.
We just need to build more housing. That's the only way to make housing affordable.
Because the adjacent landowners and the community should be involved in the planning decisions and have the opportunity to provide input that carries equal weight. Very tired of City and Council telling us they know better based on models from other parts of the world some of which have failed.
As many ways as possible for individuals to get the information. For ex. not everyone is on-line.
Making the process to build housing as straightforward fast and seamless as possible is the most urgent issue facing the city. Listening to complaints from existing homeowners puts aside the needs of young people, renters and the disadvantaged.
Engagement and transparency is great, but to a point. Have too much engagement kills project timelines and can stunt densification city-wide (this happened in Vancouver). People should be informed, but there doesn't need to be a drawn-out process for engagement.
Information and community engagement is important
Communication with residents is crucial especially when multifamily dwellings are being proposed for R1/R2 zoned lots.
I want to know what's going on in my neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods
I feel as though the rezoning is short sighted and ruining communities. Neighbours seem to raise concerns that are not heard. You are cramming more and more people into neighbourhoods where there isn't adequate infrastructure or parking. These are also communities where families moved and now you

have high density rentals with increased crime & transient renters. Again, any concerns voiced seem to fall on deaf ears. The system is broken. And the amount of waste from these projects is ridiculous!
Comes should be where the people are, not having the people need to know to go look for something.
We need to know what developments are being proposed in our neighbourhoods. Developers should not be able to push developments into place without proper community consultation.
I would like to be informed of new projects that are going to affect my way of life in my neighborhood or my standard of living
The community should be involved right from the beginning and should be listened to. If the community is against it, it should be stopped early on.
As a baby boomer I am concerned that most of the single family house owners mainly want to stop development in their area. We need a faster approval process
We have a proposed development that is in the proposed state currently. We are all feeling very unheard and disrespected by the city and the zoning bylaw changes. There is a need for a site visit on these development as the one one proposed near us does not fit location and will eliminate sunlight for two of the adjacent properties. The renderings on the proposal are very misleading regarding the building surrounding properties.
because we want community without high density, without crime, without poverty, want good schools, want services like community pool/rink/park/library/cafes/unique store, want sunshine in my windows in my home and for my garden, parking is not enough so higher density causes more parking problems and charging us is not the answer to parking as no one else in the city pays for parking in front of their house (how discriminatory, we will not be voting for the same counsel again)
Builders need to take more responsibility. The city should provide clear, specific guidelines that reflect wisdom in long term urban planning. And builders need to adhere to the guidelines. The city needs to establish a vision and move back to long range planning for the benefit of all stakeholders. And builders should be held to that vision.
The onus should be on the applicant to make contact. If it's online, then it's up to the impacted person to do the work
I think the more people know, the better able they are to make decisions.
Blanket rezoning needs to be repealed. We don't have a shortage of housing we have a shortage of AFFORDABLE housing. Developers are buying up older affordable houses and replacing them with expensive rentals. This needs to stop.
I value information and consultation about what the proposed change/development is
we are not being engaged by developers, for the most part... there is a lot of 'I'll do whatever the bylaw and relaxations of the bylaw will permit', rather than work with the community for versions of built forms

that get most of the density the developer is looking for whilst respecting the concerns of the community... upfront discussions can lead to far better proposals that address community issues with minor concessions from developers

Clear and enforceable rules create a sense of certainty, which can reduce people's anxiety about change and enable quicker approvals due to greater acceptance of proposals that fall within the rules.

Because the new zoning rules are ridiculous. Work harder to develop zones of density don't just foist the problem on residents.

As noted above, it's quite clear to me the city doesn't value or actually take feedback and engagement seriously. It's merely a pesky task that they want to cross off so that they can do what they want anyway. It's quite clear that public feedback on any zoning issue is viewed as misinformed when people have valid and legitimate concerns around how it is being approached and employed within the city. There needs to be honest dialogue and intent on this topic, and it has yet to occur

Developers need to see how they're impacting near by homes and the community as a whole.

In person discussions are valuable PROVIDED that they are used to garner feedback BEFORE developments/zoning are approved. The current City Council ignored an overwhelming opposition to new residential zoning idea and chose to move forward with it anyway. THIS HAS GOT TO STOP. Don't bother engaging citizens if you have no intention of listening to them.

Because the City seems to favour Builders under the guise of affordable housing when all the city is doing is destroying suburban neighborhood's that do not need a 4 plex in the middle of their cul de sac or close! Force developers to develop on land that is ripe for building! The old Greyhound Station - The old Shoppers on 17th ave SW at 39st!

It is important to provide different ways of notices for community as not everyone has access to each type. By providing, door to door, in person, online and flyer it makes sure that ALL people will of had a chance to see what is being proposed.

Taking into account residences opinions is important before building as it can affect their property depending on what is built.

Cookie cutter zoning doesn't work. We need to be flexible and build to meet a community's needs. Further, buildings should not stick out. They should reflect the character of the area. I'm opposed to one size fits all zoning across Calgary.

The city must consult the community!

I made these selections because I live in a blanket rezoning area that has been destroyed by the city not listening to the constituents of the wards that we live in. I strongly believe in responsible development and growth that makes sense in the areas that are being impacted.

Blanket rezoning was rejected by the majority of Calgarians yet passed anyway. It needs to be repealed. Council are destroying the fabric of Calgary for their own agenda.
Online could be missed I don't go to pop up events
Current residents in Marda loop are marginalized and ignored
As a resident i should be notified and provided ample response time with no fee charged to make a complaint
Ease of getting most people informed
The city needs to listen to its citizen's more especially directly affected neighbours. Currently your process heavily favours developers while giving the illusion that the city hears citizen's concerns, but in the end they absolutely lean in favour of developers. Your current system breaks trust with Calgarians.
We want people to have input into their community. As a community association, we want people to be informed.
Im concerned about conversions in established neighborhoods with multiple units. This will kill our property value. Make parking a nightmare. Change the feel. Impact safety. Re development like this should be kept closer to downtown
I don't think multi dwelling homes should be approved in already developed single dwelling home communities
I recognize there's a variety of needs and considerations across the city that require flexibility and consideration.
I would like the city to preserve the character and density of existing neighbourhoods.
There needs to be a way that residents can maintain the characteristics of the neighbourhood that they chose to purchase in.
I don't, nor do any of my neighbours, want high density housing built in the low density neighbourhood that we bought in specifically because it is a low density neighbourhood.
If one wants to live in a higher density neighbourhood, one can buy there. Don't try to change our areas.
The process at the moment is not working. Developers are taking advantage of the bylaws. Blanket bylaws do not work for different areas. I pass many small « parks » in old neighborhoods that are not used to play in but should be built on. I also suggest modular housing put on the Eau Claire site until the city can afford to develop C train .
Blanket rezoning encourages unplanned development that results in strains on existing infrastructure. This is reactionary and unwise.

There should be clear rules so the process and outcome are predictable, but flexible enough to adapt to unique circumstances
I live in the NW, in a beautiful neighbourhood. The infrastructure cannot handle the 8 plexes that the city is allowing to be built. It is changing the community for the worse.
I intentional bought my home based on the residential mix at that time. Changes to that mix will negatively affect the enjoyment of my home and the value of my investment.
I am more inclined to reduce the red tape yo fast track new neighborhoods where purchasers are fully aware of the residential mix. The problem comes with changing existing zoning and bylaws for established neighborhoods.
We need to make building easy. Housing is a human right. We need to get out of the housing as an investment trap.
Having common rules allows predictability. I don't need to comment on what people are doing on their private property if it's within the common rules and won't physically harm me.
Because i wanted to
Because silly hole is not listening to the people in the communities where these monstrosities are being built without parking
I'm willing to try anything that allows for engagement to be heard and not just a check box exercise. Please consider engagement of the community long before it seems like a foregone conclusion.
reflects how I already do this type of thing.
I have a right to have input into decisions that impact my community. It seems as though the city of Calgary only wants to collect taxes, but not communicate engage with citizens. You somehow forgot that your wages are paid by Calgarian's by taxes that you like to hike. Shameful.
Currently the city does a poor job of engaging communities.
The greater the requirement to inform the community the better chance everyone effected by a project will have the information to respond to it.
Being informed is important to me. The city has an obligation to consult existing residents before adding new development. I support densification, even in my neighbourhood, but it must come with consultation, adequate off-street parking, and attention to overviewing/overshadowing concerns.
The changes of the blanket rezoning mad a few years back have significantly impacted the design and look and feel of communities.

Given the huge number of bad development plans there must be public input & adherence to MDP & LAPs
It would depend entirely on the size and impact of the proposed development. The CA does not have the manpower to inform all affected residents, so that is the city or developer job.
Multiple forms is always better than just one route for communicating. I walk my neighborhood a lot and I want to encounter information about changes in the immediacy of just moving around....and I want to encounter it in time to actually have some effect on what happens. I live in Marda Loop....my god what a mess.
Presently, it seems no recent development or development proposal can be opposed. Case in point, the proposed highrise complex in Marda Loop. The developer has VERY deep pockets and an extensive history building in the city (and they do good work), but due to their ability to overcome any opposition, whether from the local population, or environmental concerns by, to whit, throwing money at the problem, citizens have no real ability to oppose their developments or cause those to be re-evaluated.
The physical sign helps catch interested citizens attention and the website provides details
Existing experiences
The citizens of Calgary have uncertainty of which buildings is getting built or destroyed without even notifying the reasons why they need to take actions. Often times private companies just suddenly take actions without notice to the citizens to the point that they have no control of what's going to happen in their surroundings.
I am in favour that citizens have the right to make decisions or thoughts on their community, and receive any information of how they're place are going to be altered."
More input from neighbors and the community as a whole should influence development applications. Decisions should not be made based on potential tax dollars!
I live in a small R1 neighborhood and don't want it to be destroyed by multiplex housing. A lot of areas that have now allowed it look like war time England. We don't all want to live piled on top of each other with no green space in our backyards to live and breath freely. Don't destroy what character some of these old neighbourhood's offer to the beauty of the city
I am in favour of homeowners having a say in what is built on or next to their properties. We cannot give developers the right to build whatever they want wherever they want. Right of appeal and petition should be maintained and we should not have a one-size fits all approach to blanket rezoning across the city.
The amount of money being spent to battle with developers in our neighborhood because of blanket rezoning is absurd. Allowing a multi unit property when the infrastructure does not support it is absurd. Just make a decision so calgarians can move on and not waste money fighting legal battles.

They align with where I might expect to find information. Reflects the fact I may not be looking unless attention is drawn to the fact something is being planned
I have had many inconveniences by having so much building activity happening in my neighbourhood. The building process makes it louder, more dangerous (large trucks speed through residential neighbourhoods regularly), more debris (garbage blows off the site into adjacent yards), and the houses being built are no less expensive than what was there before, often with similar population density on the lot (many of the older bungalows being torn down are homes for at least 3-4 people, sometimes more
There is a pervasive view that city council and the mayor have allowed development to go wild without any clear plan. Developers have the upper hand and appear to have the green light to develop anything anywhere. Shame on city council.
It is important for residents to know what is planned in their community and the ability to ask questions and appeal decisions that maybe have been made in a way that skews strongly toward the developer profit and not to the ongoing liveability of the community once they have moved on.
Information needs to be easily available and impossible to miss for those who are impacted.
I think serious consideration has to be given to existing property owners not to flood the market with competition. Parking of many vehicles in confined areas should be a reason to turn down overbuilding as well! Narrow streets in older neighbourhood should stop excessive high rises.
I believe that the city is in need of different types of housing. Having set rules of what can be built with clear rules can help developers stick to the rules in an easier way. I also understand that design is relative but the city should start denying developments that are repeated and lack architectural features
That is how I believe it would be fair.
Its critical the developer works with community residents to gain insights into the types of housing and amenities that should be built in their community. Too often the city sides with the developer and does not listen to community ideas to ensure it's a desirable place for not only new residents to live in, but for the existing community members as well.
All citizens need to be informed with all the information. The changes to Calgary's neighbourhoods is astounding. What you do in new communities is not replicable in older communities. Killarney and Altadore are good examples of communities that have been drastically altered and local residents are not happy with this.
I am not happy with the lack of rules and lack of preservation of the value of my neighbourhood
<p>Why Calgary's Blanket Rezoning Doesn't Work –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents weren't properly consulted — many feel the city ignored community input. -It may not lower housing costs — new builds are still expensive.

<p>-Infrastructure may not handle higher density — concerns over traffic, schools, and utilities.</p> <p>-It will erase neighborhood character — older homes and trees may be lost.</p>
<p>I prefer prominent signage because I, and others, don't read brochures in the mail or community newsletters.</p>
<p>To many people don't know what's going on in there neighbourhood until it's to late. These huge builds that are ruining our amazing areas need to be very public</p>
<p>The city needs to restore the ability to the homeowner to know that buildings proposed with be compatible with the existing context, to be informed about what is proposed in their neighbourhood, and to influence the design and character of what is built to be compatible with what the neighbourhood values.</p>
<p>There are developers coming into older neighbourhood - who are not taking the parking or current homes into account. Its a money grab to build alot of density and not considering the neighbourhood. Lets gets single family quality homes built. Not multi units which will be all rental and run down within 5 years. Lets build quality- Not quantity!</p>
<p>Developers do not have the community in their best interest when trying to obtain development permits. We need a clear set of rules that need to be followed that are agreed to by the community. That way, when developers choose to develop in a community, it can be approved quickly as preset rules were agreed to with the Community Associations.</p>
<p>My current home is adjacent to high density on one side and residential on the other side. I am worried that my small house with be sandwiched by high density and I will be squeezed out of the neighbourhood. Would like more engagement and better guidance on what can be built as the zoning when I bought didn't allow for this high density.</p>
<p>More options so more people have access to being informed/engaged.</p>
<p>If I get something mailed to me I will see it for sure. Onsite display would be the most useful of all communication types. Information session date(s) on the mailed post card makes the most sense.</p>
<p>There need to be clear rules for builders. The rules are what needs to be guided via community involvement and common sense. You shouldn't have a 12 unit home on a residential street for example. Where those larger units can be built should be preset and known. Neighbours should not be able to provide comments unless there is something counter to preset rules. Otherwise people who are too focused on making homes all look like old heritage homes spend too much of the city's time delaying progress</p>
<p>My personal view is that this process needs to be flexible, interactive, and transparent. Interaction may result in a better outcome for both the developer and the nearby community residents. Reasonably notifications and timelines are also key for all parties. It is important to encourage new development while also respecting the existing community and property owners.</p>

I'd like to know exactly what is being built and how it fits in the neighbourhood without killing a bunch of trees online copies of the plans, etc. that can be downloaded are essential
Visibility is important. I often find out about things via snail mail or online or by walking by in public. All of these are important to inform the most number of affected people.
I'm so disappointed to see how the city is allowing massive developments to go into quiet neighborhoods comprised of historic bungalows. It seems like such a cash grab for developers. There was a huge outcry from community associations that was ignored. We don't feel heard. Other cities maintain some of their historic neighborhoods and maintain some rules .. but here in Calgary developers can now have free rein to do whatever they please. This was such a mistake, very disappointed
For first-time developments, it's important applicants engage with block residents (those living on the block) to learn about any challenges the developer may experience as this can be addressed through the design phase. This process can also set precedence on the built form the block residents believe will benefit everyone affected by the change.
Clear and concise. No room for misinterpretation.
Many developers do not seem able to take on the projects that they do, quality is non existent, the neighbours become the only enforcement that isn't reactive.
Just look at the Eau Claire development as an example - the City and Harvard decided behind closed doors what would be built and any public disclosure has been as a last resort: (i) the City screwed over the family running 1886 and took that restaurant away from citizens; (ii) the City screwed over the family that had run Barley Mill for decades; (iii) the City took the River Run homes away from families to benefit a developer; and (iv) plaza construction has been ongoing for 6 F#&% years.
When all of the new development in our part of Killarney was up for review the only way to know is if you happen to walk by the proposed developments and saw the signs. The elderly people were not made aware. This is NOT community engagement. A major issue we are about to be faced with is parking. With over 60 new units being built with very minimal or no parking there will not physically be enough street parking to accommodate all the new residents. Where do you propose that people park.
I strongly disagree with the blanket rezoning rules that have passed. I want to be able to live in a zone the is only RC-1
Because I want to know and I don't want to miss knowing because it wasn't posted cross platform properly
The re-zoning in my area had done nothing to support affordable housing. It's just allowed a family home to be knocked down and 2 million dollar plus units put in place. Additionally we have multiple apartment buildings being put up most of which are primarily studio and far from affordable - this doesn't help. My neighborhood is a school district we need housing for families and they can't all be over 700K options. Additionally almost all have submitted one plan only to change after approval

Currently with the blanket zoning, anything goes. We are not notified by Planning if an application is approved. Developers do not care they claim "it's in the By Law we can do it". Regardless of the negative impact on the adjoining residents. No parking is provided, with the comment "people walk, cycle and use transit" Ridiculous. We need the opportunity to work with proposals, after all we live in the neighborhood and know the issues we face with traffic and parking. Dense proposals don't pass
Because it's important I have input on our communities. Many people choose to live places due to the current status of the community.
Because I am seeing too much densification with limited parking. Mardaloop for instance is a mess. Can hardly drive down the narrow streets, and super hard to find parking.
Impacted property owners need to be informed and to have a say in what is developed.
There's a lot of new builds in residential where parking is not provided or considered for those who already live in the neighborhood.
Establish rules that make sense and then move forward and stop wasting time and money asking for constant input.
Calgary is a great city despite having a government that does not deserve citizen trust or respect. A massive overhaul is needed to get this government to a base level of competence and integrity.
The zoning bylaw should be simple and transparent to provide certainty to developers. It should be cost and time efficient, and reduce red tape for arbitrary and restrictive zoning rules.
I think that zoning laws should be more simplified and have more clear language with pictures to make development processes more efficient and streamlined
Online only makes sense for typical. Atypical should be well communicated. This feels like the tactics should be scaled based on the degree of change or level of impact
Because community involvement means creating a city we all want, not just one based on making a few highly profitable.
My community is one of the top four communities that have the most density already. Why do we need more density?
Blanket Rezoning should not have been forced on Calgarians without holding a plebiscite. It is appalling that the public no longer has a voice in how our communities change.
Homes are selected very carefully by owners - including space, community and neighborhood. It's very disappointing to take that away from people who have spent a lot of time and money selecting their dream home, to go and arbitrarily change zoning that will change the neighborhood the owner so carefully chose. There needs to be many checks and balances to ensure communities have say on what can and will be built in their neighborhoods. Parking is crucial - minimum 1 parking spot per house.

Renderings provided need to match what is actually built-most of the time the colors etc. are different
Developers must make a concerted effort to inform neighborhood of development and provide a clear opportunity to provide feedback. Cannot be slip past communities. If communities are to be strong they MUST be informed and involved.
Residents of established neighborhoods should be considered seriously especially with the relaxed zoning to maintain the continuity and security of well planned neighborhoods
Feel owners of existing adjacent and nearby properties are not being informed, engaged and listened to
I do not want houses purchased in my neighbourhood and then turned into 6 or 8 plex.
The people that are closest should have multiple ways to see what is changing in the neighborhood
Because there is no transparency in marketing from developers or from the city with regard to increased housing and how blanket rezoning is affecting our communities. Developers are allowed to build with very little regard for existing residents and no thought to infrastructure or how these communities will look and feel in the next 20 years.
Getting information is useful, but building more houses is most important. We should avoid having too much public discourse, especially when most homeowners are disincentivized to enable higher density.
I believe when we make these descisions, it should be to better everyone or the majority of people. We cannot just listen to one person and we also cannot ignore the one persons opinion
Currently projects are approved despite negative feedback from the individuals most impacted by the projects being constructed that needs to change. Adjacent home owners should have more of a say in changing their street and neighbourhood for the worse. The current system is broken and is ruining communities. What is being done cannot be reversed but the consequences do not seem to be taken into account when approving projects.
The current system of no ability for neighbours and communities to appeal new developments is ruining Neighborhood and any sense of community. We do not need high density housing in the suburbs. The Zoning bylaw allows for no consultation and sides with developers only NOT the citizens who make communities their home. The only notice is a sign on the property. This is not adequate and does not give community citizens much notice. THE City of Calgary has let down its communities
We don't check DMAP regularly. We want to be CONSULTED AND INFORMED. Too many large apartment and high rises being built in Parkhill area. Traffic SAFETY is an ISSUE. Why is 38a/part of 1a street sw allowed to have commercial. This is a PARK area - engagement did not happen. The east side of McLeod should be developed.. Parkhill is already a dense neighborhoods. So frustrated with city planning. We are losing our lovely canopy and roads are full of speeding cars and construction trucks
Would like to see several touchpoints in order to ensure all messages are being received.

I think it's important to consider the impacts on neighbours that live next to properties that are being redeveloped. Those individuals should have a say if their property will be significantly impacted by what's being built next to them.
A faint hope that this government will one day start to usefully serve the citizens of Calgary.
The change to the previous zoning bylaws was unjustified and a betrayal of public trust for all the homeowners who invested their life savings in properties that saw the zoning change without any ability of the existing neighbourhood to keep their single family home status. This destroyed public trust in elected officials and puts citizens in a terrible position to have to fight each other for what they believed they legally purchased (a home zoned for single family homes). This must be fixed!
Tired of massive complex's being built, lack of parking and tired of council not listening! Especially when Calgary has an abundance of rental places vacant! Also lack of mixed homes, low towers, condos etc!!
Right now, near by neighbours are not being considered when developers come into the community with short term profitability objectives. They are not giving back to inner city communities. The zoning is allowing density in all areas and not considering practical solutions that make sense to each block.
It's crucial to get community and adjacent neighbor input. Various methods are required in order to ensure the community is aware of the proposal
For residential a flyer in a mailbox, DMAP updates or ads in the local community newsletter is sufficient. For larger developments I expect more involved engagement (events, online information available.)
A variety of methods to inform should be utilized to ensure residents are made aware of the proposed development and have numerous methods available to provide input
To protect our neighbourhood
I'm an architect so I'm pretty aware that sometimes the impact that new projects generate into their communities are important, so it's necessary to have constant and fluent communications with neighbours as well with users. Communication is the key!
I don't want a sales pitch from a developer, I want to know how any new development will impact and improve the community. What is the benefit for the community?
Don't want the cost of advertising to stop development. A sign at the site should be good with letters to adjacent neighbors
We have previously been very adversely impacted by a backyard garage suite on our neighbours property. No signage was posted and it was largely too late to have meaningful comment/ say by the time we were aware. The city appeared to have no standards or regard for the neighbouring property when approving this suite (which with a minimum of effort seems could have been designed in a way that would have had much less negative impact on our home). We moved as a result.

the most information in many ways to reach the busy people affected in that area
Our LAP does not correctly reflect the particular aspects of our neighbourhood/street and calls for a radical change in both use (ie allowing commercial uses vs none now), and the height of buildings (from 3/4 to 6). It does not appear well thought through, community input was completely disregarded, and leaves a deep sense of distrust and dismay as to what may be allowed. Accordingly, maximum input is needed on a case by case basis.
I only ever see the “proposed change” signs and I don’t know what they mean or what to do about them. I’m sure this is intentional so developers don’t get push back from people.
Changes in policy cast misgivings about new developments
There needs to be more notification of what zoning changes are being requested and the established zoning rules need to be followed. Developers are being allowed far too many ‘exemptions or relaxations’ and the only way that residents are notified of these is when they appeal the development. This is not transparent or fair to surrounding neighbours. If something gets approved it should follow the rules established by the city and not have relaxations
"From experience i found the Planning Department at the City to be more inclined to side with the Developers when reviewing applications and to have a tendency to disregard the very guidelines they implemented. Citizens shouldn’t have to appeal to make sure the guidelines are followed but they do and that is worrisome.
The trust is broken. Not a good thing."
I want to know what is happening in my community and how it will be shaped and I have a right to an opinion as a tax paying citizen.
Housing is an important priority for the city. I believe in a transparent, timely and predictable process for zoning on new construction, where developers can trust in an equitable and reasonably quick review and residents are informed of the developers intent without need for much study or research.
Because the current zoning rules are too generalized. The city doesn’t ever take neighbors concerns in account.
currently people interested need to go looking for it. most neighbours aren't even aware of proposals or plans
RC-G and H-GO zoning are too broad to address the specific context that different residential streetscapes and uses should accommodate.
Everyone receives information in a different way, so a solid communications plan needs to be aware of this. Most residents become aware of new development when they are walking past a site, or talking to their neighbour.

Calgary has had so many barriers to building housing in the past, it has created a crisis. Housing is a basic need, and existing residents should not be able to decide/reject what type of housing is built. Our zoning and approvals process should be focused on urgently approving housing, not pandering to people who already have housing...the process is flawed because you never hear from the people who would benefit to live in future housing developments, and only hear from people fearful of change.
We currently have a proposal for a multifamily home in our neighborhood. The development is FAR beyond the scope of anything reasonable and the entire neighborhood is upset.
I understand a duplex, but this has SEVEN units proposed with not enough parking, not enough tree coverage, it fills 90% of the lot, it's at a crucial intersection near a school and all the parking will overflow onto street. This pushes the building envelope of what is considered REASONABLE and should be denied
I am very concerned that the current zoning regulations favor developers and profit, and not what is best for the community
I am very frustrated that I moved in to an area that was zoned for single family dwellings and will now have high rises. My boys are designated for a high school farther away because the one in the area is now full. There is very little parking.
Pro making development easier and more predictable while also limiting what neighbours can prevent being built
For a new development on my close we received virtually no information and the one interaction the developer had with the community was a joke. They didn't listen or care about any of our concerns. They treated the engagement as something they needed to "tick a box" on and not actual engagement.
i want to provide feedback on my neighborhood when a new development is proposed
I believe engagements is necessary and encouraged. I don't think it should be a massive barrier to getting things built
The current bylaws do not allow for enough notice or community engagement. This needs to change. The developers are not the only stake holders in these situations and ALL parties need to be notified, have the opportunity to give input, and make changes/suggestions as needed.
Blanket rezoning is a major concern and pressure placed on existing home owners who are being forced to accept with zero regard for traffic concerns. Notification and consultation are not the same thing.
The city's reasoning has negatively impacted my neighborhood, then value of my home, and my quality of life. They don't care - they just want to ram in as much development as possible.
I am in an inner city neighborhood and don't feel that information on new developments is being communicated very well.

Living in a neighbourhood includes both a financial investment along with personal commitment in the neighbourhood. Developers should be conscious of this and post what their plans are.
Because the City is making seemingly unilateral changes that impact my finances to
Increase theirs. It's not that density helps people, it also helps the city through taxes and inflated home evaluations, when in reality, it's decreasing the value. No one buys a million dollar home in the suburbs and wants to live across 350 apartment complexes
rented out for minimum to anyone and everyone. It increases crime and reduces safety. Many zoning changes will change communities to something different."
I am a home owner in the city for almost 20 years with my family. I have been and continue to be impacted by the growth and zoning. I don't always feel the big picture is fully considered.
Because right now it doesn't seem that I'm informed or have a voice for when I am notified of development in my area.
We totally disagree with rezoning in existing neighborhoods. The city should use all of its own land first. But not parks. Eg the old Ernest Mannig site.
The current developments in our area are diminishing our enjoyment of our neighborhood. We are very concerned that the developers are able to cram as many units as possible onto the lots with little regard for the impact on residents.
I think moving towards higher density housing is a great step but I think a lot of new developments fail to take into consideration the context of the neighbourhood they're building in. As a result there's huge complexes where there should be townhouses etc so I think a flexible approach is best
The more options that people can be informed will help eliminate the chance of people saying that they were not informed.
Every means possible should be utilized to inform citizens of new development. There is a wide age range to inform and everyone uses different forms of communication (young people are more tech savvy and older people use print to communicate).
I am architectural designer and builder. I use the bylaw daily
Because online and email makes it easier to ignore concerns from the community.
NIMBYs need to stop having influence on development in the city.
I want to be informed, and it's important to have methods that make it easy to be informed. I also want it to be clear about what can happen on a site.
I wish building can be made easier. I don't need to be notified about every new change to my area

I believe more and faster development will help with housing affordability.
Because Calgary is building too many duplexes, 4 plexes, etc in areas that there shouldn't be. What happened to affordable single family homes??? Why destroy single family homes in areas like Montgomery? Every home looks the same and it's trash.
I am pro development but am very concerned with the construction of relatively large housing on regular lots. For example, putting a three story building and/or multiple building infill (not including a garage), on a regular, non-corner lot, that would in the past just get developed as a normal two story duplex or single house. To me there is a big difference between smart growth and non-smart growth and oversized developments as per above can ruin a street for longtime residents.
Not all properties are equal so having flexible rules allows equity rather than straight across equality which results in uneven unequal application
I think that cutting red tape will help cities thrive and become more vibrant, by redeveloping underused or deteriorating parcels of land instead of urban sprawl and car-centric development in greenfield areas.
Development permits and plans for infills need to consider that they are going into communities. How does the increased traffic affect our kids ability to safely walk to school, what are the expectations regarding safety, noise, building design and construction on neighbouring houses and how to solve conflicts or report issues.
The city should not allow the building of houses that do not fit into the community. For instance in a suburb area where people have chosen to live away from the high density type of lifestyle.. high density should not be allowed. People have chosen where to live considering many factors and one is life style and type of community. If the city changes that and effects the lifestyle and property values lawsuits for injurious affection should be expected.
New development doesn't need me to be notified but it would be best to do so in these ways if they decide to notify people
To give choice back to the people that was stripped away in the last zoning laws. You should be able to choose the type of neighborhood you live in. Inner city should be high density to meet housing needs and new communities should have high density and low density options to meet the needs of the people. While still not destroying the communities historic neighbourhoods.
We are cramming people and cars in to areas that cannot support the traffic. Causing upset and hostility towards our neighbours
Certainty and ease for investment is the single biggest impact on reducing housing costs and improving local economies
Flexibility can enable those with more influence in the political process to secure favourable treatment.

New rules should not be blanket applied to the city. Single family home areas don't want the introduction of mixed housing types. Parking and space become serious issues.
I think it is important to provide certainty and clear guidance to all. I believe it is good idea to minimize the requirements and not be incredibly strict excepting where the requirements are to ensure good building form for all to properly make use of the built spaces and ensure corners are not cut.
I live in a neighborhood that used to be good until all the zoning got changed. Now it is terrible
I wish there was a belief that the city listened and didn't just do what they wanted
We are very frustrated at 16 unit developments going up in our neighbourhood. It's enough now.
Taking a lot that currently has a single family home on it and making it available for two or four families is reasonable.
But why is the city allowing 8-16 individual family developments to be built on a 50ft lot? This is outrageous. Please STOP zoning for and allowing these massive developments in a neighbourhood. Plan better.
I believe in giving Calgarians as many opportunities as possible to give feedback on development projects. That way, it is clear to everyone what and where city building is happening. There should be no surprises and also the majority of people should be agreeing to a development and if not, then the city should not be allowed to go forward with their plans. Sending out notices in the mail would be the most effective because some people may not look online for development information.
Housing is getting more and more unaffordable to the point where I may have to leave the city I've lived in for the greater part of 20 years.
I don't trust the city of calgary to make decisions. They are putting up 30 storey buildings in areas that use to only allow 3 stories. It's causing overcrowding in schools, blocking the sun from neighbours.
Because it is so wrong that the City is treating residents to adjoining development as we know nothing. We live in the communities and know what we are dealing with. Traffic and shadow studies are a farce. Please allow residents to provide comments on ALL proposed developments and listen to the comments. Retains the opportunity to file with SDAB. Stop supporting developers, they are here today and move on to further destruction of communities. Listen to the residents and community. Thanks
Online (dmap) is a useful tool but it doesn't show applications by date so it is difficult to decipher what is new. It is also unclear what exemptions are being sought by a proposed development.
I think that the development of new homes is the most important part of ensuring Calgary's new success. Given that the country is in a housing crisis and Calgary is increasingly feeling the impacts we should be looking to build more. I would also really appreciate to have more walkable areas in Calgary and density is one important key to accessing walkable communities. And last if I may put forward a suggestion to counter max building; it would be to strengthen heritage landmarking.

I feel like the city would provide a more unbiased view on the developments. Also mandatory pop up events/manned kiosks would increase costs for developers which get passed onto consumers.
Would like faster, simplified development
I don't know why you are asking. You don't care what the citizens want but do what you want anyway. Reverse the blanket zoning back to what it was before so we don't have to worry about a 12 plex with 1/2 a parking spot going up beside a single family home.
Because the zoning bylaws in Calgary are made for the developers and have no consideration for the local residents of the community. The developers are ruining Bowness right now, so much so that we are forced to move. We tried to follow the process to provide comments but it went no where and no one listened. The developers only care about money and The City caters to them.
We need to speed up the home building process and reduce how much time/money the city is spending in the weeds.
i don't believe engagement is impacting decisions
As a citizen who resides in a neighbourhood of choice, residents should always be informed of changes to their neighbourhood by-laws and zoning changes. It should be residents choice. Not politicians decision. If such changes are in the planning stages or even discussion stages, it is the just thing to do to inform such residents in a way that would ensure they do not miss out on knowing about the information that would impact them so directly.
Development should have a clear set of predefined designs that can be built without having the seek approval from a community. But the communitys voice should also be heard
It is very obvious that neighbours often "miss" a sign if they're out of town or miss the comment period. What we have found is that mailers get residents attention. Email distribution lists to residents sometimes work but generally, it's like an old fashioned game of telephone and people need different ways to have their opinions heard. But many people are disillusioned as the LAP process felt like they informed us of decisions rather than listened to our opinions.
The less veto points the better. The city urgently needs housing and should not allow unrepresentative busy-bodies to throw wrenches into the process of building it
Limited choice
Simple. After last year's blanket RCG zoning process (lack of) and decision, I have zero trust in the City to come up with any "clear" rules that make sense for residential areas. Therefore, we can't allow any more blanket rules. I realize this may show things down, but that's the City's fault. There are so many better ways to increase the rate of housing builds but the City does not seem to be interested in those. The "appearance" of listening isn't sufficient.

In my view, Calgary has a very corrupt government that has little respect for the rule of law. I have no expectations any feedback will be considered as this government will just do what it feels like, regardless of the facts, the law, or what is best for citizens. The last 10 years of this municipal government has been a masterclass in how to now run a government.
Despise this corrupt council and administration, you have ruined our communities and created stress and conflict, can't wait for all this to be repealed. Stop pretending you care what we think it's obvious you have been placed to push an agenda through that harms calgarians.
Concerned with not finding out information on developments before they are approved. Emailing people in an area and social media breaks through the other media clutter
I felt that this is a nightmare!
City shouldn't be prioritizing builders and profit over long paying taxpayers
don't like print material- it just ends up in the landfill
Housing is important, standard and consistency is important. Mix use is important for walkable healthy good cities, transit should be made BEFORE a community is made or before they need it.
Due to the new zoning, developers are destroying the neighbourhood character. They jam as many units on the property with little consideration of the design of esthetics or appropriate materials. The city has allowed the exact same multiplex to be built 10 times in Vanff Trail and it looks overpowering and oppressive next to the original housing stock. These developers will never be neighbours. They get money and get out as fast as possible with little concern for build quality or community.
Too many things are being through with NO input from residents or communities!!!
There should be a say from current neighbours and the ability to say no
I am pro housing density, urbanism, walkable cities, public transit, etc.
Construction of transit
The City's housing strategy does not include any prioritization or concern for communities. All housing documents and strategies on the City's Planning websites focus solely on increased housing starts, increased density, and decreased costs. Not one document talks about the community. Not one document talks about what existing citizens want.
so that i can get detailed information on a project, should i choose to, and not miss anything, should i be interested
There has been no communication with our neighbourhood in particular when someone decides to have suits or renting their propert to numerous individuals.... Parking is horrendous with 6-7 cars per house now! The street can't handle this, no pride of ownership as they are renting! Also, the only way we hear of

anything being proposed is on social media where you don't know the actual truth as people, rightly so are coming to third own conclusions on what is happening!
The city could be doing a much better job of communicating to residents about proposed new developments.
Reduce paper and plastic waste. This city had enough flyers.
If it's a private development, nobody should have any say in what other people build.
Let's streamline the process, make information available for those that want it, and stop taking years or decades to get things done.
Because in person meeting to understand and provide comment to the developers is paramount
You waste everones time with these useless surveys then do what is decided before anything gets considered. you should all be fired and save my tax dollars. you are useless waste of tax payers money and time.
Because of how extremely opposed I am to the current blanket rezoning and how our voice has not been heard by council despite how opposed property owners are.
The priority should be to build more homes and increase access to services within biking and walking distance of homes.
It should be quick to get approvals when requirements are set. Each neighborhood should vote on what requirements are and what is accepted in each neighborhood
Tired of things being built in our area that don't fit in with the neighborhood and affect the current infrastructure in a negative way
I'm tired of NIMBYs completely paralyzing the city when it comes to housing. We need housing. Full stop. We cannot continue to sprawl outwards and we cannot continue to suppress housing development when it's one of the biggest crises in the country.
STUFFING HIGH DENSITY DOWN OUR THROATS IS RUINING CALGARY. SURVEYS LIKE THIS ARE A JOKE.
I am greatly concerned about the lack of input allowed by the City when making changes. Instead of changing things for new developments (eg. Multi storey buildings instead of urban sprall), the City seems determined to destroy established neighborhoods, by cramming in larger density housing.
Because City Hall is making decisions without adequaterepresentation
It's important for residents of the impacted areas to have a voice and be involved in the decisions being made in their neighborhood

A clear set of rules that gives certainty to developers, but also pre-incorporates the feedback of existing residents in the area and is more bespoke than “blanket” zoning should be prioritized.
We make it too difficult to build housing right now. There’s too much uncertainty and many projects get cancelled or cost much more due to delay and changes.
Applicants/developers should be required to notify neighbours and affected parties within reason but development that occurs on privately owned sites should also only be required to change based on outside input to a minimal level (provided the application complies to a large degree with the LUB).
The current engagement process with the city on developments is highly favorable to developers. It appears like the city might think they currently have "a flexible approach that allows decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis" regarding zoning. If the city feels they have this approach, then this is a major concern because you do not have this approach at all. You have an extremely lopsided approach that tries to tell people that it is flexible.
I live in a mobile home park, and we are going to be displaced with minimal consideration or compensation and no one talks to us prior.

We asked: Given the limited space on residential lots, how would you rank the following features in terms of priority for inclusion?

Options were:

- Trees and plantings
- Motor vehicle parking
- Bicycle parking
- Personal storage
- Outdoor amenity space such as patios, porches, decks
- Space for the residential building
- Storing waste and recycling

We also asked **Why? Do you think there is anything else challenging or important to consider?** and received the following feedback:

Preserving existing community scale and character.
Who cares about bike storage. Allow a larger garage not the tiny units now and a bike can be stored inside
Privacy
Do not allow “density” builds until infrastructure is adequate

Don't demolish Single Family Homes under the guise of affordable housing
Don't allow builds that do not fit or suit the surrounding community.
Do not allow new builds to overshadow existing single family homes
Green space is vital to a vibrant community.
Smaller setbacks make the street feel more welcoming and alive.
Large setbacks can result in inefficient use of land for housing, meaning a larger lot would be required for the same size residence.
Why would you include bicycle parking in the above question, keep the bikes in the house or garage, I don't really care where they keep their bicycles.
It is important for Calgary City Council and the City of Calgary to listen to residents. This survey as well as all other engagement is do disingenuous it is a farce. Why is the City not addressing the DEMAND side of housing? Tell the UCP to stop the "Alberta is Calling" campaign. Tell Ottawa to have policies that match the actual ability to house people. Most residents of Calgary are completely feed up with the City of Calgary's planning department.
It is important that there is room to live and not so densely placed next to others that you feel you are not able to enjoy your living space. You need room between units and buildings.
Not all neighborhoods are suited to high-density developments. Some families deliberately choose quiet, residential communities without through traffic or commercial activity. These neighborhoods serve a purpose too, and they deserve protection from unchecked, blanket rezoning that ignores local context.
Layouts that let light into neighbours' yards
We have very few summer months to be outdoors so items such as bicycle parking and decks are lower priority.
There is simply too much being crammed onto a single lot, with little regard to neighbourhood context or the "liveability" of the units. Putting 10 units onto a single lot is a recipe for conflict and stress. Basement suites with window wells and an amenity space at the bottom of cement stairs are depressing and sad places to live. Scale back and allow the next increment of building; from 1 house to a duplex, and make it a place tenants actually want to stay. 10 people on a lot doesn't work.
Blanket rezoning with 60% coverage everywhere eliminates any room for trees, parking, garbage and outdoor amenity space. If those can't be accommodated the housing size itself must be reduced. We like having a bit of green space and yard, that is what makes Calgary livable and desirable. We don't want to live in a concrete/wooden jungle.

Take into account accessibility features like access ramps that can take up space. Also, street design should be made in such a way to ensure safety, not prioritize access to cars.
Greenery is the most important aspect of keeping communities livable. Massing without aesthetics and greenery is imposing and obtrusive.
There should be an emphasis on space for residential buildings, and then trees and plantings are important because they promote wellbeing. Parking is not as important as space for residential buildings and plantings.
Impact on neighbor's safety and comfort when lots are too close - fire hazard, loss of privacy, access between front and backyards narrowed to make it unusable. For example, having to walk around the block to use a lawnmower on front and back.
Housing without proper parking are almost impossible to drive through When there's parking on both sides of the street and two way traffic. Housing MUST include parking for as many residents as the home can hold. On street parking should be reserved for the guests of those who visit the home. Build homes with driveways. Build townhomes with underground parking or sufficient parking, or don't build them at all.
This survey is forced bias. Space for residential building - what does that mean? Single family home takes 40% of lot size. I want all residential to take 40% of lot size.
The City declared a climate emergency but is allowing more lot coverage & does not pay enough attention to the use of permeable materials. Too much concrete on many DP plans. Please respect community context. Some communities have managed to do that whereas other areas have become concrete jungles. People deserve a nice space to escape from our stressful world. The COVID pandemic was a glaring example of how people were/were not able to cope.
Calgary's reputation as a very green city is something worth a value of its own and one most at risk with changing development rules. Foliage has multiple benefits both to the resident and the speculator, with very little reasonable downside to quality of life compared to other factors ranked below it.
Trees and plantings ranked #1 motor vehicle parking #2 storing waste and recycling #3
I am questioning why houses along 40th Ave from Shaganappi to 52nd St. needed to be ripped down & 6 story apartment buildings have to be put up for extra housing when there are already blocks of apartments on either side of Market Mall & many apartments still be being built in the University Area & those that are finished are not yet rented & have been up for rent for at least 3 months. Realistically, this doesn't make sense to build apartment buildings on 40th Ave.
Densification brings many more cars. We need to allow sufficient space for parking on site so the streets aren't full of home owners vehicles and no place for visitors.
Shadowing of nearby residences, infrastructure capability. Older areas have not had upgrades, but yet adding additional demand

There does need to be priority for the dwellings, and also some land for sustainable plantings for drainage, canopy, habitat, human health, pets, outdoor leisure. Parking is a real consideration. Some developments could be designed to have minimal parking, and cumulative street parking impacts need to be considered.
I am not sure why you keep asking for input and then completely ignore what the citizens of Calgary say/wish for.
You can't accommodate all of the elements of a home with blanket rezoning. I don't want to see parking on the city lots. Parking should be on the street. Off street property is for quality of life - yard space, storage space, plants.
H-GO MUST GO! They are not respectful of neighbours or residents of the proposed building, no quality of life with no personal outdoor space, no trees and green. No functionality as they maximize the lot with building , side setbacks are unsafe with having to step over window wells. No place for pets! Calgary can do much better with smarter building.
Making sure that the infrastructure will be able to handle the change in zoning including water, sewer and electrical. Street parking is not an option and must be on the specific property as there are "visitors" too.
I don't think building structure should take up too much of a lot. Front yards are where most of our community interaction takes place and the setbacks are pleasant, not obstructive. Planning should be more realistic about how many people rely on cars and require space for them. There is a big disconnect here. I believe there should be more density in my neighbourhood, on my street and even next door if 'not by default the max'.
The more space usable for residential buildings on lots, the better. The less area for motor vehicle parking the better.
Perhaps I didn't get the ranking question, though new home development heights are getting higher and higher and taking up so much of the property space. Ridiculous and looks completely out of context in a lot of older neighborhoods. Why does the city allow this???? Arghhhhh
on small cul-de-sacs, or streets without back lanes, there can be challenges with safety if there is no room for vehicles to park and drive on the street, navigate corners, etc. (including access for emergency vehicles), especially when recycling bins are out, and during the winter when snow and ice build up.
Too small of living spaces and no amenity spaces will cause lots of "domestics" and a very high turnover of occupants leading to lack of care for and involvement with-in the community. Would you want to live in 300sq ft? Over building lots will prevent sunlight and cause shadowing to neighbouring properties and therefore loss of trees /bushes leading to loss of animal/insect habitats.
Make the new development look like it fits the neighbourhood not jammed into the space.
Neighbourhood aesthetics, safety, and Access

Neighborhood aesthetics, safety and access
Waste management, bins, are an eyesore. No one plans for proper bin, waste storage. Parking! Adding more people to a lot requires parking! And NOT the parking if the neighbour's.
Trees, greenery, screens and not towering builds that shade the neighbours
Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Calgary is short of trees and we are losing many in inner city due to new development. I would like to see greater emphasis on soft as opposed to hard landscaping to aid drainage and smaller percentage of lot coverage that would leave more room for trees.
More emphasis on canopy trees and ensuring they will survive.
More area for the unit itself. More units.
Street access during snowy winters, emergency vehicle access
What is challenging is how communities are being ruined. The number of mature trees being taken down for new developments is catastrophic. Streets are filled with cars. Instead of asking what can we do to make density less impactful, please listen to citizens....density is not wanted in existing neighbourhoods. This is what is important to consider. Stop this infiltration of eight+ plexes everywhere, especially in established RC1 communities.
I like trees :) I don't like having a back alley because people leave their garbage outside all the time and it's messy. Prefer space out front
Question the Map 1 - City structure map. Needs to be reviewed as the Lynnvie Ridge has homes so should not be designated as Neighborhood Moderate Activity. Response we got: in circled off area due to Green Line Station. If that is the case, they why is the same situation in Riverbend deemed Neighborhood Light Activity. Please correct.
The amount of density could be reduced to 3 +3 instead of 4+4 allowing for trees and parking.
Overall road safety, for example being able to circulate and have clear lines of site, being able to drive out of your property without blind spots that may cause accidents. Leaving enough room for emergency vehicles.
Outdoor amenities and green spaces enrich everyone's lives. As long as the building space meets the needs of the resident, as much space as possible should be allocated to these spaces. I don't understand why vehicle, bike, and trash storage is separate from personal storage here. These are all personal items, and should not be considered separately. If someone wants a car, or to make a lot of trash, that's on them to make sure they have the space to store it on their private property.

It's hard to answer a blank response as each community is different.
Parking is a massive issue already, especially in older neighborhoods. If 15 units are to be built on a single standard residential lot, where are these people supposed to park? Where are the existing residents supposed to park? It is a fallacy to think that all of these people will use public transit. Every unit is at least one vehicle on average, if not 1.5. Any residential building built on a standard lot should have to provide at least one parking stall per unit on the property.
Spacing between buildings and using material that would stave off fires. We see wood buildings up to five floors being built. No concrete. These are fire traps. Nothing preventing exterior fire prevention.
The biggest issue for me is allowing a 4 plex to go into a space that was once a regular size lot and not giving at least 4 onsite parking spaces, because the roads then get full of vehicles, making it difficult to drive through the neighborhood.
Parking is always an issue, especially where we have basement suites, rental units, and multi family dwellings in our traditionally, single detached home neighborhood. It's also terrible to see so many healthy mature trees removed to construct new housing given concerns about climate change.
A consistent street-side setback should mean consistent (and wide!) sidewalks, which is important for pedestrian and accessibility, and makes sense for storefronts. I ranked "trees and plantings" uncomfortably low but these should generally be on public land instead.
It's all important, but you cannot upset an existing neighborhood's character in favour of adding row housing or townhouses to an area that doesn't already have those housing types/styles as part of their community.
I will continue to elaborate on this through my responses. I spoke on this in front of council. The biggest issue with the blanket zoning is that the highest density is guaranteed, when it should be AN INCENTIVE (ie the carrot) for the city to leverage produce better outcomes, including different features on the lot.
Ensuring there is ample public greenspace for families/individuals living in multi-family buildings. Walkability with access to local shopping to decrease the need for personal vehicles. Perhaps shared parking areas to limit the need for street parking would help maximize space.
Redevelopments should be in agreement of existing housing in established neighborhoods. Factors such as increased residents, traffic, neighborhood aesthetics, increased demand on existing utilities should be major factors in the decision making process. Blanket decisions will create neighborhood hostilities if the tax paying residents are not included in redevelopment proposals.
Residential structures built without adequate off street parking puts tremendous pressure on traffic flow, community aesthetic and usability.
Front setbacks in existing neighbourhoods where the site is being re-developed, NEED to be in line with the other homes on the street - NO ONE wants to look at a blank wall from their front porch or not see beyond the new development.

In new neighbourhoods ONLY: smaller setback allowing only for trees or shrub so there is larger backyard space.
All of the above amenities are important, EXCEPT 2: bicycle & personal storage. Those items are to be stored in the individual's home.
Stop increasing the building to lot ratio. Building built almost to the side walk cause shadowing., lack of green space and just look a mess
Parking for vehicles is critical to take into account.
Safety and visibility for pedestrians, noise pollution, sidewalk and crossing safety view and light obstruction
A desirable residence has screening to provide privacy. Over-looks to buildings should be prevented where possible (eg very tall buildings next to small ones).
Reduce the current density push, have more green space and include parking in the lot for every unit/suite.
Gross variation in setback is distracting, the setbacks should match context
Number of units at busy and school intersections
We live in Calgary, people own cars and will continue to do so at an increasing rate. The current proposal disregards reality and forces cars onto the street and into adjacent properties. Force developers to build homes with an appropriate amount of parking that reflects the city, culture, and reality of where we live.
A lack of trust in Calgary's municipal government, which makes it hard for many citizens to plan their lives. It seems like decisions are made behind closed doors and then rolled out with a lot of propaganda and fake engagement.
Developers should be responsible for the parking their development requires. Otherwise don't develop it.
I think the current increased footprint allowance on lots has increased the size &/or number of dwellings on a lot while not adequately accounting for the increased vehicles &/or waste bins associated with those dwellings. Putting (for example) 4 townhouses with secondary suites + a suite above the garages (total min 9 dwellings) on a 50' lot with only 4 parking spaces in vehicle centric Calgary creates a parking and waste container nightmare.
Building homes denser isn't the only answer.
Bicycle parking does not need to be a priority.stop forcing your agenda.

There must be at least one parking stall per unit. Insufficient parking causes chaos and frustration amongst residents and creates animosity between neighbors. Lack of parking also makes the street look congested and negatively affects the safety of the residents, especially children.
Yes stop rezoning and upzoning causing high density and causing high crime areas to much in an area environment suffers and wildlife
Your supposed to be saving the environment not destroying it !
Repeal Blanket Rezoning and H-GO. Development should provide similar context of current neighbourhood. Parking should be a requirement. Bungalows are low cost, accessible, and allow for aging in place. Stop tearing them down. Stop destroying our neighbourhoods and lives. You are negatively affecting peoples enjoyment of their homes and mental health.
Where are they ranking parking your vehicle??? Our public transit system is not working robust enough We need a car and we need space to park
Trying to squeeze as many units on a parcel without regard for parking and existing infrastructure is not good planning
Tree canopies, space btwn houses.
Setbacks make it much harder to build walkable, safe neighbourhoods. Also trees are critical for cooling our city as climate change continues.
Consideration for existing residents
please implement these zoning laws don't listen to the right wing cronies
We need double car garage or tandem garage.
Parking in higher density areas has become and will become an issue. It seems like new high density builds prioritize the size of the building and creating as many units as possible without providing adequate parking for those units. Relying on street parking is not the answer. Also with the increased adoption of electric vehicles there needs to be thought to where residents could charge their cars at home.
Trees and shrubs are being removed destroying neighborhoods. Top priority should be given to retaining cooling tree canopies and green spaces. Developers are not being held accountable by the city. It's sad
If we increase the land usage for more residence space, we should also prioritize some natural features in the areas provided. Calgary is not designed for biking outside of the core and certain communities so bikes are lower priority in my opinion. Vehicle parking is very important as it is still a commuting city.
Tree removal to build...not replacing our green canopy.

<p>The size of the building should be based on the lot size and allow for parking, personal storage, porches and decks. What do we want a structure for people to live temporarily (less than 2 years) or longer. Families need homes that have storage: winter/ summer, toys bikes yet developers don't think that people need these things. When city planners make decisions, they should ask themselves, " could I live here long term "? Overwhelming I would say that most, if they were honest, would say no.</p>
<p>Too many infills are prioritized for developer gain, not community wellbeing. We need thoughtful zoning that protects green space, encourages lasting quality, and respects the character of existing neighbourhoods. Rushed, oversized builds reduce parking, strain infrastructure, and erode what makes our communities livable. The City must plan for long-term impact, not just short-term profit.</p>
<p>Allow people to put up higher fences to block the view from these new larger intrusive buildings.</p>
<p>Tree lined streets have many benefits for urban planning including neighborhood safety and sustainability over the seasons, particularly as summers are getting higher temperatures for longer durations</p>
<p>We need to allow for increased FAR or FSRs for increased density and more efficient use of the land we already are using within the cities, especially near rapid transit.</p>
<p>There should be greater space between buildings, in all directions, especially in residential, suburban neighborhoods.</p>
<p>Parking for autos should not be prioritized over homes, or outdoor amenity space.</p>
<p>It's funny to ask about "limited space on residential properties." Once something is built, space is limited. We need to consider that children need space to grow up healthy, mentally and physically with some nature on the property. If you don't care about that, find another career.</p>
<p>Community context is essential, and need space for on site parking and large trees!</p>
<p>Council should start listening to Calgarians</p>
<p>Residential buildings should be designed for people first and foremost, not vehicles or storage or waste/recycling. Prioritizing the elements that directly support a person's physical access and mental well-being are most important.</p>
<p>I think you guys building apartment buildings right beside houses is stupid</p>
<p>Zero lot line houses and building can destroy the aesthetic of a neighbourhood. Setbacks on all sides, allowing for ample space give a neighbourhood a more open and less imposing feel. Row housing is a prime example of how this can work, by increasing the density into a single building, space is used optimally allowing for larger setbacks on the sides avoiding undesirable, shadowy spaces.</p>
<p>Storing waste and recycling on site, is ideal, but probably pointless as most occupants won't store on site</p>

How many garage spaces get used for storage? How does it change when there is insignificant storage in the house (i.e., an 8 plex on a single lot)? Before going to open parking, please do a survey on how garages are used in Calgary. Especially where we have more than 2 units on a single lot. We need the data to make the best decisions.
Houses are too close together which is a fire spread risk
There needs to be trees and ground cover to keep areas from being house dense. Too many cars are parked on the street because houses have suites but no parking. Larger buildings need underground parking
Parking is especially important on laned homes where many people take up front Street parking, narrowing the roadway + creates safety issues. In McKenzie Towne over the last 15 years it has become congested despite ample parking space in the back of most homes. Front streets are barely 1 lane as a result. It will only get worse as homes are allowed to have secondary suites /carriage homes. A total lack of viable and accessible transit options for commuters only compounds this problem.
It is crucial to engage all residents affected by any land use changes. Blanket approval is not working. Also the idea that 1/2 a parking space per dwelling unit is grossly inadequate.
Keeping our city beautiful and spacious. Not cramming in multi dwelling buildings.
Does this building fit the location. Many instances the answer these days is no. Parking is key right after size of the build
Seniors are having less options except to go into apartments, high density buildings. That adds a lot of walking and steps to daily routines. High cost “luxury” villas aren’t what most can afford.
More 60+ senior living, main level duplex complexes need to be included when planning communities both as infills redeveloping older communities and as the city grows out.
The whole picture is no longer looked at for different age groups. Just new population to the city is getting all the attention."
If no garage for parking , no cars permitted for resident of property
It appears that greed seems to be what is driving the housing market these days. I haven't seen a single multi complex go in that isn't at least six units on a single family a lot. We have ones going in that are eight and 12 side-by-side, with no accommodation where those 8 to 24 vehicles are going to go.
Make the buildings smaller to fit into the context of the neighbourhood and not negatively impact neighbouring homes.
Too many vehicles on the street causing congestion and reducing safety of pedestrians. Why aren't sidewalks included as a need? Calgary's walkability score is sad.

City leadership's mismanagement and overspending for the last decade have made taxes increase by too much. Changing the course of this government to become financially responsible, and to hide less behind closed door, is more important than anything in this survey.
Waste and recycling typically become an alley problem, even if there is space within a property for storage.
The new zoning does not require enough parking spaces for each unit. Street parking is going to be a mess for years to come.
We are seeing far too many mature trees get destroyed for new developments.
Impossible to have adequate parking for 8 plex on 50 foot wide lots. Also no space for garbage bins. This will create tensions and fight for parking space as well as garbage overflowing everywhere. People need space, particularly green space where they live.
Current plans prioritize the biggest building allowable, which forsakes mature tree canopy, space for personal enjoyment and parking. Allowing 1/2 of a parking space per primary residence is ridiculous. Most people have 1 car per bedroom, and pretending that they don't is negligent to the affects on the area neighbourhood.
Stop allowing multi unit buildings in single family homes neighborhoods.
I believe the City is too restrictive over the location of trees. Allowing trees between the property line and sidewalk should be allowed when the space allows to shade the street and sidewalk and allow for larger trees. Also, no more front step wells along the street.
In our area, some investors are removing front yards, putting gravel in to create a parking lot where our front yard used to be. The city does allowed, have applied for, to widen a front drive, but not the entire yard. This should not be allowed in bays or cul-de-sacs, We're parking is already limited on the street. Allow allowing this takes way needed parking that other homes visitors may need.
The lost integrity of neighbourhoods that are properly planned by thoughtful city planners. Not rapid densification that will result in lost character and major infrastructure strain and expensive housing in 20 years.
Each home needs at least 1 garage spaces per 2 bedrooms. If you do a 4 bed house with a 2 bed basement suite it needs a 3 car garage. A 8plex (4 townhomes each with a basement suite) needs 8 garage stalls. Anything denser is too dense. I don't want my community to become slums
Yes - City Council allows big beautiful trees to be cut down in well established neighbourhoods for the sake of rowhouses, etc. ti be built and then only plant a small shrub or tree in its place??? Disgusting and quite frankly hypocritical as I cannot even trim the CofC tree on my front property but a mature tree(s) can be destroyed fir the sake of rowhouses, etc????

I could not get the previous section to do anything, so I will say here that parking is a huge issue when building multiplexes with no, or limited parking. Replacing a house with 2 cars with 6 units with 12 cars is not viable.
Three storey buildings in a bungalow neighbourhood is also egregious.
Lot coverage allows for no green space on new builds.
Also, affordable housing is being gentrified into unaffordable housing."
Let us choose our trees
Amount of parking available. Height of development shading out existing homes. Nuisance, noise and dirt during construction.
Along with density, I would like to see public transit prioritized. A growing emphasis on public transit and alternate transportation (bikes, scooters, etc) will allow the city to de-prioritize space for cars. This would have great effects on the city core and making our neighborhoods increasingly green!
Yes. Start listening to the citizens.
This is treasonous what you are doing.
Too many healthy mature trees have been coming down to make room for massive multi-unit buildings that take up an entire lot, making established neighbourhoods look bare and ugly. More rules are needed on preserving and building around the existing trees.
You are asking all the wrong, self-serving questions. Calgarians already responded to the blanket rezoning with a resounding "NO", but the Mayor and Council ignored Calgarians. The Blanket rezoning Bylaw should be repealed.
Housing always comes first, and Calgary is a car centric city so people will need to park their cars somewhere as well.
Privacy of adjacent yards, blocking sun in backyards, where driveway snow can be placed
character of existing neighbourhoods
Stop changing everything that works. Your new rules are not planning. Repeal the blanket rezoning
People capacity. When redeveloping older areas where the services, particularly sewage services are not amended to match the higher occupancy.
Zero lot lines are a legal minefield and only benefit the developer with zero advantage for anyone else, especially fire fighting.

You need to take care of the little things
KEEP UNDER 4 STORIES NOT 18 STORIES!!!!!!
We need the red line extension to the south to have these new developments make any sense
I think all street parking should require a permit. Too many people have a dozen cars clogging the road
We need to keep as much green space as possible. Those neighborhoods where people pay significant prices to not have density should be left alone. Other areas for density should be found and then these things are still to be considered but can work much better.
While I think that there should be homes on the market that don't feature parking for cars, I worry that it may cause overuse of street space for parked cars.
Street parking in residential neighborhood is not safe for people getting in and out of cars. That should be done on private property. There should be visitor parking lots in all neighborhood
People already use spaces how they see fit. e.g my neighbour parks the car on the lawn when no one else does.
Balanced lot use is critical to maintaining open green space and the urban canopy.
I have fire concerns for houses being built to close together.
Consider the safety risks posed by insufficient parking - more cars parked on streets in residential areas is more hazardous for young kids and seniors who are walking / biking on the sidewalks and biking on the streets. I support initiatives that encourage less car ownership/use however reducing the availability of parking has these other consequences.
I do not like blanket rezoning. We need to plan the city allowing for parks, leaving districts with character, and then allowing for small scale housing closer to major roadways and transit where people can live without cars.
Blanket rezoning is killing our cities character.
Keep my neighborhood single family!!!!
Massing. Don't overmass a lot. Should fit into context of street not change the context of the whole street
If the covid pandemic taught us anything, it's that people need and want space. No one wants to be crammed into a micro condo long-term. Density for density's sake does not solve the housing problem. Look at Toronto and Vancouver's glut of condos! We don't have a housing shortage. We have a shortage of thoughtful housing where people actually want to live long-term.
No one wants your mass density shoved down our throats ruining communities

People want different things. Have higher density areas for those who want that lifestyle, but we need low density areas of single family homes for people who want that lifestyle.
Considering the city's climate commitments they should not be approving such large residential developments that destroys all the trees on a lot
The amount of public land we waste storing private motor vehicle is ridiculous. People should be responsible for storing their car on their own property, not in public streets.
Less cars
New builds should be consistent with adjacent dwellings.
Room for vehicle parking is very important to lessen the volume of vehicles vying for parking on the street
Vehicle parking can be a nightmare in these tight settings. There MUST be adequate vehicle parking. Governments should NOT apply their green ideologies to city planning.
Space for actual housing is what matters most above all. Space is meant for people, not for stuff and cars.
Challenge filling the survey above because it doesn't work....all of the above is priority 1 for any development to go forward.
I am praying that Calgary Party oust all the useless councillors that are not addressing the idiocy of densifying the core of this city when IT IS NOT NECESSARY when technology allows people to work and live anywhere! WHAT WASTE OF \$.
Not crowding multi family homes into small cul de sacs that already have no parking.
Blocked light and views into adjacent property. Devaluing existing property.
Fire hazards with houses built too close together.
Not enough parking and contesting streets with cars.
Trees and green spaces define the character of a neighborhood, and I think are often overlooked, so they are very important considerations for me. I think Calgary already has too much allowance for motor vehicles, and this negatively affects other potential uses of space. I think a lot of these spaces could be encouraged to be mixed-use by design, so people can choose what works best for them (e.g. an outdoor amenity space that is secure enough to use as bicycle parking).
Parking is important and needs to be considered for multiple persons in homes. As families grow and can afford multiple vehicles, space on driveways and streets are required
Allowing density on existing properties is important because it will increase available housing for everyone, furthermore allowing more trees and greenery will create a healthier city.

What is building built at this time is out of reach as developers are making these sites feel like a concrete city with no parking and folks use their garages for storage then park all over the streets.
maintaining space between neighbours beside and behind
drainage
Every unit/ house should have at least 1 parking space.
These building are being built to the full extent of the lot with no parking and the garage is too small for a vehicle or bins. You end up with too many vehicles on the streets and bins in the alley all tipped over with garage everywhere. It's an eyesore for neighbours and there doesn't seem to be any enforcement.
Front yards shouldn't look like garbage dumps with bikes, garbage, etc out front. I understand we need housing. Downtown densification should do that, not rezoning mature areas to have random 4+plexes.
Should consider controlling the massing of the buildings and ensuring adequate sunlight can reach backyards
Parking and Aesthetics of new builds, including waste storage, are an important part of new developments that impact neighbour's and their property values.
Allow for adequate parking spots for whatever is developed. People drives cars in Calgary, the City may not think it's a fact but it sure is.
The city's 7 goals of small scale housing development include: enhance look, feel and experience of the street; preserve est'd landscaping and incorporate high quality landscape design; integrate with the neighbourhood; and incorporate climate resiliency measures. I do not see how the sample housing options that the city would permit (possibly two back-to-back or 2 separated duplexes each with suites and limited greenspace and parking comes anywhere close to meeting these goals
Sidewalks, including rampings for vehicles, bicycles, walkers, wheelchairs, ...
The design needs to not negatively impact the neighbouring houses and residents. Property values need to be maintained or enhanced not devalued.
Based on development permits that I've seen, having a smaller front yard won't lead to a bigger backyard. It will simply create bigger houses. People will still fill up the backyard as much as they do now. We will lose more permeable land, lose more mature trees, and exacerbate our environmental crisis.
Allowing sunlight on neighbouring existing properties. It would be nice for the design of new builds to incorporate features of some of the existing neighborhood residential appearance, some new builds look quite stark or out of place next to existing older homes.
The established neighborhoods are losing mature urban forest and biodiversity. Developers don't put any priority on saving trees. High lot coverage leaves little room for new trees. Developers are creating heat

islands. The city isn't protecting tree canopy. Developers should have to adjust plans for what can be built based on the mature trees on the lot. Biodiversity and permeable land also need to be prioritized. We share the spaces with wildlife

I think something not being discussed here is how the water, sewers and infrastructure will support this. After last year, we should NOT be building more housing until we have the ability to provide for those in those houses WITHOUT guilting people into using less for months and months. That was VERY poorly managed.

MUST include vehicle parking change the lot coverage back to 45% to allow for more trees and amenity space. Eight units is too many. Six units with 45% lot coverage and 10 m height still increases density and keeps our urban canopy on a regular lot.

As more higher density buildings are constructed, there has to be room for people to park

Maximizing lot coverage and shoe-horning in the maximum possible units are not always the answer - can add a fair number of units whilst maintain a green tree and wildlife filled community, maintaining outdoor spaces and sunlight for residents and neighbours, and acknowledging that people do still have vehicles. Need sensible contextual front setback RULES for permitted use (max 2m step forward, maybe even 2.5m, but not more!) - shadowing, design cohesion/look, room for front trees all affected

Keeping the intent of the neighborhood design consistent.

Height restrictions need to be considered as well. Plunking huge out of context dwellings in spaces that didn't previously have them is destroying the tree canopy, people's privacy & certainty of their own spaces. Whether admin wants to believe it or not, parking is a hugely important issue that needs to be planned. Allocating 0.5 spots/unit or whatever & thinking street parking is adequate is not a plan or strategy outside of the core. Car lined streets reduce visibility, safety & is unsightly

Residential parking visitor parking. Keeping to a consistent community look. Clutter-free properties.

I doubt if you'd listen to this . Typical city SOP. Just pretend to care .

We cram too many houses into a neighbourhood. Build up in low-rise dwellings instead of having lots that are 40 feet wide.

We need to make it easier for communities to build more residential housing, in any form, even if it does not fit the current neighbourhood style. Also need room for more schools, hospitals, grocery stores.

The entire city literally is disgusted with the blanket rezoning. You have applied no logic when you allow developers to go beyond city centre instead giving them carte blanche to build wherever they want. Building west of Sarcee is not affordable housing! Why not have developers buy up existing multi family housing and make it bigger? i.e. Cactus ridge condos?

Currently buildings are being built to cover 80% of the land and only allowing 20% for garages/parking and outside space. This pushes people to use common areas like public parks for walking pets/toileting

pets, for children to play and move which given less city staff means these parks are not cared for and often dirty and overwhelmed.
Concerns for infrastructure ie: sewer, water, electricity, when over densifying a lot.
We need to avoid becoming a concrete jungle and prioritize developments with some green space. There should also be some consistency re: waste and recycling. What used to be one family home is now 4 to 8 units. That means the potential of 24 bins on one lot space. There should be some rules in place that in those scenarios, maybe smaller dumpsters would be more appropriate.
Stop allowing secondary units on small lots with th no parking on the streets!
Parking is an issue on my street. Lack of garage space because it's used for storage leads to street parking and not being able to always park close to home. I don't need a lot of front yard space if I'm spending time outside it's in my backyard and that's where I want the space. Where I live bike storage is not as important because I'm not riding my bike to work or to go get groceries.
Side street in this city have become so dangerous due to over crowded vehicle parking.
Blanket rezoning to remove setbacks, green space and cream as many units in as possible with.5 parking and often many stairs is antithetical to human thriving.
Residential neighborhoods are to give people a little peace and quiet and calm in An other wise busy, chaotic rushed atmosphere
Building multi plexes will take that away from the people that live in those areas
There are a number of issues that will arise with multiplexes. parking being just one, but a big one
Too much density negatively affects schools, parking ,recreation facilities,transit,traffic and shopping. No to free zoning.!Also buildings they are doing now look like "the projects" in Russia and look like they are built like sticks and stones
Every community is under parked. Zero lot lines result in all corner houses and park spaces having secondary vehicles in front. Multi family have secondary vehicles parked along any roadway adjacent to the multi.
People buy houses to build a place where they will feel comfortable and secure. The current housing bylaw doesnt promote it, by allowing developers to buikd new houses with minimal backyard space where families can spend their time together safe, secure, and memorable. Not everybody has the ability to pay for kids parties in an indoor playground; however, hosting a kids party in one's a backyard is more economical and cost efficient. This saves families from being burdened with high cost.
Neighborhoods cannot change too quickly

Too many houses with inadequate parking cause too many vehicles parked on the streets which increases vehicle and pedestrian collisions and reduces residential safety.
Question is to open ended for interpretation
The building site coverage is too high. Smaller building foot prints are needed to allow more green space and reduce heat island
We have a community that has many trees and greenery and I wish to continue that, there needs to be enough space for motor vehicle parking per unit as it is very annoying when cars are parked in front of other homes and nothing is more unsightly than a lovely tree lined street filled with vehicles
"I think they are putting in too many multi family dwellings in residential areas without considering where people can park, especially when many couples even, have more than 1 car.
Also there are many communities popping up that are putting strain on the roads because there are so many more drivers. Not sure the solution but plan for efficient roads before putting in more buildings."
Each lot needs a minimum amount of green space. There is a 10 plex going up in Glenbrook that easily has less than 20% green space on the lot. That is terrible. Terrible for the environment. Terrible for the poor renters who will be in the building and not have any outdoor space. It's unhealthy.
Window design, neighbourhood context
How the building effects personal privacy and enjoyment of neighboring property owners.
Don't allow increased density in existing low density neighbourhoods.
Unless you start in upper my royal and belair
Remove contextual front setbacks in medium density areas, including heritage policy areas
Building houses or units higher than the homes in the rest of the street has an adverse impact on residents (blocking sun) and vegetation/animals as well as the overall value and feel of the community and should be disallowed
Trees are a natural source of cooling. The developers so far use few windows that open .lots of glass these homes have no shade . Air conditioning is then used. This causes noise and is not cheap or good for the environment. We want to promote people walking. Not shade it's too hot to walk home.
Keeping property values from plummeting.
Calgary is a motor vehicle city, this will never change. Stop allowing ridiculously low parking requirements. My community (Killarney) and the offsetting marda loop are parking hell-holes because the city has allowed developers to over density without parking. You are ruining people's lives.

Impact on neighbors. They say high fences make good neighbors, and good neighbors make good neighborhoods
I do not believe the house should take up the full building lot. There should be reasonable aggressive between houses, and to allow suitable fire brakes. Due to the layout of the city and limited municipal transit, almost every adult likely needs occur for their personal use. I also believe people should have a little bit of personal space outdoors to relax and enjoy the environment.
Housing people is infinitely more important than housing private vehicles.
Trees and plantings help keep us happy and healthy. Beautiful spaces matter.
Bicycle parking is more important than other forms of storage because fear of bikes being stolen is the number 2 reason people don't ride their bike more after unsafe roads.
Ensure there is adequate parking for the development and space for garbage bins. The reality is most Calgarians own a car
I don't like this question
The city is growing too fast and parking is becoming an issue. Also it is becoming a nightmare to get out of communities like Legacy where zoning has allowed too many apartments/ condos with only one way out.
There's no way of getting around it. Calgary's are going to drive cars.
Consideration for the build size/type for the community. Take a look at the tower slated for Marda Loop or the old Viscount Bennet school site - the development doesn't fit the community/ land size and is all about homes at the expense of quality of life for residents.
As builders are getting easier permits they are trying to maximize space and propose developments of 10 condos where previously there used to be a one house. This affects the quality of life of neighbours and future people living in the area with problems such as parking, access to sunlight, quality of services, quality of green spaces and generally over crowding areas
Residential lots should be large enough to encompass all of these elements
Personal vehicles should be kept on personal property as much as possible. The street shouldn't automatically be assumed as extra parking space for your private vehicle.
I hate it when they apply new building standards to older neighbourhoods, and it doesn't fit at all. For example they might buy a house in an older neighbourhood with a detached garage rip it down, and rebuild it where the garage is attached to the house, and remove the front yard with a concrete pad like in new neighbourhoods.
Need to fit character of Neighbourhood.

All parking requirements (minimum 1 per unit) must be met onsite, not dumped onto public roads. Waiving parking requirements is not in the public interest. We recently bought a unit in a new inner city 4plex that incorporated single garages in the design and space for another vehicle on the driveway - it can be done. Don't reward lazy design and greedy developers.
Why are we having this survey when we are having a vote in October and the current board didn't listen when people took time to write in as well present in front of the councillors?
no multi family developments in single family home residential areas
The neighbourhood itself. Buildings must be contextual. there is nothing worse than a 8 unit building on a 50 foot lot! Trees and vegetation are of prime importance in a residential neighbourhood.
Some areas are historically single family homes and semi detached homes could be developed but not necessarily everywhere. Some areas have a more dense pattern and could theoretically accommodate a fourplex or larger in the future. Sixplexes or Eighplexes do not belong in areas dominated by single family homes. The North Hill Plan, as an example, allows for more dense development on corner lots. This makes sense in some other areas but not everywhere.
Sloping sites Building Height plane - an approach that is consistent/known, more aligned to existing/prior Highest Average Building reference point, 5.5m from foundation and extends down at 4:12 P/L. This allows for consistency/clarity, along with flexibility on individual desires for site landscaping.
Calgary is a car city, street conditions are nicer to walk, bike and drive along when fewer cars are parked out on them. Better if vehicles are parked on the lot. This could allow more opportunities for utilization of front yards for active use vs just open grass space if backyards are reduced. Could create a more active frontage for the community
The city has made the size of the lots so small that there quite often is no space for street parking or on site parking. We currently have way to many illegal suites in the city and people fighting over parking as there are numerous vehicles to a single home. In addition there is no pride of ownership and communities that look like third world ghettos and garbage dumps.
Most important: parking & overlooking/shadowing. No one-size-fits-all zoning. Drastic difference for cul-de-sac vs street & streets with/without back alley. 10 houses in my cul-de-sac with 3 *legal* parking spots. Located off busy street with parking controls - not entitled to parking passes. Neighbours have illegal suite, tenants with 2 cars, their 2 cars, & camper parked year round on driveway. Our cul-de-sac is already problematic for garbage collection as noted repeatedly by city workers.
Respect the integrity of the community in terms of building style and form.
With densifying existing neighborhoods there is now a lack of parking and space for trash bins.
Protect the urban canopy! Far too many mature trees are being destroyed. Is this whole exercise a total waste of time given you ignored public opinion on blanket rezoning?

Rowhouse developments leave very space for soft landscaping or permeable land. Lot coverage of these needs to be rethought. Reduce lot coverage, reduce upa and you get more space for other things like trees, amenity spaces, parking etc..
In some areas, zero property line builds make the entire street far more vulnerable when there are fires.
In older areas like North Glenmore, Altadore, South Calgary, Crescent Heights, Banff Trail, infills and attached homes, their heights, and their tiny rear yards contribute to significant lack of privacy, noise, and community conflict when neighbours are not respectful of others.
High density projects as in Altadore cause intense increases in vehicles without adequate parking additions
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Every site is slightly different and context needs to be considered.
An 8 plex on a 50 foot lot is absolutely ridiculous. 24 waste and recycling binds, not enough parking spaces, no personal storage. Unacceptable that the city zoning allows such poor designs. Shame.
There is simply not enough space in smaller neighbourhoods for zero lot lines homes and bins and parking. Increasing density in these areas will result in headaches for everyone. Developers should have to abide by community standards and RCs to ensure that anything built is both wanted and keeping with the character of communities.
Land value drives prices
There is no room to store all our garbage/recycling/compost bins in alley. It is extremely difficult to get out of garages and down the alley on a recycling/compost day
Don't allow 8 plexes in former R1 zoned neighborhoods. Please consider parking issues, garbage collection etc. it is important to preserve some neighborhoods in Calgary. City council only considers rapid development- it's ill thought out
Furthermore, 75% of Calgarians came out to speak against the blanket rezoning and yet Calgary council did not take it into account, this survey is doing the exact same thing. City council will ignore the results.
Nobody wants to live near an encampment. Priority needs to be a suitable living structure, the ability to park a vehicle so it is not in the street and to keep one's belongings tidy. Outdoor space is also important and can double as storage in some cases
Adequate space for drainage through natural seepage into the ground. Surface runoff and drainage through pipes leads to increased flood risk and less water to maintain plants and trees.
Everything is changing in our community and does not matter what we say

We live in a city where almost everyone has a vehicle. While bicycles may be popular in the summer rarely are they used during the winter and cold months.
My community of Westgate has seen ugly 3 and 4 plexes built on corner lots. The adjacent property has lost a ton of value and has the community. We will be moving out of Calgary after living here over 69 years
If the city and developers weren't so greedy when overdeveloping lots, you wouldn't need to ask this question as there would be the space to focus on all of these elements. When a single family home is replaced with 6-12 units, this is when these amenities come into question. Build with less density so it becomes equitable for not only the new homeowners, but for the surrounding community as well.
Parking is essential in built areas particularly in older areas where some lots already have no option for on site parking. Houses should be smaller and proportionate to lot size and surrounding buildings
Over densification is not the solution. We need to increase the tree canopy. We need parking/storage for cars and other stuff.
The reduction of green space in my neighbourhood is appalling. The very character and beauty of my community is changing for the worst when 8 unites are being built on properties that had 1 house and a yard.
Parking - availability
We are too quick to tear down old homes. They add character to a neighbourhood. Look at Victoria - old and new on one street."
keeping clutter off the streets (parked cars, trash) should be a priority. Bikes for high density housing are generally stored inside the building to prevent theft. Bike parking outside is mostly a waste of space.
Quit jamming a ton of buildings, and people on a tiny lot.
The city seem to have forgotten the climate where we live. Vehicle parking, preferably indoors, is necessary on the property. Residents make maximum use of outdoor amenity space in spring through fall months. The city is behind on tree cover and green space - more is needed, not less. Waste and recycling storage belongs on the property not on the street or alley. Bicycle commuting is not viable year round except for a hardy minority of the population.
Need at least one parking stall per unit.
Stop using city street parking when building multi units. They should not built if they do not have onsite parking as well as visitor parking.
The key consideration should be the impact to the neighbouring properties. The footprint of a new development should mirror those around it. That includes both front setback and how far the

development extends into the backyard. Shading and privacy are very real concerns to those who are currently living in the community and should be respected.
Impact to direct neighbours and their investment.
I think that it is important to consider the proximity to amenities. My preferences are heavily biased towards inner city living where cars are less important and biking or walking would be the preferred mode of transportation most of the time. I also appreciate outdoor spaces, especially if they are public or shared spaces. This is especially impactful in the inner city where density is higher and people tend to share more of their outdoor space.
The big idea is that there is a residential building and second to that is a need for trees for our well being. Everything else seems secondary. I placed vehicles in the top three as parking space always seems to be at a premium.
Blocking out sunlight
Pedestrian safety, speed calming devices. Street design - straight streets are good for traffic flow and racing. Residential streets aren't patrolled on a regular basis. Bring back Traffic cameras and no turning lanes to residential areas
We will never increase our tree canopy unless we regulate and preserve more trees and greenspace
New homes need to have some plantings and site coverage is a good way to limit how much building can be on a property. The first question doesn't take that into account rather it says we are going to make a big house and either push it forward or backward - that's not site coverage which is one of the main issues with these massive homes going up in communities (overlooking other's backyards, run off issues etc)
It is important to consider the impact the layout will also have on neighbouring properties both current and future. Hopefully this helps minimise future conflict and maximizes mutual property enjoyment.
Don't look at exactly what is next-door now look at what they can build so if next-door is re- developed It doesn't put the current application at a disadvantage.
In my neighbourhood, parking is a huge issue. Developments are being approved with less parking spaces than units and sometimes no parking at all. This is absolutely unrealistic given that these developments cannot be considered affordable and it is reasonable to assume that the people living in these new developments would also own at least one vehicle. When no parking is provided, street parking and congestion are an issue and affect how residents experience the community.
Most families have 2 vehicles which doesn't seem to be considered
"In NW Calgary (Sage Hill, Nolan Hill, Kincora, Glacier Ridge), homes are packed too tightly—especially near Walmart. Green spaces are disappearing as the City prioritizes builders over livability. Where are the

new parks? Open spaces are vital for mental health and quality of life. The City must focus on creating parks and preserving green areas, not just building more clustered townhomes and apartments.
Serve residents. Not Builders. The residents of new development won't even have sun access."
Eliminate the requirement for garages, decrease setbacks to the rear property line, especially for dwelling units. Moving dwelling units into the rear setback helps activate lanes, making them safer and more attractive. Rear lanes are overlooked but are amazing spaces that would benefit from activation. They can and should become areas for cycling, and dwelling units should have main entrances off of them.
Appropriate sidewalk space so neighbourhoods/streets feel walkable and have room for trees. Even if set backs are adjusted space in front of housing should feel roomy and encourage people to walk/interact.
Maintaining and protecting property value is of paramount importance vs the building of multi story buildings with limited or no parking being available to address housing concerns in developed or planned neighborhood's.
Senior leadership at the City that can be trusted.
oo many new developments do no allow for enough parking which crowd the streets
Houses are built too close together increasing the risk of fires. Most lot sizes in the city are not big enough to subdivide into 2 units. Parking was already a problem in many inner city communities when duplexes became the norm, nevermind the multi-unit complexes that are being built now.
1. Can the infrastructure accommodate all the additional users (water, sewer, electricity)
2. Where will people park? With new developments providing little to no parking, there will not be enough street parking to accommodate all the new vehicles. Where does the city think people should park their vehicles? Assuming everyone will use transit is totally unrealistic.
Majority of calgarians have vehicles. It should be required to provide at least one parking space for housing space.
So many new neighbourhoods lack trees and other large greenery. There is a stark difference in the overall quality of foliage and green space between older and newer neighbourhoods. New neighbourhoods frequently lack any trees that will actually grow into anything substantial.
We keep removing parking but increasing the density. While we will eventually move towards less vehicles there is nothing harmful about planning for parking now and re utilizing the space in the future but it's a necessity now. We do not have the infrastructure nor culture at this point to believe we can build a 600 unit apartment and realistically think we don't need parking. A street crammed with parking takes away from the residential benefits like trees and space and ruins property value
The impact of over shadowing, parking, existing mature green canopy. With our climate it's ridiculous to consider cycling year round. Parents cannot cycle to purchase groceries, takes kids to sports, etc. Time to drop the cycle, walk and transit use, c-train is not safe to use. Where does aging in place fit?

Infrastructure in established communities. Developers MUST provide parking. New development must match the existing character of the neighborhood. Listen to adjoining residents concerns.
What happened to Infrastructure??? schools, roads, upgrade of sewage and water pipes
We drive everywhere and need parking spots! Valgary transit is garbage and dangerous. Always delays takes too long to travel.
Keep setbacks same as single family homes
Keep low density and single family homes
Every residence needs parking. We live In a cold city, people need cars to work, keep the city running
Overshadowing and over looking impact on neighbours.
This government hides as much as it can behind closed doors and consistently ignores citizens that this survey is a waste of time and money; the sole purpose of the engagement team at the city is to keep the propaganda machine set to full bias, pretending this government serves citizen despite the reality that this government has focused on serving itself and its rich friends for at least the last decade.
The overall feel of the block and community. Each block has its own unique feel and any new buildings should align with the current infrastructure on the block.
Remove arbitrary setback requirements that restrict developements and them make more complicated, especially if the developer wants to add more units and/or secondary suites.
Keeping in mind that most families require two vehicles to function effectively. I think it is important to allow for adequate parking for every unit built. There should be an allowance of two parking stalls per dwelling built.
Building more, faster, and with greater density is more important than particular amenities.
I am concerned that we are losing our urban trees and leaving less permeable surfaces to manage our rain events. Front back row houses should be smaller building footprint, adequate setback from adjacent property, and consider front porch as amenity space with room enough for healthy trees in the boulevard.
Trees are important to maintain appropriate temperatures as they provide shade which can drop temperatures considerably. Parking is also highly important due to lack of street parking and street safety. Crowded streets decrease safety for bikes and children playing and pedestrians
The first question here for deciding setbacks is basically a trick question. You can have larger setbacks and not cut down on backyard space or trees, change the lot coverage %. Easy. If it's reduced you can make the best of both worlds.
Make a front yard more useful rather than simply a parking lot

Density in this neighborhood
Car parking is critical for new builds. I have been looking for homes and on some streets there is no parking - there must be parking supplied by the developer in order have a functional livable home. Not including parking is a real issue for home owners and neighborhoods.
Must be parking for every unit. If parking space is my considered there is no room for residents, guests, etc. Congested streets feels like a safety risk waiting to happen, because people will park where they shouldn't.
The city is committed to increasing the tree canopy (as it should be), but currently it's SHRINKING as a result of over built sites. The allowable footprint must be reduced and the bylaw needs to specify 'canopy trees' not just 'trees' as a requirement in any new building permit
Minimum parking requirements should be 1.0-stalls-per-unit.
Suites should also be required to have a dedicated 1-stall-per-suite (same as garage suites are required to have 1-stall-per-suite for parking)
Access to neighborhoods, flow of traffic and people must be considered. If too much is packed into a neighborhood without providing for parking, garbage/recycling collection the congestion becomes a huge issue for neighbors surrounding development.
Impact of multiple units on originally single family size lots and the increased parking, water, electricity and sewer needed. Location of bus zones and school zones and dangers increased.
Full to mid sized garages (NOT small) for VEHICLE parking (not storage) 1 - 2 per new dwelling to keep vehicles off streets for safety of children, pedestrians and animals
A car is really important in Calgary and people already argue about parking in my neighborhood.
I like outside space and don't want the city to become a cement city in the name of "affordable" housing"
Homes should have a MINIMUM 1.0 parking stalls per build, ON THE PROPERTY, and multi unit residential buildings need to have a recourse to three garbage bins per unit as it's not sustainable
Middle housing waste management is not effective. Middle housing garage parking often goes unused, and residents choose street parking over use of their garages. This could be because the garages are too small for cars and perhaps because the garages are used for storage. Cars parking on the street is fine to a point however, there is an impact on livability and safety. Garages built & unused indicates multiple issues that need to be addressed by the city/developers. Covered parking w/ plugs?
- The noise created by air conditioners with new builds and multi-family dwellings is going to be enormous.

- There must be adequate off street parking for all units in a residential build. It is wishful thinking that Calgarians won't own a vehicle(s). You are approving development in neighbourhoods that have lower walkability scores, and on streets that are designated bike roads in residential areas. Both of these will discourage alternative forms of transportation from personal vehicles.

Parking is a challenging thing to solve, cars keep getting bigger and bigger, we need the city/governments to limit these sizes because its making parking harder to solve. Parking is necessary for some places but in oter cases it is not needed.

Row housing does not belong in established single home communities. Build row houses in new communities where they fit. A modern multiplex town home with six suites on a single family lot does not have parking garages for six suites so now there is parking congestion in neighborhood. Also there is no green space on the lot only building. The city is destroying our neighborhoods and causing a decrease in property value of the other houses. Only the developer wins with the money they make.

Stop tearing down existing single family homes to build crappy multi dwelling high density garbage

Construction traffic planning!

The parking is a major issue in almost all areas where the density is increasing. Parking needs to be mandatory with each of these builds. A minimum of 1 space per dwelling. Additionally, old/established trees being cut down is ruining the landscape of older communities, and one of the major reasons people choose to live in older communities.

You need to consider the parking impacts and if there is enough space for recycling, waste and compost bins

"Front yards as part of placemaking - to encourage people spending time facing forward.

Multi's not being so tight on lot coverage. I am speaking from industry and there is too much we are trying to get on these lots, decreasing lot coverage would allow more space for storage, parking & amenity space."

I think with developments and redevelopments we are losing trees and green space on the lot level and we need to ensure that everyone has access to natural spaces where they live.

This government destruction of so many trees (Eau Claire Plaza, Olympic Plaza and Cowboy's park, as just some examples of 100s of mature trees being destroyed) is a concern. This government puts profit for the wealthy as its top priority and surveys like this are just part of the propaganda.

There should be NO change in zoning in established neighborhoods that DO NOT WANT A ZONING CHANGE! Implement all the changes you want in the new suburbs being built but leave existing ones alone and allow them to be zoned as they were designed! Form partnerships with the reserve to bring prosperity and new investment to First Nations by investing in infrastructure there and leave existing neighborhoods alone, these questions are not appropriate for established single family home neighborhoods!

There are far too many multi-unit building going up on already congested streets.
Yes parking being difficult, especially when kids and people are trying to cross side walks
You question on set backs is a leading question that suits your agenda. Set backs in the front and back should only be allowed to change a slight degree of the adjacent houses. You must be willing to let all homes change their set backs if new developments can push the limits of a property.
Visibility concerns with so many cars parked on the street.
All places should be built with a minimum of 1-parking-stall-per unit
For front setbacks while context feels like an important factor it can unfairly limit new development in older non-revitalized neighborhoods. I think Context should be a factor but needs to be applied with an eye for how the neighborhood is developing. (EG: in Upper Mount Royal a 3m setback makes no sense as the character and established pattern of the area is larger houses with yards etc, in Mount Pleasant though the density and established pattern should support smaller front setbacks.)
Parking requirement should be a minimum of 1-parkig-stall-per-unit ON SITE (current 0.5 stall requirement is too low). 1-parking-stall-per-unit will allow emergency vehicles, guests, deliveries, and more adequate street parking.
All suites should be REQUIRED to include onsite parking at '1-stall-per-suite'. Currently the Zoning bylaw is unfair for homeowners: Developers build 4 units + 4 suites (0.5 parking requirement) yet homeowners with Garage Suites must provide 1-full-parking stall
Space- both lot space and parking spaces in the area
We need parking that's available for new builds. The idea that most families or couples will only have one car or no car is many many decades away and only going to happen when it becomes too unaffordable to own two vehicles. Even then people will rent a second vehicle often.
Removing one 700K bungalow and replacing it with 4 or 8 million-dollar townhouses means large trees are removed in older neighbourhoods, and parking wars start on the street. We saw this happen in our old neighbourhood (Killarney) and moved for that reason. Additionally, old infrastructure (such as water pressure) can't handle the increased number of people.
Yes I think that is important that new developments improve the public space in its surroundings, giving something back to the city. Being respectful with the communitarian environment in which it is placing
NO more "luxury" development, regular people do not need fancy, we need affordable starter and median income homes.
Consider greenspace and drainage in the community on a street by street, block by block basis, do not overbuild.

Front amenity connection space is important in building community and should be considered more. Doesn't have to be large but does have to be pleasant. Bike parking needs to be a bigger part of bylaw and there should be enough to store mobility devices for every occupant of the house. Trees and waste and recycling should be put on the street for communal care.
Absolutely—we need more community. It's not just about how many units fit on a lot, it's about how people live together. When neighbourhoods prioritize connection—shared spaces, front porches, walkable streets, local gathering spots—crime rates go down, trust goes up, and people actually look out for each other. Designing for isolation leads to isolation. Designing for community literally saves lives.
other streetscape items, lighting, sidewalks, roadways, bicycle lanes
Green spaces are most sustainable, climate friendly, better for kids and mental health.
Of course, there's lots of challenging things to consider, but that's your job not mine."
The housing and parking is the most important and most Calgary homes own at least one vehicle and there's not enough street parking (and realistically Calgary transit is not good enough, we're not Asia or New York). Then lawn/trees/yards and next to make sure that our whole city doesn't end up a giant paved concrete lot. Finally practicalities like storage, deck, garbage, bike
The current bylaws totally disregard context in established neighbourhoods. This creates a lot of problems and appeals. The contextual requirement should be brought back. It is disrespectful and bad urban planning not to take into consideration the existing streetscape.
The look and feel of the street is most impacted by trees, the space of the building and parking availability.
A minimum of one-stall-per-unit should be required for all units AND suites (each suite should have a dedicated parking spot). Additionally, the current allowable 8-units on a single lot is too many. It should be a maximum of three in order to allow for families of all sizes. Furthermore, a different solution re; garbage and recycling storage needs to put in to place. The 24 bins behind the 8-plexes are not working.
The home itself must always be the priority for space, to maximize the potential for more units or attractive square footage. Trees and greenery must also be prioritized to maximize our urban canopy.
We should be considering the kind of work that is being done on the property. There has been failure to address the construction-related deaths that have been attributed to lack of safety precautions. I am a firm believer in limiting construction site supervision to certified red-seal contractors who can navigate these conditions and mitigate hazards. This would also, in theory, motivate others to become more involved in the trades which would benefit our city immensely.
Current zoning rules don't require enough parking spaces per unit/secondary units

As long as there are viable alternatives for storage or outdoor amenity space like a nearby park, then it is reasonable that these can be smaller on the site. The type of things provided has to be addressed in the context of the site location.

the city is currently approving redevelopments of multi unit residential buildings with no room for bin storage or pick up. they are getting around reasonable rules by not classifying these developments as condos. these developments are intrusive on neighbouring properties, including shadowing, overlooking, no privacy, no trees, noisy, messy, no parking. neighbouring buildings are older and can't handle the runoff of these developments. these are getting approved before bylaws have been adjusted.

Parking is not given enough consideration when approving an allowable use in combination with a discretionary use. Allowing a 4-plex with 4 basements suites on an interior lot (not corner lot) provides insufficient parking options for the neighbourhood. As more and more of these mass density structures appear, the ability for the street to absorb this is insufficient. The City seems to be blind to the reality of car ownership. These high density structures should be left to corner lot

Broad density increases destroys the physical sense of place and community. A single family lot should not be allowed to be turned into a 12 unit with limited setbacks, outdoor space, and green spaces. They are being considered as "token" elements in current development proposals and almost always approved by the City.

The city needs to reduce the prevalence of huge street facing garages, which ruin the streetscape for pedestrians and increase the amount of concrete or asphalt used on the lot, reducing the capacity of the lot to absorb water and contributing to flooding. New developments should have laneway garages only, and the city should explore incentives for converting ultra-large garages into modular secondary suites.

Consideration of surrounding properties. 3-6 story housing next to bungalows is awful. Introducing this type of dentistry with no regard to existing housing negatively impacts the quality of living and value impacts to existing properties.

The inner city roads are too narrow for the amount of traffic. With cars parked on both sides there is not enough room for two cars to pass in opposite directions.

Only mandating that developers provide ONE parking space per unit is not realistic for a city /country that heavily relies on parking. Much of the city is angry because we DONT WANT MARDALoop streets where kids don't have room to play

There should be no massive uptick in multi family housing units between preexisting single family dwellings in inner city communities.

I am concerned that new development reduces or in some cases entirely eliminates greenery, which is going to cause a significant amount of long terms issues

Build all the multi family housing you want in new developments, but NOT in existing neighborhoods without the consent of the existing neighbors.

Living in a city means definitionally there is less space available if you want to keep growing the population. So you have to prioritize living space, storage and nature for the well-being of the occupants. And bike parking over car parking simply because bikes take much less space in a city.
Reduce barriers for backyard suites in old "R-1, RC-1" neighbourhoods if they don't want duplexes and townhomes.
just give people the right to develop the land they own. We desperately need more housing
we need to protect our old growth trees in the city as they provide valuable canopy protection for neighborhoods helping to keep streets cold and provide windbreaks and habitat for wildlife
I think it should be mandatory for all new builds to plant trees in the front yard. This will help Calgary reach their climates goals as well as add to the vibrancy of streetscape.
The look and feel of the street needs to be taken into consideration and given more weight with these developments.
In a world focused on development and testing things down, native garden patches and spaces need to be added and respected and not sprayed and destroyed. In Calgary there were native patches added, then sprayed with chemicals and destroyed. What was the point?
"I'd like there to be privacy for residents in their yards and light (rather than shading) so people can grow things and enjoy sunlight.
Lack of street parking is a huge issue if we have more density. People love cars."
Street Parking is becoming increasingly a problem with many units being built with no regard for current residents
There has to be at least 1 parking spot designated per unit.
Building height. Bulgins should be limited to 5 stories or equivalent height- 60ft
Parking is atrocious in inner city neighborhoods. Adding in RV parking during the summer with people who game the system makes it even worse.
0.5-stalls-per-unit TOO LOW. It should be 1-stall-per-unit. We're experiencing major congestion issues with 4+ 4 suites and this is discriminatory for seniors and disabled individuals- they're denied equal access to housing due to mobility/accessability needs (can't park and walk far, especially in winter re: slip/fall risk). Public transit isn't close enough nor reliable enough in the winter. Lack of parking effectively excludes elderly/disabled from living in areas without adequate parking
There are many areas where trees may be planted. This will help with dust, light and noise pollution.
Reducing the min size/space requirements.

Too many vehicles for the street leads to fighting between neighbors, bad neighbors make bad neighborhoods
City of Calgary not giving existing lots sun exposure any consideration
If I install solar and then someone builds a 4 story next to me the builder should have to reimburse my solar.
They also should be compensation for the loss of sun on my patio or the like
More edible plants/trees
Parking needs to be addressed especially with high density and when we dont have adequate public transportation so everyone has to have a car. 0-1 car per house is not how it really is
Visitor parking. Homes with 2 or more cars. Inclusion of green space such as parks or boulevards.
City and builders are shrinking lots to maximize profit and garages are too
small for cars that are larger now and personal items. It overflows into yards making communities look unkept. Cars need to be parked on driveways and streets and result in increased vulnerability to theft."
I see the impact of the increase of vehicles and how it causes unsafe crosswalks and intersections die to illegal and overcrowded parking. Drainage is also improve tant to consider. Snow accumulation and where to put it when shoveling should be considered.
You cram too many homes too close together. You're greedy and out for profit and property tax thieves!
Current neighbourhood profiles need to be maintained. People buy/live in specific communities for specific reasons.
Reducing the value of existing properties when new multi unit townhouses (5-12 units) are placed onto one or two inner city lots. The parking issues that will arise from that level of dwelling density.
Yes Population is growing too fast in this city and this country....maybe the issue needs to go back to less mass immigration then we don't need to keep increasing housing and urban sprawl.
Green space in the area as a ratio to residential buildings/sites.
Considering landforms, drainage patterns, wind, etc.
It is critical the zoning REQUIRES 1.0 parking stalls per unit (minimum)
Motor vehicle parking where they are lane homes. Too often there are multiple vehicles per residence which can be solved by detached garages, but is not always used and residents lose parking. There

needs to be a limited number of parking spots allowed per home, additional need to be paid for unless a garage is built.
Important to limit reliance on street parking and interference with neighbours space
Density. A single family lot should not become an 8 unit condo. Reasonable density for redevelopment with higher density only at very specific locations.
The amount of traffic and increased maintenance and SECURITY should also be considered.
Limited removal of mature trees.
Giving space to trees to improve Calgary's canopy area is so important. We just keep developing and cutting down trees, even old ones that are the most beneficial for shading, privacy and carbon capture.
All residents living at an address need to park on that property. Street parking would then be available for guests.
Housing needs to accommodate landscaping and amenity spaces, and the ability for storing bikes and other things like scooters. To be honest, I don't care about car parking. My household has only ever had 1 car since I became an adult, and we do just fine. I also would like to see residential buildings not maximize their size. I don't want to see McMansions.
Trees give good separation between cars and people. Otherwise I believe our front yards are under used and ineffective spaces
I think that with the exception of corner lots on busy streets, that new structures should generally match neighbouring structures. Mainly, if the surrounding houses are either old bi-level houses and newer 2 story duplexes then new builds should all be no more than 2 stories and no denser than a duplex. Except on corner lots I am strongly opposed to large multi unit structures with basement suites.
Prioritize the elements that impact the surrounding neighbours first and then figure out what can be done with the built form building.
I think that specific setback measurements are arbitrary, and it should be flexible to accommodate more secondary and backyard suites.
Homes are way too close together. This alone causes unnecessary threats to fire, noise complaints, etc.
Height of building and shading sidewalks
The neighborhood aesthetics always need to be considered. If city policies negatively impact property values lawsuits for injurious affection will be plenty.
Citizens overwhelmingly did not want blanket rezoning and this oppressive, incompetent government went ahead anyway. This fake engagement is far worse than no engagement at all.

Aesthetics, lack of parking, crowdedness
The number of stories on buildings in areas outside of downtown. Most communities do not have sufficient amenities for all the homes built. It makes this even more straining when developers change the original 7 story building plans to be significantly higher, years after the original community plan was developed.
It's harder to find a spot for plants and waste since they have more particular environmental specific areas than other storage and parking
I don't think zoning rules should dictate anything in terms of space for other features aside from housing. This should be decided by individual projects for their specific needs. I would like to see more tree cover in the city, but not at the expense of housing density. Parking minimums should be abolished completely to not tack on more costs for developments.
Just build more. Let the market decide
Cramming to limits on sites is awful. No room for utilities or personal space.
Parking is critical. Too many buildings are being approved with insufficient parking on the assumption that residents will utilize public transit. Public transit can be unsafe and inefficient if one needs to carry groceries or travel outside of the downtown core.
Retain similar home types to existing format and layouts in communities.
I think that it is important and good to balance having usable amenity spaces for enjoyment of garden (via planters or otherwise), a variety of transportation support (i.e. not focusing solely on car development and encouraging bikes, walking and transit alternatives through diversity of options). Having additional landscaping to any degree is also great for softening building, but a focus should be on sustainable options.
More space between single family homes in New neighborhoods. Developers should be allowed to build zero lot sizing
What the infrastructure can support we are building beyond our infrastructure
There is too much massive unit developments being allowed. What is going on? It's wrecking neighbourhoods.
I put the following in order with motor vehicle parking being the most important and residential building being the least important because people need places to park their cars. The city can't expect that everyone is going to take transit. I also believe residential building should be kept to a minimum as surrounding neighbours don't want this. I think another thing to consider is the amount of room between buildings. If space is limited, this is the one thing the city needs to consider.

<p>Stop the excessive lot coverage, retain mature green canopy, provide outdoor space and fence the units. Provide parking for motor vehicles. Design should be in context with the existing residential homes. Nothing that is being built is affordable housing, but that's how blanket zoning was sold to us. Increase front setbacks to comply with the neighborhood. Do not place storage, waste & recycling or other noise producing items beside the existing neighbors, consider the impact on their life's.</p>
<p>Orientation. Apparently HGO rezoning allows properties to reorient their addresses onto different/cornering streets. This has a huge impact on the look/feel of a neighbourhood. This difference was not communicated. In fact, it was not clear even to city representatives.</p>
<p>Just wondering when the next civic election is taking place</p>
<p>Bicycles get stolen if outside, they need an enclosed secure space.</p>
<p>Trees are good for everyone</p>
<p>I would love to see Calgary move to more walkable communities. As such I tried to prioritize these orders by maximizing walkability throughout all parts of Calgary.</p>
<p>I think large front yards are super over-rated and provide little benefit to home owners. Mandating large front yards in every neighborhood is just silly, as not everyone wants a neighborhood like that.</p>
<p>Don't crowd people into too small a space, it leads to neighbors out disputes. Change the zoning laws back.</p>
<p>No dense housing unless you wish a copy of London or Munich or Paris.</p>
<p>Total disaster. City employees are not educated on these horrible results of immigration missed into conventional neighborhoods. Police sirens every night.</p>
<p>Should provide managers name of approval with contact number for each such wrong approval.</p>
<p>The size of the proposed development must blend with the existing infrastructure and also must easily accommodate increased vehicle parking and garbage removal.</p>
<p>Fewer and fewer people are driving. We need to adapt to that. We also need homes. Build homes.</p>
<p>buildings and green space for living activities outside as families and neighbors are necessary for peaceful coexistence. as a northern climate without city to city fast transit, we need vehicles. We don't just live in one city, we live in a province, a country, with freedom to be explored.</p>
<p>My priority is family and fellowship with loved ones. Street parking should be important. It seems nonsensical to say to a resident that their residential street does not allow for visitors. Houses so close together that you only see a wall when you look out a window is a tragedy.</p>

In Japan street parking is illegal. Home owners need to prove that they have space for car parking on their property to be able to own a car. Maybe something like this could benefit parts of Calgary?
Prioritize making the space beautiful and nice to live in and make storing vehicles and junk the lowest
Bike storage was proposed to be cut from 1 to .5 even though new developments only need provide .5 parking spots per unit. The "overhangs" at the front of the property are creating an ugly streetscape and no privacy for neighbours. As well, the additional units (secondary suites) with no garbage / compost / recycling means the bins are taking up a huge amount of space. If the average Calgary HH has 2 cars, acknowledge that reality and don't try to force "maximum allowable" on us.
Frankly it's not clear to me why the city even needs to micro-manage these aspects. Allow developers to build what they think people want - they're the ones whose finances require catering to their audience!
Keeping plantinf trees is very important. Alot of the infills and new builds rip out or don't plant them causing heat spots. Keep setbacks to allow for vegetation and shade
Calgary should retain its beauty and co-exist with nature while prioritizing development.
With an aging population that wants to stay in their own homes, forcing 2-story housing is contrary to needs. Bungalows may not suit density quotas, but they make great sense to a person that cannot climb stairs and cannot afford the absorbent fees of seniors homes. Decisions by the planning department need to consider all scenarios, and not just accommodation for the excessive immigration levels that are plaguing our country.
more parking
The addition of so many vehicles (especially if they are electric) is an on-street problem and a problem for power infrastructure. This also puts too much pressure on the water and sewer systems. Not sufficient to support what the City is proposing. Also, there are grave privacy concerns due to height and footprint allowances for infills. It's disrespectful to those who put their life savings and TLC into their property. Put high density where high density naturally belongs.
May be mentioned later, but construction nuisance, I know that homeowners have very little support from the city when their lot is being undermin or construction is impacting quality of life. I'd like to see the city have more teeth in this regard instead of being told that it's a civil dispute which will take time and money to resolve.
The fact that this government is broken and incompetent at the highest levels, making this survey exercise as effective as rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic.
We need homes and we need trees to keep our urban areas cool. I understand that people need places to park. But, I would like to see the city prioritize public transportation.
Space for car parking priority is dependent on existing viable alternatives to driving in the immediate area. For example, if the development is next to an existing train station, then parking should be considered

less of a priority to expedite development. But if the development is in a new community, then there should be adequate parking in the short term until transit can be constructed in the neighbourhood.
Wasn't an issue with our old zoning. Citizens don't want your agenda. Try listening. There are many underutilized commercial industrial areas close to transit that can be used and new neighborhoods can be designed accordingly.
You are more worried about catering to inclusion rather than respecting what an area is, has already established into, and who and what they are serving. Your incisive ideology is destroying existing neighbourhoods
Tree Canopies make communities cool, valuable and beautiful. That's all being lost with new houses in older areas. Zero trees.
Arteries of road are very important. 210 ave in Legacy is notorious for this issue. Only one road out and housing keeps getting built
Why is bicycle parking an option? Sounds like a silly DEI question for supposed "climate emergency" 🙄
I am dead against this coming and will vote in the next election for a mayor and councillor against it. Our community is small and adding residential buildings is not a solution
The overshadowing of existing properties. The developments I have seen stack 2 multi unit 3 story buildings on a single lot. These encroach on the light and space of the neighboring property. Where are the home owners tights to light and peace on their property when they suddenly have 36 immediate neighbours. They also paid a million dollars for a property that will become land value only if they are forced to sell. Seniors suffer as a result, they have very few housing options if they sell.
I see big apartment complexes or over-garage suites being built in communities that are well treed and neighbour friendly. These developments decrease opportunities for building relationships and also make for more parking and waste/recycling issues.
When's the next election
Cities are always growing and changing. This used to be wilderness. There was hand-wringing of indigenous people when the wilderness suddenly had a few tipis on it. It "changed the character of the community". That never ends. Everyone wants to freeze it in amber. Embrace the future! Bring on the Pearl River Delta (the world's biggest city).
Increase in property taxes, infrastructure services and facilities required for the development.
Transit facility
Parking has been downplayed as not important or no longer a priority of Calgarians. I have not heard a single person I know say they don't care about where they park their cars at their homes. I also don't know a single person over the age of 20 who does not own a car.

Stop changing the zoning bylaws! People bought in certain areas and pay their property taxes and now you decide to change the zoning bylaws... if people wanted to live in an area that doesn't have row houses, residential buildings etc. and bought in an area that was zoned for none of these then it shouldn't be changed because the city has decided that is what they want!
People who build lives here should have a voice. Seems like there's a focus on "temporary ." renters are not home owners. Tho important, they have different values and mobility.
Winter winter winter.....
It is important that there is consistency in the mix of the buildings. So architectural consistency like in new developments.
Setbacks should march neighbouring houses. Many of the new row houses are taking up the whole lot and resulting in setbacks that do not match the neighbouring homes. Also vehicle parking is a huge concern.
Height of building and consequential shading.
Lots are already too small and homes are very cramped together. This creates a fire risk and noise pollution. Lots should also be requires to implement a certain number of trees or drought resistant landscaping that support declining insect populations.
Do away with parking minimums in the entirety of the city. It's an antiquated idea.
Green space is mandatory, required to not live in a concrete jungle. Parking is mandatory as most households have more than one car. Space for recycling and garbage is mandatory, how else id garbage picked up? Do you leave garbage outside permanently to stink up the neighborhood and attract wildlife such as bears. Of course not.
There are too many cars on our streets
It's dangerous. Housing units should be required to have sufficient space for one motorized vehicle for each individual in a residence.
Do not squeeze multi family homes onto single home lots. No multi family homes in single family neighborhoods.
Calgarians deserve less car-centric infrastructure that focuses on living and the natural balance of Greenspace.
yes an immediate tax break when you put multi family houseing beside my house
No row houses or apartment buildings on streets with detached homes
Increasing density.

What limited space? We have lots of space all surrounding the city. Stop shrinking the size of lots.
I do not want people building a 2 story house in their backyard that blocks the neighbors back yard
Adding native or hardy plantings help support local ecosystems without using as much extra water or maintenance to keep them alive.
What happened to 55% lot coverage? Zoning changes have resulted in mature trees being cut down, little to no yards and no need for garage/parking. This is garbage.
This ranking would adjust depending on residential area in question (higher intensity areas vs. quiet residential streets)
Parking will always be the number one issue when increasing density
Impacts to Water pressures should also be considered
Trees and planting are important for the character of the neighbourhood and enjoyment of use by existing residents. Zoning and site layout should consider the impacts to existing trees and plantings on neighbouring properties, not just the lot being developed. As much as the city likes to think it's likeable/walkable this isn't the case and parking is an important consideration.
The building is the first priority, with less space for unnecessary setbacks. Need to retain and expand tree canopy. Vehicle parking is still a consideration but context matters (not requiring parking if it's next to a CTrain station for example)
We have to prioritize homes for people first and foremost. Allowing for access to outdoor space and associated soft landscaping is also important for livability and greening our city as much as possible. While parking and W&R are still important considerations, they should 100% be secondary to actually providing the housing we need.
Infills need to consider community context and leave room for trees and external amenities that complement the neighbourhood.
Parking is essential for social and safety needs. Visitors need to be able to park. Pedestrians. Drivers cannot see the sidewalks anymore because there are too many cars parked along the roads. Pedestrians step out onto crosswalks or try to cross the road and are at a much higher chance of being hit because drivers cannot see them due to the cars that you have forced to park on the road because you have not allowed for accommodation for parking.
By far the biggest need in Calgary is affordable family housing - that means more than one bathroom. Most affordable units do not offer any more than one bathroom. Very important consideration for who the target market is.
Additionally, affordability should be a priority. Too many lots are being severed to sell more million dollar homes but smaller.

We asked: Which are the most important land use impacts of new Housing developments for Zoning Bylaw rules to address? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Privacy and overlooking
- Shadowing and sunlight access
- Preservation of existing trees and shrubs
- Vehicle traffic and parking
- Architectural fit and design
- Drainage and stormwater management

We also asked **Why? Do you think there is anything else challenging or important to consider?** and received the following feedback:

Scale and architectural character should fit with existing community.
The city doesn't care if there is stolen sunlight, no parking, trees hacked away, privacy. All reasons I purchased RC1.
Stop the free for all for builders to do as they please
Stop destroying neighborhoods and communities
Architectural fit is important to retain neighbourhood character.
Requirements of vehicle parking should be deprioritized, especially in built up areas with nearby amenities, because this increases the ultimate cost. Make these optional to the developer."
Discussing your proposed redevelopment with the existing residents so as to gauge how much resistance you're going to get if you try to build a piece of garbage in a beautiful neighborhood.
Tax paying residents CHOOSE which community to live in based on its character. They made the single largest purchase of their life in making that decision. Building 8 or 12 plex apartment buildings next to single family homes is a farce. It is not the moral obligation of residents of Calgary's established communities to house folks from Toronto or Vancouver that have been priced out of their respective markets so that developers who bought this Council can profit.
Setbacks are important for fire safety and use of common areas
Three storey row townhouses are blocking light, and taking away from seeing a skyline when walking in a neighborhood. Three storey (or 2 stories with that extra 10 feet), should be limited to specific areas, and not blanket approval everywhere.
Serious concerns about added strain on an existing infrastructure. A multi-unit development in an area brings multiple new households into a space that may have been meant for one. Bringing more cars on

the street, more competition for already-limited parking, and an increase in household garbage, recycling, and compost bins cluttering the curb on collection days. Not all communities are designed for this kind of density and established communities, once appealing to Calgarians, are destroyed.

I love density but there's a way to do it without smaller older houses losing all their light and privacy due to size and shape of a building, and due to oversized windows, especially on the third story. Re: parking, I oppose forcing laneway houses to build in parking because it makes them unnecessarily enormous. Car storage is a ridiculous use of a whole floor of a structure.

Community character, age of a residence being demolished to make way for high density development (residences less than 50 years old to be demolished should not be eligible for approval under the new blanket rezoning policy), only neighbourhoods with alleys be eligible for approval under the new blanket rezoning policy as the additional road access eases congestion.

Where are the Guidelines that were promised after Blanket Rezoning was approved? The aspects above were supposed to be addressed, but instead developers are moving ASAP to get their buildings in place, without any regard for the above. Councilors agreed that some of the photos shown at council (overlooking, massing) were "mistakes" and "shouldn't be happening", yet they are not addressing them. Trees are a City priority yet there is no room on most H-GO or R-CG lots for any mature trees ever!

These are all important and the only way to address them all is to stop overbuilding. Why did upzoning have to jump from one residence per lot to 8 homes per lot. Maybe to 2 homes on lots inside the community and 4 homes per lot at the edge of the community would be more reasonable.

Streets should be designed in such a way to make people drive more slowly in order to have safer neighborhoods. Additionally visual environment has been proven to have an effect on quality of life, so ensuring that feelings aren't hideously ugly is important.

All are important. To rank these is an affront to proper planning, especially in established neighbourhoods. You are setting up a false trade off. No community is livable if there is no privacy, if there is high massing, if there is no greenery, no consideration for stormwater management (obviously) and if there is no consideration for beauty (fit) and practicality (parking). Do not get set up false trade offs.

Existing trees and shrubs are important because they can help contribute to privacy. Vehicle traffic and parking is also important to address because that impacts people's experiences in living within certain areas. Design is not as important, but there should be very general guidelines on things like signage on housing.

all buildings must be 40% of lot size.

For most people, their home is their most precious investment. I am aware of people who moved after a new development destroyed their sunlight and privacy. This is a terrible consequence & totally disrespectful of an owner's property rights! We have beautiful neighbourhoods; please don't destroy them. People have moved into our neighbourhood from overdeveloped areas. You should be studying this problem & making adjustments accordingly.

Though there is little unique architectural style to the city (with exceptions), the door should be left open for them to develop on the neighbourhood level. More important is to retain the existing foliage in the city as a major thing which sets the city apart. More practically, reliable stormwater management is underappreciated in consideration generally, but an important factor which should underpin all development for the sake of long term viability.

You have to remember that people purchased their in neighbourhoods they wanted to live in and paid the going price. We have an "AFFORDABLE" housing crisis and non of the H-GO's and increased densification is affordable! They want to tear down a house in my area and put in 6 townhouses, 3 stories tall with basement suites. There is no parking allowed on the front street for this lot. They will sell for \$600,000 per unit!!!! That's NOT AFFORDABLE.

There has to be convenience to access necessary amenities such as schools. If The City is going to build more homes or apartments in an area there will likely be children coming to live there. So schools need to be put in the planning. Schools in areas such as Varsity are already overcrowded. So to put in apartments to house more families with kids will only add to the problem & cause other problems. Also, more teachers will be needed. So The City needs to think about this.

These issues are all important. It is an eyesore to have six story multi family buildings towering over single family homes. Even the older infills are dwarfed (ie. Consider the huge bldg being built on 24th ave between Crowchild and 19th)

Privacy and overlooking does need to be considered, but may have to be sacrificed. I am more concerned about sunlight because that is a health issue. Architectural variety is desirable. "Fit" = boring. Enabling a greater range of sizes, types, and designs needs to be a priority

Yes, the feelings of the neighborhood and the community.

It's all important. That's why the blanket upzoning was the wrong decision. Did not listen to Calgarians at all.

Sit down with the communities as they are all unique and understand what will work. Listen to the citizens and work together to create respectful designs. The people know what will work as we live there and money does not guide us.

Consideration of building rules and regulations. For example, changing from "plastic" siding that can't handle the "climate change" to a substance like "hardiboard" that can weather the storm and is also more fire resistant.

Existing context. I live in a single family district and welcome increased density... I think it is crucial... but I'm concerned that the 'simplifying' will result in developer-driven 'max the return' at the expense of a more gradual street-specific consideration.

The most important land use concerns should always be density over everything. Density should be the number one priority.

Aside from parking, Garbage bin (way too many of when going from a single family dwelling to “10” units on one property!!! Ridiculous!!!!
I feel that safety and quality of life are negatively impacted if planning for new development does not look at and account for all or most of these factors
Size is on the development is certainly a concern as it brings all the above in locations not necessarily appropriate for the that development. Blanket rezoning is not the answer for every piece of property. Of course there are appropriate places for higher density but not on every street and corner.
It is disrespectful and hurtful to the neighbours/neighbourhood to have out of place, towering builds. More units and people require more parking. Respect the neighbourhood and those that will be most affected. Shadowing the neighbour's on either side is just wrong
Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Number of residents. The traffic bottle necks that will be caused. The stress on the existing overused amenities.
It is so sad to see single family homes lose their privacy and light. The courtyard concept that also incorporate balconies on some eight plexes are so intrusive. Balconies should not be allowed, nor open courtyards that intrude on existing homes. All of the above are important.
Too many people in one lot now. With too many cars. And noise.
Older communities have very old infrastructure - cannot overtax these communities with overbuild which is basically what is happening with the present Blanket Rezoning - to note that Blanket rezoning had a high % of Calgarians speaking against it.
Lower the density and return to contextual setbacks.
People buy or rent in areas for various reasons, all of the above contribute to either the feel or safety or basic technical functionality of the area.
Mature trees cannot be easily replaced, and provide a host of benefits, including cooling shade, wildlife habitat, and aesthetic benefits. I don't particularly care for shrubs, which grow much faster. Keeping the water clean is also vital, as clean water makes for healthy communities, and we have a duty to the environment and downstream users to keep the water clean. Sunlight is important for regulating sleep and waking hours; it's important that access to the sun is equitable.
Its all important
Safety especially where pedestrians and children are common. The increase in vehicle traffic is about more than just places to park.

Sewage...densifying an older neighborhood will require updating infrastructure.
These large buildings need to take into account the comfort of existing residents who have spent time and money on their properties to enjoy them.
"My home was purchased and has been maintained through years of hard work. We bought in this area specifically to have mature trees and established green spaces, a yard, and privacy away from busy city areas.
Parking is already difficult in our neighborhood due to rentals with some homes having several occupants with vehicles. We also seem to have water main and drainage issues at least once a year in our area."
Safety! Increased road traffic and more vehicles parking on the street dramatically can increase safety risks for pedestrians. Adding such elements to an area that already may have a poor design (in retrospect) may not be doable. Its taking an existing problem and simply making it worse.
"Building quality & efficiency should be on this list
Bldgs in YYC are built to the some of the lowest code standards in NA. There should be advantages (ex: full site density) when builders pursue higher standards (ex: passive house, or BC step code, or accessibility standards for % of the units).
It's not difficult, its a simple matrix table:
you wanna build a code-level stucco box and tear down all exist. trees? 2 units, high setbacks, contextual limits
you wanna build a net zero-> max dens."
A mix of affordable and market priced housing with a variety of layouts and sizes in multi-family dwellings is important. Ensuring that multi-family housing is integrated into existing residential areas in a way that maintains the community aesthetic is important.
There should be a consistent architectural fit. It doesn't need to be the existing architecture. There should be trees and shrubs in the new design it doesn't need to be existing foliage.
Compromising safety (traffic, pedestrians) due to the sudden population increases. Also, existing home devaluation to offsetting residents that many rely on retirement income income.
City's planning department & new zoning bylaw DO NOT consider ANY OF these important when approving new housing developments in existing neighbourhoods. Regardless of how much input the City receives citing these concerns, development is allow to continue. New multi residential structures have NO regard for any of the above. 60% coverage does not take into account space taken by walkways, entrance stairs, bump-outs, etc.; leaving no room for any kind of flora, trees or otherwise.
Design can be varied, limit homogeneity

Safety, visibility, noise, too many windows
Building a 6 unit building in a residential area hay has all single unit homes is NOTNOK especially when it does not fit with the style of the community.
A building should not cause genuine problems, like flood the neighbourhood or block the neighbours. However little things like the style of the building should not be considered in land use laws. It doesn't have a real impact on the neighbourhood, and its strange to have the city impose rules like that. My differently coloured cladding won't give someone cancer.
Stop with the density push and buildings behind buildings.
You have not addressed any of these things in the zoning bylaw other than to make it worse
Density
This municipal government seems to strongly support developers with little regard to the rights of average citizens. The most important "impact" to address is transparency when it comes to development because the current process seems barley legal in terms of secrecy and difficult in obtaining accurate, honest information from this government.
I think you have missed the importance of safety in terms of how the development impacts traffic, traffic speed in residential areas near playgrounds, the need for speed bumps and new signs.
Waste cart management is important.
Water supply side is also important, as is sewage capacity - are the utilities sufficient to support all of the increased loads where significant density is being added? Can the city infrastructure support additional pressure for delivery without failure, and is there sufficient take away capacity in the pipes for the additional sewage load?
High density housing causes many problems in the community. These include insufficient parking, increased vehicle traffic, increased crime, lack of privacy, lack of sunlight, poor drainage as there is less dirt to absorb rainwater and new structures that donor fit the architectural design of the community. All this decreases property values and reduces the enjoyment of the neighborhood. It negatively impacts everyone who is trying to make the neighborhood a great community to live in.
Environmental impact to land, people already in area and wildlife and destruction of park land and water ways. Overpopulated high density areas with inconsiderate developers out for the almighty dollar it's them destroying our environment and parks
Repeal Blanket Rezoning and H-GO. Development should provide similar context of current neighbourhood. Parking should be a requirement. Bungalows are low cost, accessible, and allow for aging in place. Stop tearing them down. Stop destroying our neighbourhoods and lives. You are negatively affecting peoples enjoyment of their homes and mental health. You have lied about Local Area Plans and amended without consent. LAPs are not being administered nor enforced.

You cannot allow the cutting down of mature trees!! Our best way of combating climate change!
The blanket rezoning in the city needs to be revoked we don't have a housing shortage we have an affordable housing shortage and this rezoning isn't making developers build affordable it's just letting them build lots
Placement of Things like air conditioners and venting
These are all important as they can all have very detrimental affects to existing residents and new residents.
The increased traffic patterns are something that should be thought about and dealt with by developers not just the city.
Designing neighborhoods that are walkable and safe for children to bike and play without having to worry about being run over by a car.
Privacy and shadowing are very important. Why buy a beautiful duplex and then realize the neighbours behind you (and no alleyway) are in 3 story townhouses looking down at your yard, into your house everyday, and not to mention, no evening sun.
All of these issues matter deeply, yet they're often overlooked in favour of maximizing profits. Greed-driven builds ignore long-term impacts like tree loss, poor drainage, increased traffic, and loss of sunlight/privacy. The City must enforce zoning that protects livability, sustainability, and the character of our neighbourhoods—not just developer returns.
considerations should be made with growth and development of the city in mind e.g. population growth, demand for housing and accommodation of that growth
We need to make sure our development is environmentally friendly, and density is environmentally friendly! Even if that means cutting down certain trees right now. So long as there is planned green space in a development, it shouldn't get bogged down by complaints about cutting down 11 or 12 trees.
These are normal considerations which administration wants to throw out. They all have something to do with quality of life and regardless of someone's income level, this is what they aspire to. No one wants to suffer, but people like you want to forget that important part of human wellbeing and psychology. You're the ones who are challenging. New apartment buildings still being built. BUT rent increases have SLOWED. BUT you still want to invade our single-family-home communities.
Fire separation needed!
Again, residential buildings should be built for people, not for vehicles or for aesthetics. Only elements that directly impact a person's individual ability to live in a residence should be included in a bylaw. Managing the environment and one's ability to access it is important, along with ensuring that weather events don't have a lasting negative impact on a residence.

Spacing and shadows are important to maintaining a neighbourhood aesthetic. Nobody wants to walk around in a dark and shadowy neighbourhood. Nice neighbourhoods are walkable neighbourhoods, and walkable neighbourhoods are open neighbourhoods.
New areas are house dense, houses right next to each other. The only reason for this is the builders wanting to make a ton of money and no consideration for how the community looks or how crowded it is for the people that move there
Complete lack of privacy with all homes overlooking all yards and into neighbouring properties in my area. Utilities run in the back which does not allow for any sort of natural privacy planting options such as trees and shrubs. There is also no shade available.
The goal is to provide housing. It doesn't make sense to tear down perfectly sound dwellings just to cram in multi dwelling units and destroy the aesthetics of a community. The access roads don't seem to be designed for the increase in density especially if there is no or little parking provided requiring on street parking.
You must consider the present neighborhood and fit. A 6plex beside a single family - or within a single family neighborhood, is not the correct side of space. At all
Too many row houses in inner city taking up whole lot, taking away all trees and infrastructure is not updated to facilitate parking is impossible.
Disruption filth and noise the contractor and city creates during construction and the terrible design outcomes
Calgary focus is on single family homes - there is a need for more diverse housing needs eg seniors.
I have no trust that new builds will not seriously damage beloved communities since it appears development is moving forward in an ah-hoc, who cares what the communities will look like in 20 years, approach. This survey appears to be largely an act to pretend the government is being responsible.
Infrastructure, both in things like sewer, water, and electricity. Street size and traffic issues arising from higher density in existing neighborhoods.
Current zoning is ignoring local area redevelopment plans, because "the zoning allows" it. The local area redevelopment plan needs to be prioritized first. "New developments should be compatible with the scale and form of existing and adjacent homes" is one example being ignored: a new 3 story building beside a bungalow is not compatible as required by area redevelopment plans. Requiring 1/2 of a parking space per primary residence is ridiculous. No one has half of a car.
Home owners are losing all privacy when these multi units are built next door to them. No green space left on the lot at all.

The lost integrity of neighbourhoods that are properly planned by thoughtful city planners. Not rapid densification that will result in lost character and major infrastructure strain and expensive housing in 20 years.
Property tax payers (the constituents you represent) don't want denser housing. None of us want that.
Yes- PARKING!!!!!! City Council feels that if you are a homeowner you have NO right to park in front of your ASSET (house)!!!! City Council feels that students from neighbouring Universities have more rights parking in front of our house than me the taxpayer and homeowners????
"Same as above. The character of neighbourhoods is being totally altered.
Height restrictions in residential areas should be limited to 2 storey. In addition, high ceilings should be discontinued both to lower the height of the house and also to be more eco friendly. Heating or cooling a space with 10ft ceilings is not environmentally sound."
With all the new developments in established areas, surely new water and sewage facilities need to be built
"Yes. This is ridiculous and needs to stop.
Use city land to build more housing and stay out of communities.
In a climate crisis as we are supposed to be in....the last thing anyone would do would be to cut down mature tree canopies.
Is nobody using their logic here...or is 100% for whatever the developers want?"
Designers and developers need to get more creative and find ways to incorporate the existing trees into the new design.
You are asking all the wrong, self-serving questions. Calgarians already responded to the blanket rezoning with a resounding "NO", but the Mayor and Council ignored Calgarians. The Blanket rezoning Bylaw should be repealed.
Build it to not stick out like a sore thumb
Houses covering too much of the lot
Community input that is being ignored. Schools????? Neighbourhood have to be planned around schools. Easy to not think about because it is provincial funded but any sane neighbourhood development has to account for schools and their capacity
Quality of space. Square footage is not the only measure of space, there must be a qualitative element as well as a quantitative.

Of course all of these are important
1 parking stall per unit provided.
Access to public transit and non vehicle corridors.
Historical significance of neighbourhoods in Calgary. The city seems to attribute very little value to this and it is sad to see.
We need the red line extension to the south to have these new developments make any sense
Update the fence bylaw to allow more privacy when infills are built
We need to maintain some form of appeal, especially in certain neighborhoods, however, fit traffic are extremely important.
Noise from motor vehicles
Street parking is often very crowded and there is not enough space for guests let alone home owners
Outdoor access and private outdoor spaces are what sets a great community apart from a poor one
All of these elements should be considered without prioritizing one over another - a balanced approach will be best over the long term.
Do not change existing neighborhoods
If the pandemic taught us anything, it's that people want and need space. So, again, thoughtful, practical housing is what we need. Not housing that crams people and cars like sardines.
Stop ruining the character of neighborhoods
All these elements are important. Setbacks, noise and nuisance must also be considered.
Water and power infrastructure
Input from adjacent landowners and community.
Too many restrictions will
Other than physical infrastructure that impacts the whole neighbourhood (eg both natural and manmade stormwater management) all of the above options are simply aesthetic preferences and cannot be used to block the development of housing.
"All of these are being compromised with densifying ...i.e., infills....8 ""homes"" on a 50 foot lot...not even Edmonton is this stupid.

I am praying that Calgary Party oust all the useless councillors that are not addressing the idiocy of densifying the core of this city when IT IS NOT NECESSARY.. when technology allows people to work and live anywhere! WHAT WASTE OF \$."
"drainage and stormwater management are critical infrastructure for a resilient community. Beautiful and livable neighborhoods always include trees (shrubs, less so)
sidewalks are also important"
I think diversity in building design should be encouraged, so new developments don't wind up all looking the same.
I don't want to hold my neighbour's hand through my windows
Existing communities should allow more diverse types of housing as well as taller multiple unit low density buildings. Duplex is not high density!!
I don't want someone looking in my yard. I want the sun to grow plants and restore the trees the developers knock down.
"overall building height - no more than 1 story taller than neighbours
property access - walkways and entrances consider privacy for neighbours"
Nothing else
These multi unit buildings towering over existing homes is unfair. All the trees are removed. The garages are too small for parking so you have 2 vehicles per unit on the street. The density is ruining communities
Contextual design of the building respecting the heritage of the older neighbourhoods pre - 1940. Limit heights to 2 stories in a 2 story neighbourhood
Impact of multi family units on next door neighbors property value. Sloppy construction sites.
Noise bylaws need to be revised. I have a very noisy neighbour. Bylaw does not enforce noise levels in my yard. They enforce noise levels inside my house with all the windows closed!
make it look pretty and inviting to people, especially pedestrians
All the above are of course important. Rankings for the above would be a better form on input for you.
Planning must be done to ensure a fit in the location and neighbourhood to maintain the nature of the community being impacted. Perhaps there should be some difference based on the age of the community. Focus more on very old or brand new neighbourhoods for the majority on densification.
I don't understand how drainage and stormwater management is on this list - is it not a non-negotiable?

<p>The zoning bylaws should help to drive development towards a overall urban design that addresses the needs of all stakeholders, addresses our climate crisis, and facilitates affordable housing. The list of check boxes provided above is very specific to a single lot with no mention of urban design concepts.</p>
<p>When or how is it determined that the density of a neighborhood has become 'too much'?</p>
<p>"The fabric of communities are changing because we're losing our urban forest and biodiversity. Rowhousing, etc that requires storm drains means grounwater isn't replenished. There isn't enough space or soil volume left on these lots for any meaningful plantings and to add privacy. Our bird and critter populations will suffer.</p>
<p>Also, the loss of trees means the loss of cooling....so, more A/C, more noise for adjacent neighbors to put up with, especially with row housing where A/C is four units now"</p>
<p>"Water, utilities ans how how old these are. When discussing existing trees, again the age is so important. Most trees are too old for residential area after 40ish years.</p>
<p>Houses don't need to look the same, but should be close to around the same height without disrupting the current privacy of those around them. Parking on the street should not have to increase without infrastructure to support it."</p>
<p>Must keep parking and protect our urban canopy. 60% lot coverage is too much. Stick to 10 m height to avoid overshadowing/overlooking.</p>
<p>Function before all else, if we can't function in the spaces there will be conflicts</p>
<p>Site layout, design, and height all affect shadowing and privacy issues. Contextual height (sec. 541.2) needs to be kept, starting at 7m, not 8m. Protections from undo contrast with the adjacent dwellings needs to be maintained! The higher the contextual height chamfer starts, the less effective it is - 7m is already high compared to our standard bungalows! Many of our bungalows are well maintained and will be there a long time - respect them! Contextual front setback also helps with shadowing!</p>
<p>Vehicle traffic should also consider bikes and pedestrians. Specially how will the Zoning Bylaw enable safe accessible pedestrian travel where redevelopment is proposed in areas that DO NOT have sidewalks?</p>
<p>Current landowners bought their homes knowing their neighbourhood and surrounding homes don't impede views, block sunlight or create more traffic on the street. Areas, such as Sundance, could easily be ruined by taller buildings as a result of re-zoning.</p>
<p>Keeping single family neighborhoods with limited access as single family.</p>
<p>These all need to be reviewed and addressed and as previously said, actually considered. Trees are supposed to be part of designs, but rarely enforced. The water main break has highlighted the need to ensure demand can be met and that dollars are available for infrastructure and maintenance. Privacy and height restrictions and setbacks from property lines are also critical</p>

My privacy and sunlight will be gone . But yet I've paid property taxes for years . This is how I get thanked ?
Relaxed rules on architectural design erodes value in existing properties.
Some homeowners will be unhappy with our communities' housing and infrastructure changing. But the simple fact is that our community has already changed. We've grown at an incredible pace and are punishing younger generations. Its time to adapt to meet the present crisis and build for the future.
You cannot allow developers to build smack in the middle of a suburban neighbourhood , not a main road a freaking 6 plex on a cul de sac that is no where near city centre.
Owners who live in areas that are being developed bought in those locations because of style and shape of community. When the above items are not looked at, it can force owners to lose value in their community. Look at the West District development, single family home community and now there are MEGA condos and towers, shops and store, parking problems, noise problems, loss of community and none of the above were considered. 5-10 story buildings overshadowing 20 +yr old homes - disgraceful
Parking is a huge issue. The transit system is too slow, incomplete, and developing too slowly to meet the needs of citizens. We need sufficient parking.
Respecting existing residents who purchased in a neighbourhood with single family homes.
Privacy should be an important consideration. Neighbouring property owners often have chosen a specific property because of its privacy and don't need windows overlooking their windows or yards (please consider yards too, not just the building). In a building, you can put blinds. In a yard, you cannot raise a super high fence, you cannot add trees to close to the fence.
I think having privacy in my own home and my own yard is super important and something that is decent in my current place, but not 100%. Parking is definitely an issue thankfully I live on a cul-de-sac so traffic is not an issue for my house, but I know it is for other locations within my community. To prevent floods, we need to be aware of our drainage in stormwater management and making sure that we can meet the needs for those in the community. We need to make sure other services are provided
Shadowing is happening right now with us. City said it was not a problem with computer models come and live here and you'll see what shadowing is doing.
Mayor and most of council is not listening to Calgarians. We told you during the hearings how blanket rezoning is wrong and why. You aren't listening!
"Again, with big multiplexes built beside residential they will loose privacy from those being able to look into the he houses, blocking light. That is a big deal to hose that bought their houses to have some privacy and view that is not just another building
All of these things impact the psychological for people that moved to a residential area to give them a lifestyle they wanted"

See above
The minimum yard space in between the houses has promoted for significant congestion in new communities. Likewise, this caused a lot of privacy and security concerns as well where vehicles of non-resident are parked in front of an homeowners yard, sometimes leaving their car parked for more than a day.
Very difficult to density with multistorey next to established single family homes
The infrastructure particularly ingress and egress in older neighborhoods does not support the increased density the city is forcing on those neighborhoods.
Proper setbacks between homes with space
Waste and recycling storage and street space for pickup
There needs to be more marked crosswalks on busy streets with activated lights
I hate when they take out mature trees. So sad.
Parking is a massive safety concern. The city seems to keep thinking that people just will stop driving. Quit being so ignorant. You live by the mountains. People drive out to the mountains with a car. People have kids. They need to drive their kids around. More pedestrians are at risk of being hit by cars because they step out onto the road and there is no warning for a car to see them because all the parked cars are on the street and we can't see the sidewalk.
Building houses or units higher than the homes in the rest of the street has an adverse impact on residents (blocking sun) and vegetation/animals as well as the overall value and feel of the community and should be disallowed.
Where and how large windows for ventilation are placed. Because then people put in air conditioning due to poor design and lack of trees. Placement of these buildings in a block, the size of buildings in relation to the lot. The exterior design should be similar to the area.
I bought in a quiet neighborhood and don't want my older neighbors to cash out to a developer and ruin our neighborhood and make it impossible to park and enjoy our backyard.
There are applications in our neighborhood for 8 units on a single lot. Ridiculous. There is no room whatsoever for parking, garbage etc. I agree with using the land available better, but must be reasonable. Two on a small lot is more reasonable. You also still need to consider the character of the neighborhoods. There are many new neighborhoods being built with high density in Calgary. You don't need to transform existing neighborhoods that way.
"Stop destroying communities through ridiculous over densification. For example, the minto project will destroy Killarney as the existing road infrastructure cannot handle an additional 1000+ cars entering and exiting everyday.

Council and the city workers should be working for residents of the city and tax payers, not developers. Stop allowing these developers to pad their pockets by ruining neighborhoods."
areas should have a relatively consistent feel. Giant buildings with no parking are going to be a disaster for the immediate vicinity for a variety of reasons.
People choose their home based on what is in place of that time. Changes to the neighborhood, negatively impact a person's enjoyment of their home. People often can't afford to move because a new development happens in their neighborhood.
"We can replace trees, traffic and parking are a problem we can easily solve as we have more density and prioritize private vehicle less.
Shadowing may be a good thing as climate change gets worse."
New developments must respect existing neighbours and the local context. An eighteen story tower where there are only buildings of less than eight stories is not in keeping with the neighbourhood (ie Marda Loop). Neighbourhoods evolve but this should happen slowly.
Too much growth leading to traffic and parking issues. Taxes continue to go up but things feel worse
Shadowing is a major concern especially given our long winters
See above
Everything is important and it has been neglected with the rezoning
"Maintaining the character of certain neighborhoods is important
As most in Calgary use personal vehicles for travel, adequate parking in residential developments is adequate (ie. One spot per unit)"
All of it is equally important.
Fire safety. Sometimes they build the new house so close to the older ones that it creates a fire risk of spreading between buildings when there previously wasn't that risk.
RENTAL PROPERTIES MOVING INTO SINGLE FAMILY AREAS
Vehicles take up a massive amount of public space that could be used to make neighbourhoods more beautiful. I think we need more bicycle and public transit infrastructure, which would allow for higher density and lower traffic/parking.
The value of the houses are decreased, not cheap for the 8 families to have 4 parking stalls , no place for their children or pets or family to garden, have a BBQ.

no multi family developments in single family home residential areas
Again, buildings must be contextual. Increased density must be balanced with the general look of the neighbourhood.
Greater consideration towards flexibility on architectural form, style, design integrity in parallel to the intent of the Bylaw - allowing for elements to be maintained that create greater design and diversity
Stop over building areas! Home owners bought their home in a single family home area now we have to put up with multi-family living in a single home and infill multi units this destroys our property values.
Off street parking must be 1 parking stall per 1 dwelling unit.
Listen to the community input ...and develop a process in which all voices are heard. One city wide plan is not appropriate.
Architectural fit & design is critically important.
All these things contribute to the use and enjoyment of neighbouring properties. Again, lower lot coverage and upa and these will help naturally.
The way building height is calculated in R-CG (and what's being proposed for the new bylaw) is a mess, use of imaginary lines for localized depressions, measuring from anywhere along a building s finished grade to measure to the opposite side of the home, and very difficult to represent in a 2D drawing makes every submission a gamble as all plan checkers look at it differently, R-C1 while it did have it flaws was a lot easier to follow and to be checked by the planners.
Density is necessary but planning is substantially lacking. Changes to zoning will make this worse and does nothing to preserve the character and desirability of legacy communities in the inner city.
It's not just about preserving existing free space and trees. It is also important to create space for replacement planting and sufficient soil volume. Also capturing stormwater.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
If all of these zoning requirements are not considered, communities will be wrecked from developers that build, make a profit, and leave the existing residents with a ruined community.
Existing buildings
You've left off the size of the dwelling. 8-plexes should not be allowed on single 50-foot lots in the middle of a residential block.
Infrastructure. Water and electricity usage

Personal space and a sense you can reasonably know what you are getting when you choose to invest in a neighborhood
There are so many things to consider - and yet it is too late. City council has gone from 0 to 100 with the blanket rezoning. They have thrown away privacy, trees, shrubs, parking. They have diminished home owners property values.
Need to preserve the character of existing neighborhoods
Because mixed era communities have no cohesion. They are unattractive and more mix reduces property values. Design adjustments are good but the overall look and feel of a street and / or community should have the same flow
Architectural fir and design has to be more important to the city of Calgary. Lately new developments lack any design and are of poor design. Having a design guideline or designs that are not boxes will help shape Calgary.
Old infrastructure ie. sewage, water that hasnt been investigated and will not support high densities. Transportation infrastructure - existing road framework cannot support the influx of the high density the city is approving. Why should existing community members lifestyles and home equity be severely compromised because of the high density the city continues to push through.
Any development should reduce impacts on neighboring properties parking is the biggest issue on my street. There would be a lot less opposition if parking were addressed. This also includes an increase in problems with waste and recycling as we have no lane and need street space for these uses as well.
All of these listed items are important. Most 311 calls are about neighbour issues. That tells you something about living to close together. Matters will only get worse if there is no privacy, no light for gardens and plants/trees, no parking for pick up trucks, no method to get excess water off the property after rain storms.
The above should be ranked. Shadowing, sunlight and trees and shrubs should be first
Old and new on same street - add variation. Cookie cutter everywhere is so boring.
Proper snow removal / placement and drainage for snow melt is crucial to prevent damming which is an issue. Sunlight access will affect neighbor's ability to landscape their yards. Offstreet parking availability (underground) should be mandatory. Street parking should not be allowed near high density areas because it creates blindspots for drivers and pedestrians and affects space for garbage pickup. Security and exterior building maintenance and landscaping should be mandatory requirements
The neighbours and neighbourhoods. The facts housing prices are just going up for less home and no yard or personal space. It is terrible
The highlighted characteristics determine the livability and quality of life for a property and neighbourhood, and indeed the well being of the residents.

When building higher set home - ensure the drainage is NOT in the existing older homes back homes causing flooding and damage!
Nobody should be able to dictate someone else's taste. You don't want to see your neighbors ugly paint job? Don't live near 1.5M people.
Far too many developments are dwarfing the existing homes in established neighbourhoods. It changes the entire use of one's backyard when there is considerable shading and loss of privacy. The current land use bylaw allows for developments that are far too tall and far too deep to take into consideration shading and privacy.
"Alternative modes of transportation have to be available and effective so that fewer cars are on the road
Storm water and drainage should have increased capacity before new constructions are built.
Privacy shouldn't really be an issue, large front facing windows are the largest privacy concern imo, and people already deal with these issues with blinds.
Trees and shrubs get ripped up instantly, very sad. Greenery is very important.
I also think that interesting places are eclectic and diverse."
Our well being.
Neighbourhood use. A 10 plex in the middle of the block of family homes is community busting! Multi family if fine if residents are considered. Affordable housing doesn't have to be nasty - to punish the residents but reward the developer?!
Spacing between residential buildings.
I think the City needs to do a better job setting expectations, there are no guarantees. Neighbourhoods change out of necessity, and just because your neighbour used to be a single story detached doesn't mean it always will be. I also think that greenspace should be protected, a new building could kill an entire garden. And new, dense, infills, that are built in areas with limited on-street parking, should be denied residential parking permits - setting expectations for the new arrivals
New developments just need to have have trees and shrubs planted and maintained for a certain number of years - doesn't have to be the same trees. People think developers don't need to replant but they do so communicate that and monitor the plantings.
Drainage and stormwater management is not optional. Traffic and parking are not going away any time soon. Lack of privacy causes ongoing friction. Although existing trees and architectural fit are important, they must be able to evolve over time.
Design things for old people we are looking at re-developing right now we've been in the same house 35 years and we need something without stairs going forward because everything the city wants is ground

oriented. It means we can't redevelop and stay in the neighborhood. We want something smaller on one level and we don't mind increase density, but we have to get away from stairs and we certainly don't want to move through our area.
Parking is a main concern. There needs to be at least one designated parking space per new unit built. Anything less causes more cars to park on the street and drives congestion in the community. New developments should also consider preserving the existing trees and shrubs as these are often many years old and add character to the neighbourhood.
Architectural fit and design has been totally overlooked in many historical neighborhoods.
When was the last time a new public park was built in the northwest? Look around—there's a striking lack of green infrastructure in this part of Calgary. Families, children, seniors, and everyday residents need these open spaces to relax, connect, and thrive. Green spaces aren't just nice to have; they're critical for mental health, community connection, and overall quality of life.
For two building semi-detached, it would be beneficial for the second residential building be incorporate with the garage. This would eliminate one building, increase amenity space, and allow for more trees/shrubs to be planted. Also allows for the second building to align with garages, and the front building to align with dwellings, thus decreasing privacy and shadowing concerns.
Quality and design of construction - mixed use, density, etc can all be encouraged and welcomed if design/quality is high and the neighbourhood character is considered. For example, restrict shadowing and encourage sunlight access. Use of quality materials regulated (e.g. poor siding in NE - in thunderstorm alley)!
See prior answer.
Quality of new buildings
Citizens have no faith in this government.
Denser construction should include underground parkade options, especially in areas with less access to (good) public transit
People still need and want cars and need somewhere to park them. I already see people parking on adjacent blocks in my neighborhood with the 5-10 unit complexes at the end of the block...who wants to haul groceries from their car parked 2 blocks away in -40?? Also nobody wants to ride the loser cruiser transit system and risk their life with all the crack heads. Building higher is an invasion of neighbors privacy.
What about adequate infrastructure for water, sewer, and electricity? There are over 60 new units being built within a block of my home. So far only 8 are occupied and already we are experiencing lower water pressure. What is going to happen when all new units are occupied?
There should be dedicated areas only for multi unit residences to be put up. No one wants an apartment building or townhouse complex right next door especially overlooking their backyard. If the city clearly

states the areas in which this could happen it would give peace of mind to homeowners. Right now there is no guarantee that a street with all single family dwellings can suddenly have a multi unit development right beside. Should be strategic placement, ie corner lots, high traffic areas

The tree canopy for me is more important than anything at this point with our changing climate and the incredible length of time it takes to establish mature trees... Ensuring that new developments have trees as a part of their plan is critical. There are so many call Aspen's being put in as a token and dying within a year because they have no sun and cannot thrive and we're never well suited to the limited green space on the site to begin with. It's a little bit laughable.

We need to be mindful of what additional units looks like for the neighbourhood and direct neighbours. We can't financially drain people because we put up an apartment building beside their house making it impossible to sell and a loss of equity. We can built multiple units on a property in a respectful, and affordable manner without it being a apprentice building or 2-4 \$1M+ units

Privacy, overlooking, shadowing and sunlight must be taken into consideration, existing residents should not be negatively impacted by new development. Retention of mature green canopy is a priority, parking needs to be included in ALL new developments, the .05 parking is useless, people have vehicles, Calgary is a car City. Transit does not go everywhere. Designs must consider the existing style and character of the community. Aging infrastructure cannot handle the increased uses.

New zoning rules RCG is too broad. It is basically build anything anywhere. What about compensation to homeowners who bought in rc1 and rc2 zoning who now are stuck with the new stupid rules. I don't even think it is legal to alter my title deed. So stupid. So much land in calgary and you are squeezing things in with no planning. Can't even drive through altadore anymore. Multi units with windows looking into brick walls. Planning department doesn't know what they are doing

Vehicle parking is most important. Also building the ugliest Infills is ruining most communities.

Private use and enjoyment is a legal right

Maintain the ability of home owners to enjoy their property.

People paying taxes shouldn't have reduced areas to park. There shouldn't be road reduction for bike lanes in our climate.

Added density impact on critical water/sewer infrastructure.

Maybe don't demolish perfectly good homes, like the River Run homes, which the City tossed in the landfill so it could make a developer more money. That action speaks to who and what this government is at it core - the prime value of this government is to make senior city workers and their rich friends more wealthy. Things like competently providing services has not been a priority for many years.

Again, build more faster, design is secondary

You are missing the most important one - lot coverage. If you have hardscape on the full lot, there is no room for landscape? Why are we not considering building up with strategic multi-story developments

before building on every horizontal surface? I don't understand the direction this zoning is taking the City. I feel we missed an interim step to increase density.
I think the plan is a backwards approach where the City should be asking residents first what they'd like to see then create a plan accordingly. Not telling residents once again what they need to expect, another top down approach.
Road safety, and cross walk safety
Parking is the biggest thing to consider, followed by privacy and equitable access to Sunlight.
Fire prevention, drainage and parking. Also amenities for all these new buildings.
We should increase allowable height and reduce side setbacks (to 0m in lots with alley access) so buildings are taller to meet density targets but with a smaller footprint to not eliminate tree canopy, have green spaces, and improve storm water capacity. Overlooking privacy should not be such a big concern.
The current 8-units that are allowed on R-CG lots is too high. It should be a maximum 4 (ex. Duplex structure with suites). And ALL units should have a minimum of 1-parking-stall-per-unit
Existing development should not be significantly impacted by new development and have their neighborhood significantly changed...streets become overcrowded, sun blocked, green spaces / greenery removed or significantly reduced.
Safety. Surrounding houses and families. Property values reduced by injecting row housing in the middle of single family areas of established neighbourhoods
We are losing trees, parks, green spaces and sports areas inner city for development of housing and retail. Housing and increased density seems to have become a priority over green spaces, trees resulting from the past 8 years of council & mayors seemingly on the side of Developers. Impact = quality of life.
Climate features and designs
Again, parking is already a problem.
Everyone wants something new to fit in and look nice
Existing infrastructure, road maintenance, alleyway maintenance, visibility around vehicles parked on the street.
"Trees are planted and die. Healthy trees are sometimes cut down and never replaced by anything. Building to max lot size does not allow for other features.
Parking in middle housing is an issue. People have cars, even if they live in condos or secondary suites or townhouses."

Privacy and sunlight are critical for mental health.
Noise pollution from air conditioning units.
Our urban canopy is already below what it needs to be to be healthy and is decreasing with each multi-family complex built as many times there is no vegetation planting, only water wasting grass.
Bikes, walkability
Current designs are being built cheap and ugly and do not match the rest of the houses in the neighborhood. Plans are being approved without caring about running neighborhoods and streets. Parking space is not being thought out resulting in congestion that doesn't need to be there. All trees in previous lots are being taken out and replaced by ugly building structures.
The neighborhood has a certain architectural control homeowners had to abide by when building their home. The city is now allowing anything to be built. With no thought to parking, traffic, green space, trees and shadowing neighbours. City is ruining neighborhoods that people build their homes to be away from traffic, parking headaches, lack of trees, no front lawns and EYESORES IN NEIGHBORHOODS
Quit destroying existing older homes for multi units
Losing privacy due to a new large/tall dwelling going next door and also losing trees in order to make the houses the MAX size possible on the lot - is very upsetting and removes many of the main reason people choose to be in a community or specific house in the first place.
Quality, reliable utilities like water, power and roads. Concerned that competence has been optional at the City for a long time and we are in for a decade of problems with basic infrastructure.
The destruction of public trust when homeowners have to fight city hall to keep their neighborhoods in tact when all the rules were changed with no regard for public opinion or differentiation between needs of different areas of the city. Lazy, inefficient and counterproductive.
In the many instances of multi-unit building going up, there is zero consideration of parking, drainage/ storm water management, or preservation of trees and natural sunlight. This is an important issue that needs to be addressed for each building permitted individually and all residents in the surrounding area should be consulted for each individual build.
It's the rat effect, people need space or people and crime rates go up
I know you don't care about any of this based on what you're allowing. It's criminal what you're doing to our inner city. Developers of inner city homes don't profit enough to give back and you need to consider developments that can be large enough for the developer to sufficiently build and plan (eg parking for all tenants) in order for our community to truly benefit from building up in this short term agenda.
Privacy and shadowing/ sunlight access should be key considerations, followed by vehicle traffic and parking

Minimum parking requirements should be changed to 1-full-stall-per-unit and all suites should be required to have 1-parking stall per suite
As housing is made more dense, consideration needs to be given to the fact that the public transport and bike lanes are not sufficient to expect homes to be car free
If the local public elementary and junior high schools bus in less than 10% of the students, then each new development in that community that more than doubles the existing number of bedrooms needs to be justified. Stop H-Go in communities with full schools.
"Drop R-CG limits to 4 units (down from 8) as 8 is too many. Sunlight & privacy are severely limited and the buildings greatly overshadow neighbors' lots.
Minimum parking: 1-stall-per-unit + suites should have 1-parking-stall-per-suite so elderly, renters, people with disabilities, and families with young children are not discriminated against as they should park close to home.
Stop penalizing garage suites by requiring 1-stall -per-garage-suite) when Developers provide only 0.5-stalls-per-unit."
Not negatively impacting anyone
Respect the wishes of existing neighbourhood homeowners. We, like most of our neighbors bought a home in a neighbourhood because we loved the character and feel of the area. We specifically moved to our neighborhood because the developers took over our last one and completely changed the livability and character of our street
Because I think that it's really important to minimize the impact of these new developments in it's surroundings. This is related with environmental factors as well as traffic and public services.
do not allow more than 1 story taller than surrounding structures, build slowly to evolve communities.
"Don't flood your neighbor is an easy priority.
I checked off sunlight access only from the point of view of if an adjoining neighbor is dependent on the sun for energy. I'm talking solar production not gardening. I propose allowing solar panels to be moved to the adjacent building if the initial building is now in shadow and can not make the same amount of solar energy as it use to."
Privacy, sunlight, and stormwater management directly impact livability, but zoning should also support community-building—shared spaces, walkability, and connection. What's missing is attention to equity: if zoning fuels exclusivity, it shapes who gets to live there. We need bylaws that don't just manage land, but help create inclusive, connected neighbourhoods.
harmony

Need to be considered in context of neighbours so that it doesn't negatively impact their own homes and yards. Of course change is hard, but there is a balance between a new build and still have something that has a nice look, and doesn't overwhelm the neighbourhood
Yes! Bring back the contextual requirement in established neighbourhoods.
SETBACKS NEED TO BE MATCHED
A minimum of one parking stall per unit should be required for all units AND suites. By-rights approval should not be implemented as it does not in any way account for community character nor does it allow residents who are directly affected by a proposed development to have a say.
Accessibility should also play a role.
Enough water for residential area so there's NO water restrictions!
I have noticed that nearly all recent community developments have failed to employ Pt. C in Section 2.3.2 in the Calgary Plan. Take areas in the northwest such as Tuscany and Nolan Hill. The houses all look almost identical, apart from colour variation. This lack of variation decreases the value of homes, especially with the rapid urban sprawl that has occurred in Calgary, which is careless and implies that the homes within these communities are effectively made of cardboard.
New developments often don't take privacy or sharing of neighbor houses into consideration
These are the things that will have the most push back from communities and are the most likely things to send a DP to SDAB so to have clear rules helps make the process smoother.
why have these developments been approved before the bylaws rules have been changed to address them? approvals have not been contextual with neighbourhoods
These are all so important. Maximizing building footprint in combination with excessive height (11m) results in these massive structures that dwarf neighbouring properties and mostly add limited character to the existing community. These 8-plexes (4 up, 4 down) create material Shadowing and have a negative impact on neighbours' enjoyment of their own property. The parking issue puts pressure on the street capacity (a full street runs a higher risk of accidents with animals and children).
One of the reason new infills are unpopular is that they're huge and ugly. They reflect a modernist international style and they max out the entire lot with one giant, unattractive box. They don't reflect our architectural history, especially in the established neighbourhoods where they're built. The city should permit as much infill as possible, as long as it uses a complementary historical style (e.g., arts and crafts, cottage style, colonial). See Garrison Woods as an example of what to do.
These options are secondary to urgently providing housing
Items listed above are all important in the CONTEXT of the surrounding neighbourhood. Contextual design appears to not play a role in the new blanket rezoning.

There is no law to keep the upkeep of landscaping on condos and townhomes.
The city proposed this bylaw to offer affordable housing. NOTHING about those developments are affordable. You just provided insane access to them to still charge 800 K for a small unit in a 7 plex. While also destroying the integrity and nature of the neighborhoods
Those of us who own our own single family dwellings end up sandwiched between massive developments with no regard to our privacy or access to sunlight.
How close the buildings are to each other for fire safety
Developpers currently seem to be able to build anything, and as a result, new structures that don't match the neighborhood are being built and the overall aesthetic, and charm is being erased.
We bought in a neighborhood of single family houses. To change the make up of the neighborhood without the consent of everyone affected is unacceptable!!!
architectural design does not really matter
Streets, especially in heritage communities, were specifically designed. Adding multifamily developments needs to be done thoughtfully to maintain the integrity and infrastructure of these streets.
I don't wanna be looking directly into someone else's house so close to mine. Adjust the windows or change the location. And if you're gonna add more houses to the same property that used to only have one, then you'll have to do something about parking because the city is only getting busier and the city of Calgary seems to take advantage of residence to just figure it out when it's been working fine when there was only one house on one lot, not 4-8 units on one lot with no parking options.
There's nothing inherently wrong with people choosing to live in neighborhoods with single family housing (or homes with basement suites). Keep high density to the busier streets and shopping areas. It feels like developers are holding all the cards.
Existing residents should be a priority when it comes to privacy. New construction often supercedes the existing rights of neighboring lots. Homeowners often purchase in areas specifically for existing privacy. Architectural design is often dismissed in favor of building box style structures using cheaper basic materials.
You cannot accommodate people in housing without sufficient parking. At least 1 parking spot per unit.
Bylaws need to insure parking space for new residential buildings to prevent resident vehicles occupying public parking in the street.
Not cramming in as much as possible. 12 units on a lot that used to have one house on it is ridiculous and not tenable.

0.5-stalls-per-unit TOO LOW. It should be 1-stall-per-unit. We're experiencing major congestion issues with 4+ 4 suites and this is discriminatory for seniors and disabled individuals- they're denied equal access to housing due to mobility/accessability needs (can't park and walk far, especially in winter re: slip/fall risk). Public transit isn't close enough nor reliable enough in the winter. Lack of parking effectively excludes elderly/disabled from living in areas without adequate parking
Nobody wants to live in a concrete jungle. At the same time driving and drainage are important.
Having neighbors looking right into your rooms, backyard, is invasive. People don't feel secure or free to use their own space
Too much design control results in "cookie cutter" neighborhoods.
Demographic and safety. Property value and matching like for like.
See above reason.
You cram too many homes too close together, people have NO PRIVACY. Your climate indoctrination better not see you try to block the sun or other stupid things other countries are trying to do!
These are all extremely important. Especially in a city with aging infrastructure
Not all existing trees and shrubs are worth keeping. Obviously, beautiful mature trees are worth keeping. On the other hand, half dead or diseased trees and shrubs belonging to the City should be removed in a timely manner and replaced if necessary.
parks and green spaces need to be included in planning
Care to eliminate building in areas such as river or creek overflow. I see some subdivisions in the south with development in an area that I feel like will be prone to flooding some seasons. I am a geologist (with some geography as well, with study on landforms and natural disasters) so feel my point of view is most likely reasonable.
Buildings should be designed to not overshadow or shade neighboring residences as well as be required to have 1.0 parking stalls-per-unit constructed (and include suites in this requirement)
Whether the property will be a rental property. Landlords need to be visible and make sure to property works for the tenants and works with the community. Proper parking allowances, and also snow and ice removal.
Density. Limiting excessive density will mitigate all of the above impacts. Changing density from RC-1 to RC-2 is reasonable. Changing a single family lot to an 8 unit condo is not. Blanket rezoning will exacerbate the land use impacts described above.
Mental wellbeing, access to nature, ability to grow plants (needs sunlight), seating areas, walkability, security.

We need to focus on the environment, so landscaping is most important in my opinion. I don't care about vehicle traffic and parking, or privacy. We live in a city of 1.5 million people. We aren't going to have private get-aways in a city that big.
I support less regulation overall. I have seen many creative build forms from small redevelopment.
More compact development will result in city spending less per household for utility maintenance (including road that needed to be maintain)
See above. I am opposed to any structures more dense than a standard two dwelling duplex on most inner city lots, with the exception of corner lots.
managing expectations of single-family home owners in terms of what is reasonable for maintaining privacy.
All of the above ! To be beside a towering three story in an old bungalow is undesirable . Save the multi buildings for corner lots only . Duplex infills are lovely - keep that up .
These concerns should not fully cancel any developments from happening, HOWEVER it is understandable that residents have their comments be reselectively taken notes during the design process.
Don't change the feel of suburban neighbourhoods.
The main problem is the government itself. Until there is a major overhaul of city leadership, there is no path forward to a competent plan for housing. Housing problems will only get worse under this current government. Calgary is such a great City, despite having a municipal government that citizens cannot trust or respect.
Already hard to find parking in zero lot communities, adding more units would make it even more impossible. To the existing residents, it changes the principles of the neighborhood they initially bought into. Buying into a quiet suburban neighborhood with minimal neighbors that unwittingly turns into a dense, multi housing neighborhood. Not what some people paid/signed up for.
It takes a lot of time to regrow trees and fix drainage, but curtains are inexpensive to put up
Forcing developments to follow existing neighbourhood norms limits density. I think people should be able to build what they want on their own property as long as it doesn't directly cause harm to the adjacent homes, as could be the case with improper drainage. I would not consider shade, limited street parking or having your window facing another window a "harm." These are minor inconveniences and should not be enforced with bylaws.
Only safety matters. Otherwise let the market decide. Shade is a safety concern for our seniors. Water is obvious

Traffic to surrounding commercial buildings can utilize limited parking and negatively impact tradesmen and delivery people.
Retain similar housing type to existing. No mixed use
I think a focus should be placed on ensuring that approved developments adhere to a wide range of architectural designs to improve the look of our communities. We should ensure there is good articulation on all visible areas and even encouraged on less visible areas.
listening to citizens
Overcrowding. It's happening. Please stop.
All of these things are important when thinking about building design because people value these things. This has been the norm for so many years and people will choose to live in areas with these aspects in place. People are fine with change, but if it happens too much too soon that's where you get pushback.
Retain the provision for single family homes. The above noted are all necessary to be considered and the impact on the residents and community. Many of the new designs stick out like a blight on the neighbourhood, time for architectural controls.
Lot coverage.
People need space like yards and gardens
No one wants 16 units beside their sfh
I don't want to be a nimbby
I would like to see these implemented but not at the cost of more development.
"Enabling more mixed use development is essential for providing better, more convenient communities.
Normalizing building codes with Edmonton to enable pre-fabricated housing is essential.
Vehicle traffic and parking are frequently used in bad faith arguments. Like if on average less than a quarter of on-street parking is being used, then parking is probably not a big issue. And if the road has little traffic on it, a 4-plex won't make a big impact. Verifying correctness of arguments is good."
Change the zoning bylaws back.
Just no rezoning in existing neighborhoods.
The current new residential developments I have seen online are definitely NOT geared for low income or considered affordable to the individuals needing them most. The City is NOT approving low income developments or putting their main focus in this area Where it is needed most of all ... instead the

permits being approved are for multi units costing over over 700,000 each!!! This is wrong and not going to solve the problem.
If people like the look of something, it's a lot easier to deal with the change.
as is applied in building new communities, these same considerations need to be equally applied in redeveloping older communities. R1 exists in new communities and so should they remain in old communities.
View older neighbourhoods and stick to design that focuses more about families and less about maximizing profits. Older neighbourhoods are far better than newer.
People need to feel safe. Parking would be better off street, like in Japan. Sunlight is important in the North. Cities don't have to be biodiversity dead spots.
People are healthier and happier in beautiful places with green spaces
They're all important. Without greenspace or trees, stormwater is running into neighbouring properties. There are cars parked everywhere so we may want to move to permits in my neighbourhood. I'm sick of seeing 8-15m trees being cut down and replaced with shrubs, drought resistant landscaping and no grass. I get the direction but the overall impact of the overbuilding "next door" is no privacy, no sunlight, ugly housing that is too tall and too big, with no trees to soften how ugly it is.
Because Calgary is so large people continue to need vehicles even if they live in a dense area. Most households have 2 cars
Families want privacy and room to grow.
Public transportation, especially since rural bus service is kaput, does not accommodate the need to move quickly and to bring cargo where it is needed. Canada is a vast country where private vehicles are usually the only option, especially where new developments have no reasonable transit access. Therefore, skip the woke-wacko idiotology and make sure parking is a priority consideration.
Footprints and height allowances should not be in such contrast to existing homes. And there has to be a limit in existing residential areas to the number of additional doors allowed - maximum of 2.
Having just come back from a trip to Vancouver, I noticed they maintain a lot of their old growth trees and it creates a great environment. Would like to see more of this
The fact that this government hides as much as possible behind closed doors and prioritizes profit for friendly developer above the well being of citizens.
I think the city needs to take seriously the need for climate resilient housing and energy efficient homes.
Infrastructure capacity, for example, water and sewer pipes.

failing infrastructure can't support the current population in these neighborhoods. You are creating conflict and Calgarians don't trust you.
Respect the neighborhood and what it took for people to buy into that area. We worked our lives to live in an area that isn't full of rental buildings and high density buildings.
Sunlight privacy and trees are why people buy houses. Don't infringe on those.
Traffic management is critical. The city is growing in population rapidly and development is not aligned with road infrastructure
City doesn't listen to us (Remember blanket rezoning)
Traffic creates chaos. As does incorrect deainage
NONE of the new current infill multiplexes in neighbourhoods I have toured follow any of the above qualifications. NOBODY from the city is holding these developers accountable or making appropriate interventions to ensure more than the bare minimum are met.
We've already had an issue with water usage and now are putting more people in areas with old pipes/drainage systems. And many of these new (big!) buildings cut off sunlight from neighbours and create privacy concerns because the new dwvelipmemts are taller than what is already in an area for housing.
Next election??!
The average citizen gets very pearl-clutchy about nonsense like shading of their vegetable garden. Or they for some reason think that everyone is interested in their bloated sunbathing body. They neglect important infrastructure issues like water management, waste collection, etc. Until they have a problem!
"Increase in property taxes,
infrastructure services and facilities, amenities required for the development
Transit services"
"Traffic and parking! This is a priority of the majority of Calgarians.
People don't want bedroom windows 10feet from someone else's bedroom window."
"With the densification that is happening in Calgary and with transit advancements not keeping up we are a very car-reliant city. This needs to be taken into account for zoning bylaws. If off-street parking is not mandatory, it becomes on street parking and can become a concern for access of emergency services, or just access to your own house.

As well there is such a push to increase our canopy, but there is currently no mandate to try to protect the mature canopy we currently have."
If the city decides to wreck a neighbourhood do to their rezoning they should be considering that now they have devalued an individuals property due to their reckless decisions then property taxes should be reduced to reflect the property devaluation.!
"Not all builders follow the extensive rules. Some get away with so much crapjust walk around. -It's evident. Some seem to be allowed to do whatever they want without recourse.
A wholistic view of necessary infrastructure would be helpful and a consideration of quality of life.
Buildings need maintenance if you build. Who is responsible then if renters can barely afford the rent and builders TAKE profit without recourse for ensuring longevity of the structure?"
The city is allowing too many rowhouses in neighbourhoods where the predominant building design are detached homes or duplexes. The city needs to stop rubber stamping these new rowhouses that do not fit the character of these neighbourhoods.
We are dealing with this on our street. The developer is entitled to build to the allowed maximum to the detriment of me and my neighbors. Privacy!
Infrastructure being overwhelmed by density added in areas that were not designed for it with aged pipes and electric grids and small roads meant for less populated areas. Like Montgomery and bowness, these areas were torn apart to add bike lanes and now traffic is insane. Calgary can't have it's cake and eat it too - bikes or density. You can't take room for cars off the table then add more cars.
All of these things are accepted factors of living in the city. If you don't want issues with privacy, or motor vehicle parking, or shadowing, move out to the county, out of the city, away from everybody else, and then you can have that. But when you live in the city, there is going to be other people living around you, and people need to accept that.
Infrastructure including schools, electricity, sewerage, plumbing etc. other items in the area including senior homes.
Just have some common sense & prioritize those who have already invested in communities.
Preserving the character of the neighborhood is most important. No multi family homes in single home neighborhoods period.
Streets with detached homes should only permit detached homes being built
While preserving existing trees, plants and shrubs is not a priority, maximizing the presence of these is very important.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

QUIT CRAMMING DENSITY DOWN OUR THROATS AND CHOPPING DOWN ALL THE MATURE TREES IN NEIGHBORHOODS

The impacts I selected are those that directly impact the existing residents and they should be considered the highest

It's important to try and maintain existing trees or replace with new ones. Sunlight access could be considered (blocking another home's sunlight) but it should lead to mitigation not cancelling of new developments

Housing typologies and designs change over time. There should be ZERO consideration for how a new home "fits" (or doesn't) within the character of the structures around it. At some point, all of Calgary was farm land. The homes that exist today and were built 10-80 years ago didn't reflect the former farmyard "character" so why would we start enforcing that now? There is no "right" to sunlight, and while overlooking/privacy should be mitigated, it should not prevent the delivery of housing.

I believe that architectural fit and design is the first priority and ensuring creative design that enhances the existing area.

For people's health and safety. Having one's own green space has a direct impact on quality of life. Plants are healing and essential. Forcing cars to park on the street is a safety issue. People choose the community they want to buy in. The blanket approach is trying to transform the communities all into the same architectural feel. It brings down Calgary's appeal and takes away from its history.

Vehicle traffic should reflect the local community and transportation needs - ie, an LRT station should be a high priority location for increased density

We asked: Which of the following should be top priorities in the design of new housing buildings? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Overall tree count and greenery
- Preservation of mature trees
- Outdoor amenity spaces (patios, balconies, and yards)
- Landscaping for design and privacy
- Managing the view of waste and recycling bins
- Minimizing the visual impact of utilities (e.g., air conditioners, gas and water meters)
- Rainwater management

We also asked **Why? Do you think there is anything else challenging or important to consider?** and received the following feedback:

Mature trees are invaluable. Can hack a 60 yr old tree and replace with a bush and think they count the same. Tree canopy is being taken away.
Overall greenery is key to making an area feel livable and welcoming. Mature trees should be prioritized when possible but not when these are at end of life, and not in all cases when this would sacrifice the best site design.
Material choices for rainwater management are key to reduce the risk of flooding.
In mature areas like mine, new developments often remove every tree, shrub and blade of grass from the site and dig up to the property line. The new landscaping is often minimal and planting of trees is not incentivized
The development happening in my area remove mature trees that took 40 years to grow, and they don't plant a single tree when they are done. Tree replacement should be mandatory. Trees add beauty, brings in nature and induces calm. They are also important for the environment.
Fitting the existing community layout, design and appeal. Do not bring low income housing and desirable rental units to an established single family dwelling community.
Please encourage front porches which make friendlier neighbourhoods
Start with impact on neighbours for each of the above. 3 storeys next to a bungalow? Massing/shadowing impacts ruins neighbour's use and enjoyment of property. 12 garbages/bins along a shared fence? Too smelly, ugly. 5 parking spaces for 10 units? conflicts. No room for tree roots or space to grow? Trees die soon after planting.
Use common sense. Start with "if I lived next door, would I accept this?" If not, then rework the DP. Developers build anything, anywhere without consideration of impact"

Ensuring that the rest of the neighborhood is walkable and is designed in such a way that encourages people to walk and or bike. Otherwise, amenities such as street-facing patios provide little benefit cuz there's no one walking by to have a conversation with.
The trade offs here are again false. All must be considered and cannot be sacrificed for developer profits.
Increasing greenery as much as possible promotes increased levels of wellbeing. Rainwater management is also a priority because it can influence things like flooding and the wellbeing of nearby plants.
Function and aesthetics are important and I believe can have an impact on physical and mental health. Having a usable private outdoor space is important.
I have a builder putting 2 a/c units by my master bedroom window. That should be illegal.
City Planners have told us that they don't consider draining in DPs. This is ridiculous. Neighbours have been impacted & they get the run around from the City. You should be monitoring all the people who are draining their water onto City property. Same goes for the garbage that is flying all over from overflowing bins.
Having lived near parts of the pathway network for most of my life, I think that designing housing to accommodate spaces within neighbourhoods for expansions of the path network would serve a through a variety of ways. Beyond maintaining Calgary's tree coverage, the pathways provide alternatives to sidewalks which are safer, can help tie communities and amenities together, and provide amenities entirely on their own -- New buildings with direct access to (new) pathway networks.
Respect for the existing neighbours that have lived there for years. They bought a nice lot so nobody could look into their backyards. Then a 3 storey H-GO shows up and they lose daylight and privacy....
The City of Calgary needs to consider & be aware that extra condos that have been built in Toronto & Vancouver, for the purpose of supplying extra housing, are not being sold or rented because they have overbuilt. These cities are having a hard time getting buyers or renters & buildings are sitting empty. Is this is what is going to happen in Calgary? Do the City planners not keep track of what is being built in places like the University Area & assess if extra housing is needed?
Outdoor amenity spaces take up a lot of space and cost and resources and are usually not designed in ways that actually get used much. Improved design rather than token allocations need to be mandated.
All water management is going to be challenging. Asking residents to not use water all summer is not an acceptable management strategy.
Tree canopy, respectful and functional design, reaching out to the community and the residents to work together to form their neighbourhoods. People are feeling forced out of their forever homes so that excessive density can house too many individuals and will ultimately cause conflict. Bad planning!!

Building properties with "zero" lot lines is good for the developer/builder, but adding a few feet can make a viable difference and make for "visually pleasing" neighborhoods. Might as well make them all rowhouses/townhomes.
I don't think it will be enjoyable for new residents to lose the benefits that mature districts have — in my case over 60 years. It is part of what makes it pleasant — especially looking ahead to hotter times.
The top priority in the design of new housing buildings should be density and trees
Community context (look and feel)
I think it really matters for the homeowners and potential buyers that there is relative cohesiveness in building design and inclusion of landscaping for design and privacy. Otherwise we are just living in a depressing and cold concrete jungle.
Actual design and materials on new builds. Increased amount of trees required to be planted > not just the one token Columnar aspen (these are literally just sticks in the earth; no habitat in these) !!!! > and Junipers do not grow. A Follow-up program to ensure that the proposed trees have been planted and are actually growing. Limit amount of concrete on allowed on properties > creates problems with rainwater management.
Currently, there is no consideration for management of waste and bins in these new builds in older neighborhoods. That's wrong, disrespectful and such an eyesore
Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
All items should be considered. So new development should be different then redevelopment
Balconies and patios in an eight plex are noisy and intrusive for the poor single family homes that are next to them.
What a biased question. It doesn't even list any aspect of the livability of the home itself for the citizen who owns the property, which seems like it should be a high priority. I don't understand why the City is so focused on how citizens manage their own trees when the City is so terrible at managing trees - so many destroyed and not replaced in Eau Claire and Olympic Plaza as a few examples.
Parking. Very disruptive to a residential street when 4 plexes etc are built with limited parking assigned to it.
Trees provide habitat for song birds as well as clean the air we breathe. Private tree policy is a necessity.
In multi-unit developments, it's important to consider outdoor amenity space for the whple development, vs on a per-unit basis. A large, functional, and communal outdoor/green space will make a development feel more green, and allow residents more connected with their environment, and their community,

compared to small private yards that add up to the same area of green space. Rainwater management is just important generally in the foothills, especially with more droughts due to climate change.
Consideration for how well it is a fit for the area.
Making sure the design does not impact adjacent neighbors is at the very least a requirement not to mention courteous.
The height and style of the building definitely need to complement existing homes. I believe duplex type townhouses would be best in our area versus condos and row housing.
The relevance of overlooking probably depends on the context of the development. In inner-city developments, it should be of little consideration -- homes have blinds, and there are architectural features that can help, but part of the compromise of living inner-city (as I do) is the density and reduced privacy compared to, say, an expansive suburban development.
not an expert on amenity space but there should be bonus' and penalties for keeping/removing large mature trees.
Most of these spaces are so small folks are putting down fake grass anyway which defeats much of the purpose of our rainwater & climate goals....
maybe more focus on small local parks is needed in lieu of trying to have every rowhouse get's a backyard - or the rowhouses have shared backyards? this isn't new look at turn of the Century apartments. They usually have a courtyard."
Keep neighborhood existing aesthetics consistent. Home owners choose to live & buy in certain areas based on current area allowables. Drastically changing the rules along the way is unfair and unjust.
Once again, the City doesn't consider any of these things when allowing for re-development of single family homes to multi-residential; these structures do not have room for any of the above priorities.
Parking
Managing waste bins is important but should be a homeowner responsibility within their land
Shadows/Privacy
Parking
Moving towards a system that is transparent and accountable need to be the top priority if the system for housing development is to get any better.
I can't think of anything else.
Overlook into existing yards, blockage of existing views, and the allowing of placement of new windows that look directly into windows (especially bedrooms) of existing residences greatly impacts the existing

residences. While some overlook is unavoidable, direct views into existing windows should not be allowed, and allowing mid-lot placement (aka in backyards) of new buildings should also be limited.
Multi residential buildings take up more land space leaving less space for trees, balconies, yards etc. It causes rain run off problems leading to flooding. Flooding - Remember the 2013 disastrous flood? Why would we want to design Calgary to be more susceptible to floods. Most insurance companies do not cover overland flooding. Parking is also an issue. Not enough parking (at least one stall per unit) is unacceptable. Insufficient parking makes the street look crowded and unsightly.
Water consumption and use, electrical consumption from high density land use environment and use of environmentally unsafe products like wind turbines and solar panels danger to wildlife. Climate has always changed green products and no amount of money will stop the weather people stop setting fires and be careful
Repeal Blanket Rezoning and H-GO. Development should provide similar context of current neighbourhood. Parking should be a requirement. Bungalows are low cost, accessible, and allow for aging in place. Stop tearing them down. Stop destroying our neighbourhoods and lives. You are negatively affecting peoples enjoyment of their homes and mental health. You have lied about Local Area Plans and amended without consent. LAPs are not being administered nor enforced.
Parking parking parking!
New build that have adverse affects on existing adjacent properties need to be thoroughly reviewed and not just rubber stamped fir approval
Monitoring impact the certain builders have on neighbors as they build. Some are not even trying to be considerate and clean up as they go.
Design should consider existing architecture of neighbourhood
Water causes damages and costs to home! Rain and drainage should be number one!
Why are mature trees being cut down for the sake of building structures that completely devour the lot, it doesn't make sense. Make up your minds city of Calgary, do you want trees or not?
All of these should be priorities, but too often they're ignored in favour of quick, high-density builds that maximize short-term profit. We need long-term thinking that values skilled labour, environmental integrity, and the durability of homes. Poorly built mass housing today will become tomorrow's problem. Design must prioritize quality, livability, and sustainability.
"Eco-friendly measures and sustainability (solar power could be advantageous as calgary is one of the most sunlit cities in Canada)
use of indigenous and native plant species for lawns"
Density, walkability, and mixed use! These are the most important things to consider. Larger scale developments should also include housing types for a variety of income levels, which makes for shorter

commutes for a variety of workers, and healthier neighbourhoods. We should encourage ADU construction in Calgary.
Trying to make use of native plants and water-wise plants rather than lawn grass
By putting multi-family units on single-family-home lots, you are decreasing the tree canopy because they have to remove the trees and other natural growth. Of course that's happening. You have university degrees - seems like a waste of time. You contradict your intentions with your actions. Nonsense prevails.
Considering privacy or aesthetic concerns alongside access to natural elements and existing fauna is a deeply flawed approach. Carving out "private" areas for each residential unit can consume additional land that could otherwise be used for more public spaces (giving everyone a larger "private" space when they would need it). The same can be said for aesthetic concerns, prioritizing "hiding" waste storage or utility structures is a waste of resources.
While privacy is important, so are spaces out front for neighbours to meet. Balancing the needs of allowing privacy when wanted and opportunities for interaction of neighbours walking by is complicated, but both are essential to fostering a sense of safety and community.
Same as other answers
Calgary has a serious lack of Greenery. McKenzie Towne has plenty of well maintained green spaces thanks to the community plan but some of it is slated for parking lots (future green line) so it will go away.
Security is not mentioned here. Planning for the safety and security of residents and property of those living near green spaces /recreational spaces should be considered as part of any plans. Especially near transit where transient encampments and drug use are quickly becoming an issue.
Involvement and consultation with community members is paramount.
Number of people and their vehicles that's will clog up available parking
The City has destroyed hundreds of trees in Eau Claire, Olympic Plaza, Cowboys Park, all for wealthy to profit more. It's odd that the City is focused on how citizens manage their own trees but the City seems to have little regard for trees.
Privacy, and being able to not be affected by noise from close neighbors.
Most of the above list is being ignored. Just look around the neighbourhoods- old houses and every single tree is being taken down. Mature trees cannot be accounted for with new plantings. Extensive hard-scaping is used as private space for enjoyment is minimized in order to maximize building size on lots. No mature trees affects temperature in summer and rainfall absorption is reduced with lack of mature trees and excessive hard-scaping. Trees that were 'saved' are now dying.
The city does not care about privacy or green spaces. Or the neighborhoods that are being destroyed by these ugly row houses

The lost integrity of neighbourhoods that are properly planned by thoughtful city planners. Not rapid densification that will result in lost character and major infrastructure strain and expensive housing in 20 years.
Housing with little to no back yards don't belong in detached home neighborhoods. If those people can't afford to live inner city they can live in apartments down town or they can move further out if they want a home with a yard. Stop building dense housing in neighborhoods that don't want it. You're doing a disservice to your tax paying voters and you're going to push the wealthy to leave this city and you'll be left managing slums.
Quit destroying mature trees for new developments!!!!
Since some of the above have to do with aesthetics, it would be nice if architectural design was more than a flat roofed box, or one with a high triangle to one side of the building that again, is wasted space to heat.
Mature trees are incredibly important for all neighborhoods. They provide clear air, shade, and shelter for the city fauna. They are often replaced by trees that do not offer the same benefits. Please try to save them if you can, and if you can't, re-plant the same species
It's a very bad idea to let developers clear lots of all existing trees
Mature trees are the heart of a neighbourhood and need to stop being cut down to make room for new, bigger buildings.
You are asking all the wrong, self-serving questions. Calgarians already responded to the blanket rezoning with a resounding "NO", but the Mayor and Council ignored Calgarians. The Blanket rezoning Bylaw should be repealed.
I don't think this is that important. Just have a few trees and nice landscaping and call it a day.
Need to keep water away from adjacent structures
Fit in with neighbouring houses.
housing covering too much of lot
Ensuring we are not developing tomorrow's slums, tenements and shanty towns but over populating
All need to be addressed
Conforming to the neighbourhood and surrounding properties.
We need the red line extension to the south to have these new developments make any sense
All of this needs to be addressed and taken into consideration.

Safety of pedestrians more light controlled crosswalks.
N/A
The proposed lot coverages are too high. We need permeable surfaces for ground water absorption and rooms for lots of trees and shrubs. We want to live in a city with songbirds, we need trees that provide a habitat for birds.
Calgary needs more trees and less grass, especially considering how hot the summers have been lately.
Privacy and sunlight is important.
City waste and green bins sitting out continually are an eye sore. There must be a designated spot for these to be put away. Conversely, these must be easily put out for pick up.
Increasing density and less yard space to absorb water. We should make sure rainwater systems are robust.
Please do not allow neighbours individual aesthetic preferences to dictate what can be built
"All of these are being compromised with densifying ...i.e., infills...8 ""homes"" on a 50 foot lot...not even Edmonton is this stupid.
I am praying that Calgary Party oust all the useless councillors that are not addressing the idiocy of densifying the core of this city when IT IS NOT NECESSARY.. when technology allows people to work and live anywhere! WHAT WASTE OF \$."
It is easier for someone to build their own patio than it is to grow a 100 year old tree.
Exterior Aesthetics should be considered for all neighbours who can see the property. Nobody likes an ugly building or surrounding area
Planting more street trees on arterial roads will create more safe and walkable communities.
This is logical. Rain gutters not spilling into other yards, privacy. Go look what they did to 17 and Grand Oaks and the bungalow beside them. SSTOP being inconsiderate of those who live in the community for a long time.
Pet friendly space
For new builds mature trees are ripped out and not replaced with makes the area look less nice and impacts heat in the summertime
Making sure enough parking is provided
Noise impact in yards. Enjoyment of outdoor space is very important to me.

Again, a better form of input would be rankings from 1 to 7.
The design should fit in the community at large , eg adding a two story 6 unit town house to a bungalow designed cul de sac is not appropriate.
Again, all of the items on the list above seem to me to be "nice to have" but I would think rainwater management is a necessity. Is there something I am missing?
Rainwater management concerns me in this list. Our approach to rainwater management needs to change. We need to make ways for all rain water to enter the ground and replenish ground water. Instead, in recent developments, rainwater management has been exactly the opposite: that is, whisk it away to the river so that none of it enters the ground. There needs to be a focus minimizing the AUDIO impact of utilities like air conditioners and heat pumps on neighbors.
The city says they want to increase tree canopy but 70% of the tree canopy is on private property. Huge disconnect here. It shouldn't be so easy to cut down mature trees. People don't understand the value trees bring to their community, developers don't care. We are getting heat islands with all of the new development. And we're losing permeable ground
It's the noise of the A/C units and heat pumps that needs to be managed. There should be a maximum decibel requirement
I don't think the tree count is as important as having some nature in decent amounts.
Protect our urban canopy and provide parking so people can live with gradually increasing density.
Trees/plantings are critical to the human condition
With 60% lot coverage, most developers are denuding lots and planting young trees - there needs to be more incentive to maintain both private and public trees. Plans often have only narrow columnar trees, that whilst not worthless, are nothing like the grand full trees they are replacing - more needs to be done to have full scale broad trees maintained/added in redevelopment. Shadowing studies and the effect of development on sunlight for neighbours' and their trees need to be done and used.
Preservation of established neighborhoods
I mean, plunking a big development where there wasn't one previously is already a huge challenge. There's yet to be a rendering or design I've seen where the design fits the existing aesthetic. It's oversized and encroaches upon neighbouring lots. Not enough space for thoughtful landscaping, bin mgmt, parking or any sort of community minded elements
Calgary needs more trees and needs to preserve its mature trees.
Stop allowing trees and park and green spaces to be destroyed? You claim to care about the environment yet you are selling off our green spaces

You need to consider privacy, right now Calgary is turning into a concrete playground. The older neighbourhoods had condos, single home, attached homes, apartments ALL mixed in but all respecting each others land. It is all about money now and 0 consideration for function
Many houses are being build with no yard. The hard is covered by a patio or cemented. I worry about this for water.
Preserve yards and green space, buildings do not need to fill the entire lot.
Avoid concrete jungle, keep habitats for fauna and flora, respect our connections to the land.
Your blanket rezoning building plans do not create certainty for homeowners and do not create liveable conditions - not affordable, not aesthetically suitable, not wanted by the majority of Calgarians.
Another thing with rebuilding in residential or even new neighbours would be if there is a lack of trees and greenery
Don't build too close to the street.
We need to give the new homeowners or buyers their money's worth. I see a lot of front car detached new houses that are built by developers that has no to minimal backyard space. They charge people more with extra premium which is ludicrous, which futher contributes to people not being able to buy a decent houae unlike few years ago. The ruling on minimal backyard should be changed to encourage people to buy housing that they desire.
None of the above need be given priority. Maintaining the existing density should be the top priority. So stop with four plexes with basement suites. They are outrageous and are ruining neighborhoods.
Preserving the space between neighbors and the number of residents within a community
Greenery is important to reduce noise and heat
Again, parking. If a street is lined with vehicles all the beauty of the street is overlooked or obscured
Cement versus trees. Trees do so many things. The city needs to read the Giving Tree and start respecting nature again instead of chasing developer's money.
Air conditioning put in after it is built due to poor design.
Is what management reduces risk of flooding and pooling. I believe additional trees and greenery makes for healthier communities.
Having enjoyable outdoor space is important, but it shouldn't need to be all private space if we build beautiful shared outdoor spaces and everyone has access to homes.

In Marda Loop we are losing tons of trees and green space due to new development, especially multiplexes and high rises. New development cannot come at the expense of the existing canopy.
Again- I think thoughtful consideration and selection of building type is likely more important than any of the above
We just saw a construction tear apart 9 old pines that contributes to a lovely view kd the neighbouhood, house birds and animals and all to maximize the land use and put more houses than the land can sustain
Risks such as hail or high winds.
Maintaining the pre-existing greenery is something that rarely happens in new developments. There should be more pressure on developers to keep the trees that are already there, even if they have to design around them.
The dense housing in Bowness shows no place to be outside in a yard, windows over looking the neighbours so lack of privacy.
no multi family developments in single family home residential areas
MUST be contextual!
Priority for USEABLE amenity space, tiny patios are useless for many people.
Available parking per unit.
I do not think expansive outdoor space for all dwelling units is necessary. Units should have some minimal opportunities to sit outdoors - such as balconies. Privacy of neighbouring properties is very important as is access to near-by park space for those without personal outdoor space is important. Many people do not want to care for yards. As long as they have access to public outdoor space within communities, this is sufficient.
Our city is beautiful and these priorities must not be compromised.”
The outside spaces on fully built 4+4 on a standard 50 x 120' lot is eaten up by pathways (which you did not include here), buildings, w & r, and mobility storage. This needs to be rethought. Consolidate w & r. Insist on efficient unit entry locations that do not multiply paths/landings (paired). We see "amenity spaces" that can't be used - crammed with plants as that is the only place they can fit. Almost no permeable land for rainwater (avg 11% of lot).
There is a conflict between three-story infills/attached homes, and multi-unit buildings and privacy for existing owners/residents. Where there is zero privacy in one's backyard, it makes for fewer and fewer people outside. This phenomenon has been noted so often when we have visitors from abroad; ""there's nobody outside,"" is a common observation.

When homes types are so mixed and close together, there is lack of privacy, more noise, and a much decreased enjoyment of one's outdoor spaces.
Adequate soil volume for stormwater and future tree/plant growth
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Existing buildings in neighborhood to be consistent like R1 vs building a 4 plex beside
Older neighbourhoods have great mature trees that should be protected. New giant homes built often have very little to no yard space.
This question is absurd. Move on to something more meaningful
Respect for your neighbours, especially when they have been there a long time
The majority of trees and shrubs are lost when a developer builds 8 or 16 plexes. Again this survey is insulting as there is no way of preserving any old trees, there is simply not the space.
Sufficient parking to keep streets clear
Retention of existing mature tree should be a priority. Something else to consider is the over interior spaces. Lately very small spaces have been designed and I'm afraid that they will not last the test of time, people need a comfortable space to live in.
Parking!
Again if you didn't overdevelop lots, there would be an abundance of area for preservation of mature trees, patios, balconies etc.
Greenery is a high priority for shade and general healthy living environment
Again, ranking is important
Green spaces available for community gardens in all areas.
Managing the exterior aesthetic should be a priority. Utilizing the space should be a priority over preservation of trees.
Calgary is behind on overall tree count and greenery and preservation of mature trees, and under R-CG has hamstrung or completely removed any assurance of space for outdoor amenities such as patios, balconies and yards, landscaping for design and privacy, and rainwater management. The city is going backwards rapidly.
The waste and recycling bins should not be left in alleys or streets for storage. Ensure this is ample room out of site! Preserve the Older trees .. They were there first!

Fire protection! Huge issue in other places and will likely become more important here unfortunately.
What is missing from this question is the impact to existing home owners. Top priority to new housing buildings should be the impact to the existing homeowners and direct neighbours.
As we increase density rainwater management becomes more of a problem as there is less ground to absorb. Proper management will ensure less impacts to the neighbours. Existing multi-family high density housing in the neighbourhood do a very poor job of managing garbage overflow and the city seems to not do much to enforce as the garbage crews see this each week and nothing is done about it except for the residence to cleanup after them.
I think that the most important thing is to remember that we live in a city not a test tube. Things happen, we have utilities and waste, I often feel like we hide these things because we are scared of messy things, but messes add intrigue and curiosity. They also reveal problems in the system earlier on which makes them easier to address and remediate.
Well being, enjoyment of life and respect for nature and its natural resources.
Environmental concerns - water issues and heat mitigation can be managed through Considered design. Insist on considered good design not contractor specials
I think amenity spaces are up to the home-owner or developer. If they want a cheap apartment with no balcony, that's their decision. (However over-supply of "bad" apartments should be managed to prevent what's happening in Toronto with all the unwanted, tiny apartments.
The cumulative impact on access issues and infrastructure should also be considered and anticipated.
We are considering a green roof. There should be more allowances for this type of development.
Having units with outdoor spaces is important for the tenants/owners. Being able to enjoy this outdoor space without looking at unsightly waste bins is also important.
This dense development model may serve short-term growth targets, but it comes at the cost of long-term well-being. Residents living in these clustered communities are losing access to something essential: green, open space. Parks, trees, and natural areas are disappearing as the City continues to favor builders over balanced community planning.
Amenity space needs better attention. Currently, there is too much hardscaping and not enough soft scaping. Many rowhouse-type developments are not fulfilling their landscaping requirements post-construction and many amenity spaces are undesirable. If this cannot be achieved, then there needs to be additional investment in public parks to ensure there is adequate green space available for the population.
Not just the residence itself that needs to be considered but also the neighbourhood and walkability. Encourage sense of community. Developers need to be on the hook for more aspects of 'community'

such as tree count/greenery, wide sidewalks, designing so waste/recycling and utilities are well integrated into design.
Injecting some competence and integrity into the City's top decision makers.
Shouldn't be allowed to knock down mature trees to increase dwelling density. That is one of the selling features of living in older neighborhoods. Has anyone actually measured the width of all the green/blue/black carts and done the math on how wide that is across a 50' wide yard and
What about adequate infrastructure for water, sewer, and electricity? There are over 60 new units being built within a block of my home. So far only 8 are occupied and already we are experiencing lower water pressure. What is going to happen when all new units are occupied?
Because it's the way I feel. That's why
Preservation of mature green canopy is priority. Do not place waste & recycling beside the next door neighbors, have a set location for them, out of site. Noise associated with AC's, meters etc is biggie, everyone complains. It's unfortunate that developers only concern is making money, the impact on adjoining residents does not seem to matter - WHY?? Please adhere to the concerns raised by residents and communities feed back. Where does housing that is RGI fit in this survey???
Stop selling off right of way land and stop over massing of building on lots. Huge Buildings coming right to the minimum requirements to sidewalks are creating wind tunnels in places like marda loop and shadowing. Increase the setback if you are going to be approving massive multiplexes everywhere
Over densification is already stressing water and sewage infrastructure
Keep parks and do not sell them to developers.
Overlooking impact on neighbours.
The City destroy more than a hundred beautiful mature trees at Eau Claire, at Olympic Plaza and now at Cowboys - all of these trees were destroyed so rich people could get richer, on the taxpayer's dime, for projects that are highly unlikely to have a benefit that outweigh the costs.
All new buildings should be required to include native landscaping. The one tree that's typically planted is not enough when mature trees are being torn down to maximize the building size on a lot
Again, build more faster, design is secondary
You are missing explicitly planting of new trees and having adequate space for viable trees. I realize private trees will be removed but where is the rain water going to go? Stormwater drainage infrastructure (pipes) is terribly expensive. Why are we not talking about this cost in terms of meeting growth and affordability needs? Housing is only part of the equation.
And context, context is important for any proposal.

Cool design and lots of trees
Reduce footprint of allowed buildings, except for lots with a city owned boulevard with canopy trees. Bylaw should specify canopy tree requirements because developers will put in the cheapest, smallest plants they can find. A Costco potentilla does not replace a 60 year old mature elm (except in Calgary bylaw)
Trees should be replanted on the lot being developed- it is not good enough to say 'those trees lost will be replanted in a park somewhere else'
Sound increase of multiple families and disruptions to the surrounding homes.
There's a high requirement to improve how waste and infrastructure are impacted. High density = more waste bins and pressure on infrastructure which doesn't seem to be addressed at this stage.
Climate considerations for stormwater
Parking needs to be included and a proper definition around what mid density housing means.
New houses seem to be black and white in the inner city. Why? Max lot size, sheer front design of homes built to max profits, and no trees is something that will be a regret of future planners and generations.
Noise pollution from air conditioning units.
Trees are a priority in cities. Now you are allowing trees to be cut down and NO requirement for planting of trees ! It is crazy how the city bends rules to developers,,,
See answers above
Preservation of mature trees would be great if you can ensure they are healthy and will survive the development process (not have their root systems cut off when digging or trenching). If you can't ensure that they are healthy and going to survive for many more decades post-development, then it may be better to ensure conditions are maximized for the successful growth of new trees (soil volumes, soil quality, adequate space for mature tree size).
Again, basic infrastructure comes first and I expect it is being overlooked as an army of bureaucrats instead focus mostly on pet projects that waste taxpayer money. I really respect the very small number of city workers who actually serve citizens.
There is an indisputable difference between planning new communities, revitalizing communities with abandoned land, and those that are firmly established and citizens have invested in a community BECAUSE it is not densely populated and do now want to see their neighborhoods torn apart and neighbours have to fight each other over restricted covenants because their city abandoned them, changed all the rules, and left them at the net of FOR PROFIT developers!!b

There should be a mandate to both preserve existing old trees and a priority to plant / re-plant new trees on all properties where there is a new build.
I don't want Calgary too look like New York, Vancouver etc. let Calgary grow but Calgary made! Larger lots, green space etc!!!
Planting one columnar aspen in either the front or back is not considered sufficient replacement of trees. To date you have not required diverse tree planting and have not held developers accountable when they don't plant a tree at all (eg Dean Mark homes).
Buildings should not be so close to the road that it becomes difficult to see or dangerous when stepping out of the dwelling. Dwelling lots should not be so small that basic needs are crammed on the lot and the dwelling loses function and visual appeal.
Trees on properties that face public green spaces should not be required. Otherwise, plant away.
Require a % increase year-over-year to tree canopy to help alleviate effects of climate change.
No
I can appreciate that density could and should be higher than in some older neighbourhoods, but they should be developed to be "livable," i.e., with recreational facilities and parks. Traffic has to be considered as areas develop - certain roads can't handle the additional traffic, i.e. Bow Trail. Although it is under discussion, we were told changes to Bow Trail are "at least" 10 years away.
I think that amenities would need to be placed in a very respectful place according not only with the users of the new development, but also with the neighbours in its surroundings. Sometimes the activities developed in this areas, might include noise, food cooking, etcétera.
Soil volume requirements are critical to ensure that trees and plantings survive in small areas, and that drainage on site is improved. It will also greatly help with water retention, in a city that is increasingly drought prone. Planting requirements for landscapes need to consider what will actually survive in a dry climate, that is shifting because of climate change.
consider street by street, block by block design, consistent with overall neighbour feel to grow communities rather than overwhelm.
Outdoor amenity space that faces the front street builds community and should be a top priority.
Also don't flood your neighbor.
Preserving mature trees, outdoor spaces, and thoughtful landscaping should be top priorities—they impact mental health, biodiversity, and how people actually feel in a space. But we also need to design for connection. Shared green areas and small social nodes (not just private patios) help foster community. That's what turns housing into a neighbourhood.

addressing these will reduce visible focus on utilities
Mature trees take forever to grow here, and provide shade and homes for animals. The new little tiny trees put in by developers are so small and hard to keep healthy as they aren't properly planted or watered
Families with children need access to nice, useable outdoor spaces, so this should be made a priority in design.
Setbacks of new buildings. Some stick out like a sore thumb in established neighbourhoods. Also 60% lot coverage is a lot and does not leave enough room for any meaningful canopy. Many trees are taken down with no room to plant new ones.
SETBACKS NEED TO BE MATCHED
Tree canopy is a critical factor for heat and climate change management. There should be an effort to increase the percentage of tree canopy coverage in all communities. Eight units on a single lot is too many re: RCG designations; a maximum of three or four units (including suites in this count) will allow for better landscaping, better waste management, and increased privacy for all residents.
In our area, we have trees, elms, that drip sap on our vehicles which is damaging our vehicles. Elms too get into the water and septic system as well. We should be able to call and have damaging trees removed!
There seems to be a lack of character in newer urban communities, where homes are tightly packed together with limited personal space. And while this is the case, there is still little room for recreation in certain areas which isolates neighbours and omits the potential of community cooperation entirely. I have not met one person in one of these communities who wouldn't prefer to live in a place such as Triwood or even Montgomery. While affordable, these places lack actual value.
These are part of City projects that have benefits beyond the private residential sphere.
redevelopment has been wasteful. new construction material has been corrosive in aging city infrastructure, causing breaks and leaks resulting in sink holes. neighbouring buildings can't handle runoff. there are bins all over the place.
Shadow impacts onto neighbouring properties is big, as it impacts all of these considerations for the neighbours as well. Impacting landscaping, gardens and use of patios/balconies. Calgary temperatures are dependent on sun. Once in the shadows, the enjoyment of these amenities decreases due to the large swing in temperature shadows create. A higher build on the north facing side of the street is less damaging than on the south facing - as it impacts the neighbours backyard enjoyment.
Work to increase the number of native plants used in landscaping.
Approval of diverse built forms to introduce different housing types for different family makeups (affordability, aging in place, intergenerational families)

The city canopy should be protected, and enhanced through new development. Mature trees should have protective zones during construction, like other cities like Toronto mandate.
In Legacy, they develop a portion of the community called the woods because that's where that original natural environment used to exist, but in order to build the houses they cut down most of the trees and planted three or four tiny sticks instead. What a ridiculous idea to plant trees to create a community division called the woods only to chop down those trees to put in a house once someone bought it after looking at the lot.
Noise from utilities and shadowing from tall buildings
Consideration should be given to encouraging planting of drought resistant vegetation as well as those that encourage pollinators.
3 bins per unit is absurd in an 8 flex. This is 24 bins--typically lined up across the garage space that can't be used for a vehicle.
Adding too many units. And not enough parking.
8 units (ex. 4 up + 4 suites) on a 50-ft lot is too many. It's overshadowing neighboring properties and restricting sunlight, not to mention all the garbage bins block the alley and garage access. And ridiculous parking issues. Maximum allowed should be 4 units (including suites) where previously there was 1 house. You'd effectively provide more density with max 4-not-8 units/suites and maintain community character at the same time.
People pay for yards so they can use them without fear of an entire building looking down into their yard. Rainwater management can prevent flooding
Encouraging people to plant flowers and flowering bushes. Public places should be neat and manicured. Public washrooms should be in all public spaces including parks.
These are items that often are an afterthought and it shows. It can also lead to problems down the road such as bins ripping, garbage blowing. Trees and greenery and rainwater management =sustainability and overall environmental improvement.
Lots used to be larger and neighbourhoods used to be beautiful - lately you're letting developers chop down all vegetation and cram everything together for profit and tax revenues.
They should match the aesthetics of the community. If it is an older community the housing style should match.
Not encroaching on neighbours yards or their enjoyment of their space
Higher density equals more runoff to manage due to the imperviousness of the surface.
Mental wellbeing of existing residents. Long term maintenance.

<p>Preservation of maturity trees is top for me with increasing greenery a second. Trees have a number of benefits for communities - provide shade, reduce heat island effect in urban areas, lock up carbon, provide habitat for wildlife, prevent erosion. For example, we have chosen not to have a/c in our home (protecting the environment, reducing bills) as we have a large spruce tree in our yard that keeps our house cool.</p>
<p>Preservation of mature trees is important, when they are healthy and safe. But if they need to be removed, then it would be good to replace it with two trees (if there's space).</p>
<p>An off comment about the spacing between houses: houses spaced very close together should be allowed to be built together like a British row of houses. All that tiny side area does is catch debris and leaves. Grass doesn't grow because of shadows the loose soil kick up dust. I don't know current setback regulations are, but I'm in favor of building up to the property line with no side access to the back yard</p>
<p>physical building design that is interesting and adds character / maintains character.</p>
<p>The City should remove parking requirements for personal use motor vehicles, and provide for emergency, delivery, or service vehicles only.</p>
<p>The City should call a cease fire on its war on trees. 100s of mature trees destroyed at Eau Claire plaza (under construction for 6 years, so far - what a disgrace), at Olympic Plaza, and now at the Cowboy's for-profit park. Citizens are far better at caring for trees than this municipal government, which is laser focused on taking from averaged citizens to benefit ultra high net worth families. The government is the challenge to overcome.</p>
<p>It's important to keep our environmental impact low while still making sure that it is usable and accessible for all</p>
<p>Rainwater management is the most important. New developments are a good opportunity to replace old landscapes that do not do a good job of sequestering water, like grass lawns.</p>
<p>Only safety matters. Otherwise let the market decide. Shade is a safety concern for our seniors. Water is obvious</p>
<p>Maintain curb setback to match existing dwellings, retain off street parking to match dwelling occupancy.</p>
<p>We should ensure that even with higher density we maximize the size spaces for individuals to use, or offering sufficient alternatives through park or other amenity spaces.</p>
<p>Listen to the people</p>
<p>I strongly support neighbourhoods that have lots of trees in them especially mature ones. There needs to be rules that the city can't remove trees easily when putting up new development. The trees were there first and development can be relocated elsewhere.</p>
<p>No more relaxations for sewerage disposal. Retain mature green canopy.</p>

Ensure the waste and recycling bins are not left in the alley or open areas, provide fencing to ""hide"" the bins. Appropriate drainage for rain and water run off.
For waste/recycling, it is unrealistic that residents of a 8 plex will share bins. The city should be prepared for deadline with the excess capacity that will exceed provided bins, especially given that there is insufficient room on properties to just increase the number of bins.
People need lots of yard space
Trees and gardens are important for mental health
Keep the trees
Again, maximizing households should be the priority, beyond specific design elements such as those listed above.
Normalization of zoning code between Calgary and Edmonton is important for enabling pre-fabricated homes.
Enabling mixed use zoning across all apartments.
Removing red tape (such of laws mandating preservation of old trees) is crucial. Affordable housing matters more then old trees.
Review of recycling economics, I pay taxes that should include all these fees.
Reduce City staff count or salaries if you need more money.
Said recycling will provide revenue. Where is it? Another liberal lie.
Low income housing!!!! These multi units are not being listed as anywhere near affordable for low income families and yet this is the developments the city is approving over and over and over. It's just a way for the developers to make maximum return on their investments and does nothing to provide affordable low income housing. This is the city's scapegoat excuse that more building will solve the problem but only the developers are happy They ARE NOT building affordable low income housing
We love our trees.
sustainability of those designs should be considered. developers are putting in grass where no one can access it to water it or cut it- can't get a lawnmower into the area to do the job. trees are being planted where they will require constant pruning to maintain less than mature size or will be cut down in a matter of 10 years because of those ongoing costs.
Quality of the build. I have a family member that just moved into a new build and the outside wall shakes and rattles the stove when the washing machine is running. The stove rattles when I walk by on the floor. Talk about garbage.

<p>People need to feel safe in their homes. People will want to go outside if there is plants and vegetation. People will want to go outside if there are amenities. Places should be designed for people, not cars.</p>
<p>Quit killing our trees. Don't say we have a climate emergency and we all need to walk or scoot our way around town and then take down all of our trees.</p>
<p>Calgary needs more placemaking. Make communities feel unique and connected by design and allowing for small, local businesses.</p>
<p>Housing is important but building functional and long-lasting communities that kids can play in should be top priority.</p>
<p>In this age of global warming, very little attention is paid to concrete parking lots as contributors to heat production. Stand in a shopping centre parking lot on a hot day and get a feel for how much concrete parking lots contribute to local warming. Have a look at the trees that are in the lot and how poorly they are watered. GET CREATIVE. There is a way to design for soil water retention vs runoff in parking lots and to support trees without baking them.</p>
<p>Indoor parking for vehicles must be for at least 80% of all occupants.</p>
<p>All the above are important to me, but I live in an inner city lot and see a ton of waste bins behind houses strewn about all over our alley. This creates not just visual problems, but it makes it difficult to even get into our garage sometimes. Would need to see this addressed.</p>
<p>This government destroys trees for developers everyday: Eau Claire, Olympic Plaza, Cowboys park. Pretending this government cares about the environment is propaganda.</p>
<p>Planting native plants and designing green spaces in a manner to withstand drought and attract pollinators.</p>
<p>Not every single building on a street needs to have green space, but there should be some form of communal gathering area in a vicinity. Otherwise, if it is a mixed use building with commercial space on the ground floor, maybe only a couple tenants would need to have an outdoor patio area.</p>
<p>nobody wants to live like sardines in a concrete jungle. Densifying requires more public park space not less. Yet you are ripping our playgrounds for new developments.</p>
<p>Our kitchen window now looks directly on the new houses utilities. We used to have a view.</p>
<p>Accessibility for all people has been given zero thought. There are no provisions for universal design or ADA compliant access.</p>
<p>So many new developments are taking down beautiful well-established trees and replacing them with scrawny trees that provide little to no aesthetics or benefit to birds or other creatures. I thought this city wanted more green areas rather than less. In addition, a lot of green space is being converted to housing.</p>

Can't wait for the next election
See my comments above. Function over form. Prioritize housing density and efficient city infrastructure management. Moloks and dedicated public transit rights-of-way. Everyone wants more trees. This is naturally a prairie ecosystem!
Energy efficiency, reduce water consumption
Durable building
Increase in property taxes,
infrastructure services and facilities, amenities required for the development
Transit development
Infills in old neighborhoods destroy the character and charm of mature landscaping. Replaced with stucco houses, close to the street, 2 feet from the property line.
Again. Not all builders are equal. They seem to have all the rights and powers leaving existing homeowners struggling to find peace and rights protection in the place they have invested in.
Going from one house to 14 dwellings on one city lot is going to be smelly with waste and problematic for parking and privacy.
Yes. The education system doesn't allow for enough schools, and Calgary is behind and sold off the RB Bennit land, while also adding massive density to Bowness and Montgomery. This is very short sighted and was irresponsible. Stop selling land that is designated for schools and other things.
Context of the existing neighbourhood.
Think about where we will be in 30 years. Higher summer temperatures can be partially abated by mature trees & landscaping. Concrete holds heat in. Trees & landscaping do not.
No multi family homes in single home neighborhoods period
Increasing density.
Stop cramming too many people into a small space
Environmental impacts should be top priorities
Government shouldn't be too heavy handed here. Maintaining and expanding tree canopy is the most important thing.

Preserving and expanding Calgary's urban canopy is very important. New developments should have to include a minimum NET tree count (i.e. if you are removing trees, you have to add more). While landscaping CAN be an effective tool for providing privacy and screening, this should not be a requirement. W&R bins are a reality of living in a large urban center like Calgary. We should not be including costly design requirements to "hide" these as this cost just increases the cost of the homes.

Do you know how long it takes to grow trees in an arid, prairie city? Also, mature trees assist in moderating the climate. I have met with many home owners who do not require air conditioning as the trees provide sufficient shade for their property. Thus trees help buildings adjust to climate change.

Mature trees are stunning and add character to a neighborhood. Going into a neighborhood with green space is welcoming. Having concrete cement buildings everywhere is unappealing and it is not good for your health.

Affordable housing should not mean restriction to outdoor space - consider the landscaping around to provide healthy recreation in the area.

We asked: Which of the following should be top priorities in the design of new housing buildings? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Electric vehicle charging stations
- Solar panels
- Drought-resilient vegetation
- Durable roofs and siding
- High performance insulation, windows, and doors
- Low flow plumbing fixtures

We also asked **Why? Do you think there is anything else challenging or important to consider?** and received the following feedback:

None of these are a hill to die on. If you didn't allow 2 feet between building fire wouldn't be as big an issue.

Efficient buildings will preserve resources. Rough-in for EV charging will make buildings more attractive for final sale and resale, and this with solar panels will support our energy transition.

I feel that new structures should have all modern amenities so this is a dumb topic to include, you pay for what you get. What would be more important to include as a topic is if you want to get re-elected, you should listen to what the people are telling you about what kind of housing should be allowed in an existing neighborhood and blanket rezoning isn't the answer, well it is an answer, but it's a wrong one.

Again, looking at the community and the residents that live there and see if the new plans completely change the existing community layout, design and appeal or if they will enhance the community. Do not bring low income housing and desirable rental units to an established single family dwelling community. Ask yourself if this was your community, your neighbourhood, your street, would you want this next to you, before approving applications and permits.

Passive climate features - Trees provide shade and cooling, but need to be mature and large as in old neighbourhoods. Bungalows or 2-storey are easier to shade and cool: 3rd storeys are difficult since heat rises. It seems crazy to rip out all the mature trees on a lot, replace it with 3-storey R-CGs that require running AC constantly in the summer. Some even require 2 ACs to cool the top level. Older houses have basements that are cool in summer, trees for shade. Older = better!

Forcing these environmental requirements is increasing the cost of housing to an unreasonable and unaffordable level. Do not embed this in the zoning bylaws and regulations!

Prioritizing bike infrastructure as well as access to public transit and local amenities so that people don't have to drive. Taking into account things like wind direction wind direction and sunlight so that less cooling is necessary during the summer and heating during the winter.

Why build without durable materials? Profit. We are seeing builds that are cheap and slapped up. The city can do better to enable homes to last longer.

All of them are important and should be addressed in housing because it improves people's experiences within their homes in the long run. Some people may not care about electric vehicle charging stations, but other people will. Drought resilient vegetation will become increasingly important as time goes on. Durable roofs and siding are important due to simple practicality.

With a climate like Calgary's, it's important to think of the cost + environmental impact of heating/cooling homes. Additionally, housing should be built to last and weather the types of severe weather events that Calgary often faces (e.g. thunderstorms, hail storms, heavy snow, risk of tornadoes/high winds). EV charging stations are less of a priority as I would hope that we would be able to have improved transit + walkability and move away from cars as the norm

Solar panels and EVs environmental impact are grossly understated if taken from "creation to expiration". I don't believe they are an eco friendly choice and now they are finding that some Chinese solar panels can be shut down remotely. Has the city investigated geothermal energy? Or passive ways of retaining or reflecting heat?

"One hail storm in the hail capital of the world being Calgary, I think solar panels to be the least important.

Low flow plumbing fixtures on toilets cause problems in the main lines, ask a plumber. I think that's a poor choice."

Technology is changing fast. solar panels and charging stations are visually ugly and will be the size of a cell phone soon. Do not invest in.

Please be mindful of the fire risks with lithium batteries. There was a story from BC about a condo building that was no longer allowing charging vehicles which has resulted in major inconvenience to residents with EVs. This is an unintended consequence which needs to be monitored. You need to add here a requirement for permeable surfaces and minimal if any concrete.

It seems likely that given the increased strain new vehicle charging stations would have on the grid, the municipality should take whatever steps available to reduce overall capacity. Solar and other energy options are naturally conducive to this then. Otherwise, considering the highly variable rainfall of the last few years, designing with drought resilient vegetation is obviously worthwhile. Any effort which reduces the water needs in the city is worthwhile as a long term measure.

The garage should be wired for 220 electric vehicles but the station itself could be installed at a later date by the home owner. You are asking about solar panels for a new home when we have seen panels shadowed from H-GOs on older homes. How ironic!!!!

Where is the money going to come from for E.V. charging stations? The majority of Calgarians do not have electric vehicles. I for one do not want my tax dollars to go to ward something that only a small minority of people in Calgary can afford.

Calgary has experienced costly storm damage, building materials must be hail resistant for roofs, siding. Incorporate this into new builds, and those that damaged and must be repaired

All of these are important for different reasons. Calgary's future may be hotter, possibly colder, drier, stormier, and electrical infrastructure is very expensive to retrofit. Affordability needs to play a part - adding more and more features to buildings makes them more expensive. There needs to be a place for simple structures with few amenities.

There is no climate emergency. This is a game for municipalities to continually feign emergency status and steal more money from residents. Stop the lies. Stop the madness. If individuals want to spend money on greenwashing for their personal property, that's fine. The city should have no input on building materials aside from traditional fire safety considerations.

You could leave people space to garden, and store bikes.

No brainer - insurance will cost less and be available to all, not only some people in the city of Calgary. The others are options, not necessary

low flow plumbing is a scam. EV's are totally unsustainable and should be banned. Solar is not an infill priority at all, it is super easy for solar to overshadowed by new developments. Priority needs to be underground infrastructure, therefore less redevelopment and more greenfield development.

Minimum building codes seem wayyyyy too minimum!!! Just ask Mike Holmes!

To reduce the effects on the environment, climate change, and promote sustainability, I agree that there needs to be consideration for energy/resource-efficiency through alternative means (like solar panels, electric vehicles, reduced water consumption, and high performance insulation), but I feel that the

expense of these is cost-prohibitive at this time. Plus the issue of replacing and disposing of these alternative products also needs to be accounted for.
if there is no parking required why do you need EV charging??
Solar panels are good but must be coordinated with tree planting locations.
With the change in our weather why are we still allowing vinyl siding?"
Asking about drought resilient vegetation but hardly any of the plans have green spaces.
Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Minimum energy efficiency standards should be part of building code as should more durable exteriors, especially in "hail alley" areas of northeast Calgary as last two hail summers have demonstrated.
Design should be focused on more efficiency of major building systems.
Better building materials to prevent fire spread
Wow. Again such bias. The City should focus on providing services in a financially responsible manner instead of social engineering.
Reasonable space between housing buildings; access to an outdoor space for each housing unit is very important - need to have a connection with nature.
We need to demand quality in development.
Watering lawns is a waste of valuable water, they're boring to look at, and don't support native biodiversity. There are so many other plant species that need less water and maintenance, look way nicer, AND support native biodiversity. There is no downside to drought-resilient and climate appropriate landscaping. Development should also consider how to take advantage of the aspect and natural features (i.e. hills, trees) to help keep homes cool in the summer, and warm in the winter.
Quality builds are required to ensure we aren't wasting resources with housing that doesn't last.
Efficient heating/furnaces
Prioritizing pedestrian and cycling traffic is important to me, but also for climate and sustainability goals. I strongly feel that sidewalks in Calgary are way too narrow and contribute to a feeling that these are secondary or tertiary transportation options. Cities more space-constrained (Tokyo, London, New York) are far more generous with pedestrian space. There is no reason Calgary should be so stingy.
To focus on Electric vehicle charging stations and solar panels is a textbook example of putting the cart before the horse. It's straight greenwashing.

I am all for EV's and Solar panels AFTER the base load of the building/grid is reduced. That also makes future solar panel adoption CHEAPER (less panels needed).
The province is literally making it illegal for the CoC to REQUIRE higher standards then the province. Therefore you need to INCENTIVIZE better bldg. There is no other option for CoC
Creating spaces for urban gardens, opportunities for "living walls" in the design of indoor public spaces. We are a winter city so this should be considered in helping creating spaces that can be used throughout the year.
Current electric utility infrastructure is currently constrained. This should be considered before approving high density housing in already established area.
These need to be included in new housing projects. However costs to build homes this way will make homes more expensive, not affordable for most. Taxpayers should not be on the hook for rebates, etc if developers are required to build stronger homes.
Should consider the environmental impacts of ripping down a perfectly good 30 year old home and the landfill and carbon emission destruction this makes regardless of the number of solar panels and insulation
Low flow fixtures don't work well in sw Calgary and perhaps other areas, where water pressure is low
Well you wont be able to do solar with any certainty, given how the city allows giant towers anywhere a developer wants. Developers also want to cheapest, densest possible. Unfortunately this new zoning favors developers over residents at all points. Very sad TREES are not even on the climate resiliency.
Flood mitigation. Every else in this list is a joke.
The City should get the basics right (be transparent, effective and financially responsible - the current municipal government checks none of these boxes) before dictating how citizens live their lives.
Not at this time.
Low flow plumbing. This is now standard in the industry. Solar panels - useless. Payback for solar panels is up to 15 years, far exceeding the panel's life span. Insurance companies refuse to insure homes equipped with solar panels. Our infrastructure to date cannot sustain charging of electric cars. An average cul-de-sac in Calgary is only capable of charging 2 vehicles, making charging stations useless and frustrating to the home owner. Adding high density would only make the problem worse.
Stop high density recycle and care for the trees and replant them prepare for weather events as we always have reduce reuse and stop high density building stop rezoning and upzoning that produce high crime areas
Repeal Blanket Rezoning and H-GO. Development should provide similar context of current neighbourhood. Parking should be a requirement. Bungalows are low cost, accessible, and allow for

aging in place. Stop tearing them down. Stop destroying our neighbourhoods and lives. You are negatively affecting peoples enjoyment of their homes and mental health. You have lied about Local Area Plans and amended without consent. LAPs are not being administered nor enforced.

And once again off street parking within design

All of these things have cost!!! So should be considerations but maybe not mandated unless for safety

EVs are not happening anytime soon. Focus on issues that are more concerning in the winter time and hail storm season.

Trees and a walkable neighborhood. Also a bike network that connects to larger networks for commuters.

Climate resilience must be more than a buzzword—it requires enforcing higher building standards. Too many homes are built cheaply with little regard for lifespan or energy efficiency. Materials and practices should be durable, environmentally responsible, and future-focused. We need to incentivize long-term savings over short-term cost cutting.

As electric vehicles become more affordable and performance increases, they will become a no-brainer for consumers, probably sooner than we think. This will be a stress to our current electric grid, but we can be proactive and change this today by planning for tomorrow. Solar panels play a large part in this, by spreading out generation, making electric bills cheaper and the grid more stable! Insulation regulations are the city's single biggest tool to fighting climate change.

Consider policies to encourage adoption of things like heat pumps vs gas furnace & a/c

How will you supply the electrical grid for silly EVs?

The sun only shines during daylight hours and only on sunny days.

Wind doesn't always blow and quite frankly, we appreciate days that aren't windy.

Let nature do its job and stop interfering with what we have and what we've been blessed with (oil and gas.) Each province in Canada has a reliable energy resource. Alberta's is oil and gas. Why not be grateful and practical. Climate change? It changes every quarter of the year.

Fire separations!

Solar panels are an excellent way to provide access to green energy, while the rest of the options are crucial to reducing waste generated from low-quality materials and inefficient infrastructure. Electric vehicle charging stations would be great, but it could be seen as wasteful for those who do not ever plan on getting an electric vehicle.

EV charging and solar panels are nice, but may add unnecessary additional costs. They should be on a case by case basis. Not all homeowners will use a charging station, making it wasteful. Not all houses are optimal for solar.

Drought resilient and low maintenance vegetation make sense as a base design. Lawns are rarely kept up, and a waste of resources. Most people will enjoy having a low maintenance yard.
Well built durable houses are the only way forward. New houses shouldn't need fixing
If low flow plumbing fixtures result in reduce usage, then it should be mandatory. Fixing leaks from our treated water mains should be the priority. The other features listed above likely add to long term affordability but likely not in the short term.
These are all important to consider. Shelters at all transit stops in residential areas must be considered. Inclimate weather hail rain freezing winds and soaring temps make waiting out in the open for transit really sucks. Especially when it can be 30 min to over an hour wait during bad weather.
Build for the future. i.e. build quality dwellings with safety in mind. Multiply floor, multi family apartment buildings with a wooden structure don't seem to be a safe option. I would not live in one of these.
The others are nice, but not a necessity
What a leading, biased question. The top priority should be functioning, reliable utilities and infrastructure - something many citizens do not trust this government to provide currently.
The above options are for quality of materials only. The workmanship is equally important and the City needs to take steps to ensure developments meet a certain standard. Either the current standards are too low or many new buildings do not actually meet the standards despite passing inspections and the developers continuing to receive permits to build.
Sound proof walls.
Build for the weather extremes: extremely cold to hot, and use materials that withstand hail. Unless there is a wholesale upgrade to the Canadian electrical grid (new infrastructure), focussing on EVs is fruitless - there is not enough power for all.
Climate change is a lie. Maybe look into the chem trails that they are spaying over our city every day
We need to adopt stricter environmental standards even if our province won't
The lost integrity of neighbourhoods that are properly planned by thoughtful city planners. Not rapid densification that will result in lost character and major infrastructure strain and expensive housing in 20 years.
Only allow siding that is hail proof. Vinyl siding, etc should be stopped immediately!!!
Banning high ceilings that use energy to heat and cool.
EV's are a no go as far as most of us are thinking. Solar panels leach poison and only last a limited # of years.

Drought-resistant and native vegetation id a game changer! And creating high-efficiency buildings is both responsible and a huge selling point.
These whole survey is jaded
You are asking all the wrong, self-serving questions. Calgarians already responded to the blanket rezoning with a resounding "NO", but the Mayor and Council ignored Calgarians. The Blanket rezoning Bylaw should be repealed.
Solar panels are a no brainer. We get hail so better roofs. And better insulation will reduce heating costs.
Tree cover
Building codes so that we don't have hail damage every year due to cheap sidings
We need the red line extension to the south to have these new developments make any sense
Ban vinyl siding it's a huge waste
This is so very important in this new world we are living in. We simply can't just keep building houses as in the past. This will increase pricing and hopefully discourage developers who are cheap and just want to put up poor quality to make \$\$\$.
"We are not shareholders, we are living in a high-cost era of time. Scrap the ESG initiatives. We should get higher quality homes that can withstand natural weather disasters while not ballooning insurance. Especially in an expensive market like Calgary, quality should be reflected in these rise in costs.
All the green initiatives can be pursued by the individual if they want to."
Noise restrictions for HVAC. All HVAC should be vented out the roof. They are noisy and unsightly
I'm shocked you haven't listed heat pumps, so heat pumps.
Fire prevention.
Climate change does not mean an emergency. The climate has been changing for thousands of years and should not be the focus of city planning. If people want to do the unmarked things here, let them do it on their dime. The free market will decide.
We should have roofing and siding standards so that buildings are more insurable given the hail risk we face
What a stupid question.....this is up to the person building their home....is the question for affordable housing paid by taxpayers???
consider position of exhaust to not impact neighbours

minimize outside noise of external appliances such as air conditioners and heat pumps"
No
The amount of waste created in new construction is appalling. It doesn't even get mentioned. Everyone turns a blind eye and as a society we should be ashamed.
Designing building to minimize noise impact.
Rankings ...
Priority should be the impact to the current residents whose property values will be impacted. This is why doing this primary in a newer area is preferable since the design of the neighbourhood can be cohesive.
Preservation of mature trees is our very best climate resiliency plan. The list of checkboxes provided above are all minor aspects in comparison. They are the wrong focus.
Solar panels where they make sense but you shouldn't use it as an excuse to cut down trees. Vinyl siding doesn't make sense in our hail prone city. Developers use builder grade materials and then it becomes someone else's problem. There should be a sustainability measurement where keeping mature trees scores the highest, permeable land, INCREASING biodiversity and use of quality materials to increase longevity
Solar panels would be nice but drought resistant plants and plants natural to the area are great ideas. Homes that will last are also important.
Refurbish existing houses rather than demolish them. The greenest home is the one that is already built.
All of these items are important, unfortunately we must balance them with cost
Good environmental building standards are important, but should also consider costs, so as to not make new builds unaffordable (need to balance priorities). Electric grid can only handle so much, but readiness for charging and parking for charging are good. Shadowing of others' roofs that would take away their solar potential should also be seriously considered. Drought resilient vegetation and low flow plumbing fixtures should be easy targets, as they shouldn't add significantly to costs.
Storms have become a huge issue, there needs to be enforced materials standards so that cheap buildings are not obliterated, raising insurance rates & claims. The standards for building, consideration for adjacent dwellings that may have panels & be dwarfed should also be considered. Low flow plumbing is ridiculous way to try and offset cramming 24 people where there might previously have been 4. The system can either handle upzoning or it can't. City has been disingenuous in this regard.
Why ask me ? I'm not a greedy developer
Update the building code to prohibit the use of vinyl siding. It looks cheap and performs horribly when hail storms hit. Lose the impulse for EV charging stations. That industry is dead.

Insulation is key. Alberta already has some of the highest energy fees for residential consumers in Canada.
None of those are a priority? Plant tree's! Get out of suburban neighborhoods outside of city centre! Force developers to develop area's that make sense! There are numerous location around downtown that are sitting vacant
It is important to integrate all of the above but affordability has to be considered.
We have more and more hail storms, we need to be prepared. Solar panels and EV charging are choices that can be added by owners
Just stop pushing the climate agenda! Plenty of evidence to show there isn't a climate emergency. It is a UN agenda. It is a wealth transfer scheme. It is more about control than climate. The sea isn't rising and Antarctica has gained ice! Just stop pushing this tired fear-mongering climate agenda.
I don't like Changing the look of the neighborhood! Every new building looks the same with pathetic little green spaces for 10000 people (radon willows)
Durable roof/sidings, and high performance insulation windows and doors are what make sense right now with the limited purchasing power that has.
All the others are for aesthetic as those doesn't contribute really on cost effectiveness when buying a new house. Instead, the developers are charging new home buyers for those, which causes people not to be able to afford to buy a house.
There's no issue with housing as there's already a surplus with unsold houses. The issue is affordability.
Again none of the above. See above comments.
No over shadowing of roofs that could have solar panels
We really need to restrict the cars going through our community with more lights and more crosswalks with lights. 33rd avenue and 17th avenue should be where traffic is routed
We need to keep homes affordable. Implementing any of these items should be the choice of the homeowner, not mandated
Developer should use sustainable energy solutions according to the orientation of the lot. How can affordable housing be cheap enough to buy with electric power stations and solar panels?
New construction should replace current houses, not have a condo built in low density housing areas. It's ridiculous to think everybody wants to live like they are downtown. We have planned zoning in cities in Canada. Traffic and parking is going to be ridiculous!

Is there need to consider Fire Smarting urban neighborhoods? Not the same risk as in the Bow Valley, say, but with climate change worsening, may be an issue (see Kelowna)
Most of this is stupid. If people want to put this stuff in, let them. But the City should have no part in it. Except we cannot continue to have people put crappy roofing and siding on housing only to have it destroyed by hail and then have the city pay to replace it.
I believe improving the resilience of building materials to limit hail damage is important to reduce insurance costs and construction waste. Improved windows and solar panels reduce energy consumption and cost to homeowners. Very few drivers have an EV so I believe chargers should be optional in new single family homes at this time. Retrofitting homes for EV chargers is a growing concern particularly for multi-unit complexes. Some maybe worthwhile. Power grids would also have to be upgraded.
e-bike storage.
Electric bikes are the transportation solution we need to move on from cars. They are expensive and easier to steal than a car.
Better rules for determining construction quality given that they are building them poorly
I just saw an article that suggested that a regular outlet provides enough power for the average EV user. Level 2 outlets aren't necessary perhaps.
How often things need to get replaced. Older houses have a furnace that lasts 40 years, newer ones might die out after 20 years and have to be replaced, even if they are more efficient.
Pushing the climate agenda? At what cost?
High cost luxury vehicles are the problem, and every electric car that is being sold right now is a high cost luxury vehicle. EV's take a massive amount of natural resources to manufacture.
EV cars don't run during cold winter weather
no multi family developments in single family home residential areas
Environmental considerations must be paramount. Building codes should be amended for those considerations. And what about heat pumps?
Calgary is getting less rain so having drought resistant plants seems like a good move for the future
Building types to withstand the extreme weather of Calgary - particularly hail storms and winter storms. Storm water drainage so as not to overwhelm city infrastructure or cause flooding of adjacent properties.
This is the right list.

Section 42 of the draft H1 zone needs to be eliminated or rethought. Why would you allow a "green building" to be higher and bigger? Too bad if their envelop takes more space. I would consider tax incentives rather than this (not a zoning matter), but also need to show proof it is actually still working
We live in an area with INTENSE densification. There is wide variance in the quality of builds and attention to visual impact, access, obstructions. The city seems not to oversee these projects to ensure adjoining neighbours are not impacted more than necessary. As a specific case, we suffered - and I mean that - through 8 months of a builder behind us blocking our alley and garage access, endless debris - nails, metal cuttings - noise. Bylaw was out almost 10 times but no change.
Drought resilient vegetation should not be a goal. Plant selection is the final tool in design, more attention should be made on increasing soil volume and storm water capture. It has become a false crutch to say "drought-resilient", the term is uninformed and only deals with a small aspect of plant selection. It is not a technical term.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Vegetation, not vegetation
Anything high performance for green building and materials is great considering that all the hail and water claims make everyone's insurance premiums increase across the city.
Please reconsider blanket rezoning.
Options for the other suggestions is good, but more personal choices
None of the above!
Parking!
The types of builds currently in our area are an eye-sore. Built quickly, without integrity and craftsmanship. I'm surprised they passed building inspection.
Vinyl siding should be illegal on all new builds because of the yearly hail storms. More durable roofing materials should also be required as well
New buildings should not cast shadows on existing roof surfaces where solar panels are placed
All of these items are important for today's new housing construction. We need to think ahead and realize that water shortages will be real with increased droughts in the Calgary area.
Siding that is hail and fire proof!
Natural and native planting only. Dogwoods, willows, pines etc.

Solar panels will slightly reduce the demand on the grid and drought resistant landscaping will provide a pleasant and durable aesthetic and reduce landscaping costs for the residents
The most obvious omission from this list is the loss of mature trees which most housing developments plan for.
I don't think the city should mandate solar, electric charging etc it should make sense for builders to incorporate into designs as these things become more mainstream. These are currently luxuries that don't make building cheaper. Making houses more energy efficient will save more over time.
Mandating EV and solar panels will add to the cost for developers. If an owner wants EVs or solar let them put it in at their cost but don't make developers have to put it in. Mandate the roof be able to support solar panels if they want it in the future.
Reducing water usage will be the most important in the future for us.
The most important thing to consider is the longevity of the build. The externalities of the construction should also be considered. Things like environmental or social impacts must be mitigated as well. Eg. Large mansions are antitheses to community and environment.
The three options I did not select feel like half-baked solutions, I almost want to add solar panels to that list, but at least they contribute to self sufficient homes which reduces power grid risks.
These are all best ways of our times and provide resiliency and sustainability.
100 % sustainable house design is now available. Sustainability principles should be rewarded and required!
All of these need to be mandated, otherwise the cheapest short-term option will be built. This will have long-term higher costs for individuals, who should be protected from developers building wasteful buildings.
New homes should be designed for the people building them. If there are incentives for solar panels and it makes sense, builders will add them. New homes are much more energy efficient than old homes and that is lost on some people who only want older homes
There is a need for continued future flexibility. Electric vehicles and solar panels are the trend today but that may not be the case 20 years from now. Also the complete lifecycle environmental and social impact of some of these new technologies is often underestimated and lost in the political and self interest focused discussions of the moment.
I think you guys are right on with this list
Very important to consider climate friendly build materials but also durable materials.

It's time for the City to rethink its priorities. We need more parks, trails, and community-focused outdoor areas—not just rows of housing and concrete. Let's build communities that are not only dense but also livable and sustainable.
Drought resilient vegetation needs to be a top-priority. Equipping dwellings with RV charging stations should be something that is considered in the next 10 years, based on trends and whether drivers are switching to electric. There should be incentive for durable building materials, especially in areas that experience increased weather impacts like hail and wind damage.
All of the above are important - why should we have to rank in terms of priorities?
It is nice to have any of these, but they must all be installed properly to see the benefits.
What a biased, leading, ridiculous question.
None of the above! It's not the city's job to prioritize how to make building more expensive. There are building codes to meet minimum safety standards. This isn't the city's mandate. You need to worry about fixing roads, ensuring public safety with adequate police and fire and also transit. Stay in your lane.
Room for each unit to park at a minimum 1 vehicle.
Non of the above! Parking problems!
I want to see resilient outsides not dented and destroyed. I don't want see solar panels at all, I don't want to see charging stations(our grid can't handle it) and it's up to the owner to plant what they want not for the city to dictated. Low flow has already been put into place for years so this is just gaslighting those that don't know!
With durable building materials hopefully the development will last and not become a negative impact on the neighborhood. Solar panels are great, the what if's: are higher buildings constructed next door, renders them useless. Low flow systems lead to less water use. Insulation, windows and doors add to energy efficiency. Above all consider the existing residents and the impacts on their lifestyle.
How about no plastic sidings that get damaged by hail and increase everyone's insurance costs
Parking
Considering electric vehicles are not common and will be replaced we don't need electric charging stations everywhere.
The status quo is of existing homes is the most resilient
"Keep green spaces and low density.
Protect single family homes."

Keep insurance costs manageable.
Variety of housing to allow for aging in place.
This question epitomizes what is wrong with this government. Incompetent people in senior government roles are focused on dictating and micromanaging how people live their lives without, instead, first doing a competent job of providing basic services on a financially responsible basis.
Ensuring new buildings are properly completed and used quality materials that is durable when weather events occur.
We should incentivize developments through reduced development fees if they specify materials or fixtures that result in city savings (e.g. low flow plumbing fixtures, drought resilient vegetation)
Increasing insurance rates due to severe weather. Building standards shouldn't result in people facing astronomical insurance or no insurance
If you stop allowing the 12 meters or even 11 meters which are ridiculous in height, we could have more successful solar panel installations for homes, instead you're allowing developers to shadow residents interested in investing in new tech for their utilities.
Solar belongs on every large, flat roof commercial building, not financially viable on every home or ownership timeline.
Minimum 1.0-parking-stall-per-unit should be required.
Passive House should be the standard builders and developers are required to construct to.
The electric grid strain increasing when it's already being strained.
All are more important than Building and Amenity Design elements
The weather is changing and we can't keep ignoring it
Affordable homes should be built with these features as well, climate change will affect everyone and it's discriminatory not to include lower income populations in sustainable living options.
Green roofs. Integrated rain barrels for rainwater capture. Glaze on windows to reduce heat.
Vinyl siding and low level roofing shingles should be illegal in Calgary. High durability concrete Hardie-board like siding should be the building code if working with siding. Our severe hail storms will continue.
Yes they are more expensive, but maybe people don't have to live in 2000+ sq ft homes. Smaller, more durable, energy efficient homes.

not everyone will have an electric car, we should not make that mandatory. we need to make houses better suited for the future impacts of climate change
It's vegetation not vegetation
I don't really prioritize any of these. The design should consider and accomodate the existing neighbours and not just the maximum profit and capacity in the new space.
Low flow plumbing fixtures are required in all new developments (as per the Water Utility Bylaw) so I'm not sure that should be here as an option as it's not optional like the other possible selections. I think making houses more resilient to hail should be a top priority, as well as adequately insulated and water wise in landscaping.
Walk down Stephen Avenue and see the carnage. Calgary is becoming unlivable in some areas due in large part to this government's incompetence. This government should focus on making communities safe, clean and livable before we get too excited about solar panels and micro managing plumbing fixtures.
Existing neighborhoods have more tree canopy, and overall vegetation. You cannot make up for turning green spaces and yards into concrete patios with drainage and saplings with no where to grow and call it a move towards sustainable living.
Electric vehicles are NOT sustainable for our environment (winters) in Calgary and do not take into account the carbon energy inputs to create them nor the human cost (African slave labor / child labor) required to mine the earth minerals to make them. This is not a priority for Albertan's.
You missed the most important option (conveniently) - enough parking spaces for at least 2 tenants per unit to have a car.
Water pressure for neighbours
High performance buildings with better insulation, doors and windows would greatly reduce energy demands rather than create a need to offset energy used. Low flow plumbing would help reduce the high water demands of our city. Both of these options also reduces utility costs for residents.
Passive House should be the minimum required building standard
Through insurance and water restrictions, we all pay for bylaws that don't reduce climate change impacts.
Durability, Climate and Energy efficiency are important but should not be the purview of bylaw (these are code items). The bylaw should however be setup to help incentivize incorporating these into the design. (Note: durable roofs/siding is more of a concern in hail prone areas, area's with lower risk should be allowed to use appropriate materials.)
Require Developers and Builders to construct to the Passive House building standard.

Work with insurance industry to outlaw cheap siding materials so the NE doesn't experience so much hail damage to their buildings. Require Hardie board or similar siding on homes (make it so you cannot get housing insurance for hail damage if cheap siding is on the building)"
General appearance
PRICE! All the "green" bells and whistles are, of course, great, but they add dramatically to the price of a home. If this is important to the City, then drop the cost of permits and fees to accommodate this type of construction.
Also, all homeowners should be expected to carry appropriate insurance on their homes. Taxpayers should not be re-siding houses.
I believe that new developments should prioritize passive design strategies to ensure indoor comfort from the outset. Then be complemented by integrating advanced technologies into heating and cooling systems, utilizing renewable sources such as geothermal, wind, and solar energy.
I keep reading about concerns around Calgary's water supply with shrinking glaciers, and increasing drought. Water conservation should be a top priority.
Climate change is also going to bring extreme heat, smoke, and hail events. Our homes need to be resilient to these - we see already how cost prevails and poor quality materials are used in pursuit of housing acceleration. This results in substantial damages to homes and cost for homeowners during extreme events."
noise levels of air conditioner units and heat pumps, where HVAC units vent outdoors to minimize impact on neighbours.
In Japan show homes show the building assembly so buyers are informed. Is there away to ensure that is done with future builds like having a window in to one wall? We build poorly in Canada and should find ways to do better with all the tools we have.
High-performance insulation and drought-resilient landscaping should lead—they reduce emissions and long-term costs. But resilience also means adaptability. Zoning should support flexible spaces and passive design strategies. Climate response isn't just tech—it's how we shape homes to endure, adjust, and support people through change.
Listen to the people - higher density is great but many other things need to be considered and it should be achieved in a respectful manner. Schools, infrastructure, amenities don't need to be an afterthought in the quest for higher density
Builders who are not passing inspections or code should not be allowed to continue to build. Sustainable design is not what is being built in Calgary. Poor building construction is everywhere, we need higher standards even if it costs more for sustainable designs and climate resiliency.
Does the building fit in with the existing housing in that area

Developers should be required to construct all new building to the Passive House building standard.
Don't push electric on us as well as solar. Experts are saying not good choices.
Homes in newer areas fail to show any sign of quality. Notice how areas with older homes such as the aforementioned Triwood have required minimal maintenance over the years. In this, I wonder: why is reassessing these areas a priority when they should be the model of actual quality housing? While these houses are certainly less affordable, they would amount to about the same given their size (typically less than two storeys) compared to the tall houses in fragmented, inaccessible locations.
Reducing our water usage should be a top priority. Even with fully functional water infrastructure, Calgary has to prepare for continuous drought conditions.
These points will take off considerable strain on the community infrastructure. Even more so would be to have modest densification (RC-2 was good density for interior lots), not MC-1 density that the new bylaw provides - allowing 8 dwellings on a single interior lot takes too much resources per square foot of land.
Ensure there is ON SITE PARKING for 2 vehicles per unit. At a minimum.
Increasing thermal efficiency and minimizing water loss should be too priorities given the current climate and where it's headed.
Though it's more expensive can we need stronger siding against hail
Minimizing empty lawn (or concrete) space, encouraging more gardens whether individual or community.
Storms are going to be a thing of the present and a thing of the future and the cheap materials being used will get destroyed in the smallest of storms and then cost significantly more than if they had just put good materials in the beginning that are more durable and will withstand storms that are frequent in Calgary.
I don't think it's fair to the neighbours that developers get to build bigger if they build greener.
Fire resistant building materials should be mandated and cheap materials such as vinyl siding should be eliminated and banned for use. Vinyl siding is cheap but does not stand up to hail storms and fire.
Hello YYC weather.
Passive House should be the standard.
It will cut down on heating costs and requirements. Building will be less suseptible to damage by mother nature.
With the changing climate Calgary is very prone to damaging hail storms, our flimsy vinyl siding is raising insurance for everyone. Mixed with drought conditions we need less lawns and more native plants
The city is totally missing the point by having an option of drought -resistant vegetation

Growing our own food on our own property is the single best way to help the environment
The jury is still out on climate change.
Environmental impact towards sustainable. The increasing unpredictable weather such as last summer's hail storm require more weather safe designs and materials.
Stop trying to push climate indoctrination and fear!
Building and landscape design (overall neighborhood design) for reducing fire.
Passive House should be the standard builders/developers are required to construct buildings to meet.
Green roofs would be good to see implemented
Builders and developers should keep the climate the ecology in mind. Some areas should be mandatory whereas others are optional.
New construction builds are utter garbage when it comes to quality and durability. These new builds are not sustainable.
Drought resistant vegetation will help preserve our water supply.
These are all important and should be standard for all new residential builds. We cannot be doing less when the technologies are there. Build more resilient and low-carbon housing.
Similar comment, I prefer less regulation. I support better vegetation because it keeps the soil down and now blown as dust. I am unsure how a build form can encourage this without encumbering new development.
While it is nice to include solar panels and EV charging stations, requirements like this on a developer will increase the price of the finished product to the consumer. Could be nice to include in some cases, such as apartment buildings, but I don't think it makes sense to make this a requirement for single family detached homes.
Wild fires, droughts, environmental costs reduced through solar, and hail damage for siding and roof. Need to build better from the start for our climate
Remove arbitrary setback requirements and parking requirements for personal use motor vehicles. Less red tape to allow mixed use, neighborhood corner stores and others local amenities.
This government negligently lets areas fall into disrepair, like Olympic Plaza, and then throws the entire area into the land fill to build something shiny and new. This government threw the Eau Claire townhomes into the land fill so a developer can earn more profit. Despite its gross propaganda to the contrary, this government in substance has absolutely no regard for the environment.

Any sustainable options that can be done, should be done and it is irresponsible to not be doing them in the first place. Especially if it will be longer lasting and therefore financially better in the long run
Let the market decide
Will the city listen or do what they want...i think they will do what they want
The three I checked off are the most important because every home or other type of housing needs properly designed and sustainable roofs, windows, and plumbing. Most people still won't be able to afford an electric car or have solar panels on their roofs. These technologies have a ways to go in order to be considered reliable.
Solar panels are a joke, residents have installed them to comply with climate controls. Then you approve a 3-4 story building beside the existing home. The new build shadows the property thus the solar panels are useless. Is that appropriate?
Aging infrastructure does not always allow for low flow or electricity demands.
None of the above
No one can afford ev's
Bicycle parking would a good addition to promote for housing design to ensure sustainability in the community.
With the recent hail storms, better durability is a necessity.
Mandatory unnecessary luxury add-ons like solar panels and EV charging stations would dramatically increase the cost of home ownership. It should be the buyers choice, not mandated by government.
Remove EV charging, they are not economical in Alberta. Too cold in winter. Solar is a farce when disposal of poisonous chemical laden panels are considered
Low income families cannot afford EV's!!!! The more fluff you add to the space the more low income families cannot afford them.
We should definitely be building things to be long term resilient, but we also just need to be building. We can't be too strict.
their size and closeness to property lines needs to be better balanced. We live in homes not apartments for the space between neighbors. respect that by not having houses 8 feet, or less, apart. might as well be a townhome or apartment building with such limited unusable spce between homes.
Durable interior walls and flooring. Houses that are built with minimum thickness in floors and walls. Taking away minimum standards of quality is inhumane and greedy.

Efficiency for utility usage. Higher ceilings is a contradiction to your non-sensical ""green"" agenda.
We are wasting free electricity from the sun. Native plants should be prioritized for drought-resilient vegetation. With climate change, we will get more frequent and severe hailstorms. Many new subdivisions may not be insured if they continue to get destroyed by hail.
Vehicle chargers save the auto industry and don't have a large effect on the environment.
The social re-engineering of our City is now breaching the rights of citizens to live how they want to live. A friend put in a hot tub, she needed to make sure she had the capacity for a charging station in her garage as part of the permit. I'm happy to fix my roof so it isn't destroyed by hail but that is MY choice to put a metal roof on my house. The City cannot mandate what we do with our personal property. And that includes how much water our showers use.
If people have smaller homes they need more informal, free places to gather fo either public or 3rd places like coffee shops (e.g. birthday parties, new mom groups,etc.)
Focus on our environment and being efficient within our means. If developers want to incorporate net-zero infrastructure that's their choice. Not a priority for housing.
Solar panels and EV charging stations are a step forward, but harnessing magnetic energy as Nicola Tesla did originally is the future. This technology is available. So, making commitments to current technology should include designs that can easily be discarded are upgraded. Don't spend big bucks on tech that will be obsolete next year.
Not overloading power and water infrastructure.
This government should focus on the basic services, not trying to dictate how citizens should live their lives.
I think all of these are critically important.
The city should provide these guidelines for sustainable design, but the developer should make the final decision whether or not to adopt these design considerations.
Literally makes zero difference to climate, just a way to launder tax dollars
All of them
No thanks. Waste of money!!!
I don't want new buildings at all
The strain the increased density will have on existing water infrastructure. If a developer is doubling or tripling the demand on old infrastructure then they should pay the greater portion of the community upgrade required.

Hardie Board should be on any new houses. Solar panels are great, but what about hailstorms? Isn't there a risk of these panels being broken or impacted by bad weather?
None of the above
Lots more to consider, but that's a good start!
Energy efficiency
Durability
Increase in property taxes, infrastructure services and facilities, amenities required for the development
Transit construction and Management
Electric vehicles are very expensive and only the rich can afford them. Calgary's housing strategy is not focused on wealthy people. Same goes for solar panels. Insulation, windows, and doors should be high quality and meet Canada's building codes.
Climate change is the absolute biggest challenge we are facing. We need to both protect existing structures against bigger events (floods, hail, drought) and reduce our consumption, so that there is a world left for our grandchildren.
Really, you are thinking about sustainability... there should be no more building in older areas when there is no upgrading of electrical / Enmax can not keep up and continually have issues with power failures, and water and sewage! The roads in older areas are a mess, companies like Shaw/Rogers and Telus can not keep up and their infrastructure is barely working due to old infrastructure. Yet the city with its knee jerk reactions to just blanket rezoning of Calgary is unbelievably reckless!
Every element of a home has a cost.... Just saying.
Not all wants are reasonably affordable.
Homeowners make adjustments as they can and pay for these innovations when they are cost effective. Renters likely want all of the above."
Wind and hail resistant materials. Vinyl siding is popular in Calgary, but is ruined by wind and hail constantly- this creates constant garbage.
Calgary also doesn't have solar panel incentives which all other cities do - even Edmonton.
None. Please do not ruin our neighborhoods with multi family homes
Literally anything we can do to lower our climate impact, we need to do.
Your priority of climate resiliency is stupid.

Solar panels and EV charging stations should not be required due to added cost to new housing.
In our climate, durable exterior cladding and roofing is very important. The cost of cement fiber boards (i.e. James Hardie) has come down significantly and in my opinion, vinyl siding should be completely banned for any/all new builds. EV charging stations are a HUGE upfront cost and the societal uptake is relatively low. There will likely be better options in the near future that will make EV irrelevant and then we will have all this useless infrastructure should it be mandated.
Also consider increasing access to public transit (why isn't that an option above?). As long as this city continues to develop based on the premise that everyone drives a car we are destined to lose our ability to become a climate resilient city.
Good insulation is important in our climate and saving water in houses is a good idea.
Housing that isn't moldy.

We asked: Which approach to regulating residential parking do you prefer? (select one)

Options were:

- Minimum requirements for parking
- Open option parking
- Maximum requirements for parking
- It depends on the location
- Unsure

We also asked **“Why did you make this selection?”** and received the following feedback:

Residents of Calgary will have cars regardless of City policy. To not accommodate this will cause congestion and conflict and eventual backlash and political change.
Max parking is 2 stalls per unit. 99% have 2 cars. Stop forcing transit
This is a very complex issue.
Not a one solution fits all
NO parking fees or charges for residential areas"
Minimum parking requirements are a failed policy proven to be detrimental to good land use.
Open option is ok as a stepping stone, but to prioritize reducing housing cost we should ensure that parking never takes up too much of the land use. Maximum parking is a strategy used by mature, global cities to great effect.

There is a proposed development in my neighborhood that will have 3 main dwellings and 3 basement dwellings, this will open the door to a possible 12 new vehicles in an area where there is already limited parking. There are children play in this area and if there is more parking congestion, this could cause driver agitation and they may not see a child at play in their attempt to park on our street.

I live in Killarney and my street is already full of cars. I have yet to read a peer reviewed study or any type of reputable published literature that states the transition to EV cars will in ANY WAY reduce the demand or use of cars. In fact, the reasonable conclusion is that zero emission vehicles will drive demand for cars. I understand that Developers lobby the city for things like "open option" to maximize their profits. Shame on the City of Calgary for a lack of transparency.

I live in an area where there is now NOT enough street parking due to developments not having enough parking for each unit set aside during the planning process. It gives the area a look of crowding and causes problems between residents.

You need to have a place to park your car, and a spot relatively close to your home for visitors.

Car storage is expensive and a bad use of space. Instead charge for street parking and use the funds to improve transit service.

There is no one size fits all solution for parking. Many variables can affect how much parking a given development requires to ensure the safety for the residences of a give community.

Spillover parking creates conflicts with neighbours and difficulties for the tenants who don't have a parking space. In my area, when rental costs rose, the number of people sharing a dwelling increased, and so did the number of vehicles associated with a property. Consider an R-CG with 4 units, 3 bedrooms in each main unit, plus 4 secondary suites with another 1 (maybe 2) units. Minimum of 16 bedrooms. 4 parking stalls. If even half of bedroom # have a car, then 8 vehicles. Builders don't care

Livability requires regular vehicle access to a property. Although we walk and bike a lot, we still need to get groceries to our house, have recreation equipment to haul, kids to drive etc. etc. And for 6+ months of the year the weather makes vehicle use almost mandatory. Therefore sufficient spaces for parking vehicles is a necessity and NOT OPTIONAL.

A lot of Calgarian families have two cars and I don't see this being taken into consideration enough!!

In order to achieve a more accessible and walkable city, we need to limit the number of people that are relying on cars and limiting. How many parking spaces will encourage people to use other forms of transit as long as those forms of transit are available. So other forms of transit will also need to be prioritized such as biking and public transit.

Not having maximum parking only breeds stress, resentment and fighting over space. TOD is a failure and parking must be planned into new developments.

There should be a cap on how much parking space there is in residential areas. Parking should be considered, but it shouldn't be an extreme amount of parking space.

Parking requirements are very context-dependent and not one-size-fits-all. Generally, the importance of ample parking is overstated, especially in residential areas.
Open option parking as we see it now tends to create dead space. Many suburban strip malls have acres of paved, unused parking. This approach seems wasteful - we don't need more empty paved areas in residential areas. I believe there should be minimum requirements that are reasonable. .5 per unit (especially based on the definition of unit) is unreasonable. We live in harsh winters, our transportation infrastructure is weak and households usually have more than one vehicle.
Calgary is a car depend city, every dwelling should have adequate street or parkade space.
I've seen streets where the houses are compact and there is no parking. They are almost impossible to drive through especially in two-way traffic.
Regulations should be NO one can park in front of your resident except the home owner or their personal visitor.
.5 of a parking stall is insane and wrong.
There should be 2 parking stalls requirements for each home. Again this is a forced bias survey.
People will not give up their vehicles so the anti-car attitude needs to stop. It is totally unrealistic. People can still try & minimize trips to save on emissions. Cramming streets with cars is crazy for anyone who has to live or visit. Vancouver has become a nightmare (as an example). Those of us who live close to institutions deserve consideration. Please don't kill our parking permit program!
Setting a cap on parking should theoretically improve the effective use of land in the city, reducing sprawl and freeing up useful space for other developments. Maximum requirements may lightly pressure residents towards other forms of transport in overall support of a transition away from car-centric planning.
The developers will put the least amount of parking in to save more space for the building. Again which will not make this an affordable house if the square footage is a good size. BACK AGAIN TO THIS IS NOT AFFORDABLE HOUSING!
There needs to be adequate parking in front of someone's home. Both for the owner of the home & any visitors that they may have. I know that there was actually a fist fight between some men in Trinity Hill because of inadequate parking allowance. This is unacceptable & should not happen. The City did not do a good job with allowing for parking. If apartment buildings are built one of the main requirements is to provide for adequate parking.
If left to the developers, they will provide the minimum parking they can get away with leaving overflow to fill the neighborhoods. Open option would be a nightmare.
New builds and re builds (using the same footprint as the previous build), need to provide at least two parking stalls for each unit. NO street parking should be allowed.

There is a variety of neighbourhoods and building designs and target markets for dwellings. Most locations are not close to convenient rapid transit and will necessitate car ownership. Open option is probably overall the best choice, but it depends on the goals.
Every housing unit requires one off street parking place.
Developers need to design so as not to ruin quality of life and property value for the existing community. Full stop.
People who have jobs in the trades require trucks or some sort of vehicle at least. We all work in different areas of the city and transit is currently not reliable, safe nor does it access where we need to go. A family needs a vehicle to take children to activities or to grocery shop especially in the winter months we need our vehicles.
Parking is not a option. Street parking should be for visitors and EMERGENCY vehicles only. If you are building a house - 2 parking stalls need to be provided by either a garage or parking pad on the property. Building a condo for 60 units, then at least 90 stalls need to be built on the property.
It should not be up to developers. There should at least one parking spot per residence. Street parking will be overcrowded and insecure
because cars are important. more density is not more better.
Parking is a waste of valuable land.
If you have a garage you should be forced to park at least one of your vehicles in it!!!
every homeowner has different needs - some people don't drive, some homes only have one car, some homes need more - but i don't feel the city should responsible for parking to accommodate ALL vehicles. But if there were at least 1-2 spots allowed per household, then if there was overage, the residents would have to come up with other ways to store the extra vehicle(s) or use other forms of transportation (carpooling, public transit, etc).
this is Calgary!! Most households have a least one vehicle if not more (based on age of occupants). Also our public transit system is not great nor safe.
This should be on a case by case basis and the availability of parking in an existing neighbourhood
This should be on a case by case basis depending on availability of existing parking and the existing neighborhood
If there is going to be multiple unit buildings going up in my area, I want there to be strict rules on vehicles, parking.
I do not want vehicles to be lined up/parked in front of my place on a permanent basis. I shouldn't have to "fight" for parking in front of my home

Inner-City density needs to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Landowners in residential areas are usually in best position to decide how much parking their development will require. Unnecessary parking requirements can drive up cost of housing.
Should not be a maximum, only a minimum and from there it matters where in the city this is.
Land owner should decide as they know the market best.
People do not want to circle the block 10 times to find a place to park. The more cars on the street the less emergency access and the worse the community looks. Winter navigation gets difficult as streets are not cleared.
The city seems to think people won't use cars in the future. They will. This is a car city sadly and our weather doesn't support year round bikes. Even using car apps for occasional use brings more cars into the equation. An 8 plex can generate 16 cars which affects the homes around them.
A requirement of a minimum of 1 stall per unit and require 1 stall per suite
The multiple housing units everywhere with only one single garage so they will park in front of my house and if I have guests there is no where to go.
Depending of the location. If in a residential street, then there should be a minimum requirement - cannot have townhomes, row homes etc with no assigned parking when built in residential streets.
In many area we don't have enough. Set minimums. No open option parking
For safety and circulation purposes, homes must be able accommodate parking further number of vehicles per household.
Maximum parking requirements allow the city to limit the number of cars it wants in a neighbourhood, while also giving flexibility for developers to use less space for cars, and more for people. Minimum requirements creates a sea of pavement for parking that usually sits empty, anyway. This wastes space that could have been used for a nice garden, or shared greenspace. It also assumes everyone has a car, which isn't true.
Hard to make a decision as neighborhoods are so unique
All new units seem to have 1 car park vs 2. Most young households have 2 cars?
The pollution and noise is a concern. A new residence should not mean that current homeowners can't park at their own homes.
It is OK to say nobody will be using cars, but the reality is every family has at least 1. Parking on street impacts safety of everyone in the neighbourhood. Both Bike riders and pedestrians.

Parking is an issue that will become worse as more units are crammed into existing neighborhoods that cannot accommodate it. This will decrease the living standard by adding stress and burden to existing residents and is not sustainable.
Downtown or close to LRT or BRT, condo living with no expectation of street parking is fine. Move to suburbs you need vehicle. Bus convenience and routes that head downtown are unrealistic therefore car parking expected. Should one pay for this convenience? No unless I have assigned street parking I do not agree.
I generally favour Maximum Requirements in inner-city neighbourhoods. There are many transportation options available. In the suburbs, it probably makes sense to require space for one or two cars per house. But in the inner-city, there should be maximums.
Sites should have a minimum amount of parking as well as a maximum for aesthetic purposes.
There is a proposal of a new development in our neighborhood and there is no enough parking spots near the development.
With the need for more secondary suites, it provides an incentive for homeowners to consider this if parking requirements are eased.
Because congestion is unsafe and is also causing more road rage and incidents between drivers. Too much potential for kids or pets or other to be harmed when there are cars everywhere and lines of visibility are reduced.
Current residential housing development does not appear to have enough off street parking for the number of new units and residents.
Now that developers can build up to 12 residences on one 50' lot (4 up; 4 down; 4 over garage); there is no way to park up to 24 vehicles on or in close proximity to the premises, so no approach works - those owners vehicles will impede on neighbours ability to park anywhere near their homes. If a new large parcel of land is being redeveloped, minimum of 2 spots should be required for EVERY residence.
Limit non residents parking on our streets for long periods
There is not enough off the street parking available in my neighbourhood. New builds should have at least one off-street parking spot per unit - including secondary suites!!
You need a car to get around this city. Transit sucks. Also emergency vehicles cannot get through when all the streets are clogged with parked cars because the city is mandating no parking requirements. What is wrong with the planning department??? Please live in reality.
It's not a one size fits all problem.
survey the maturity of the neighborhood and current economic situation. Most houses have 3+ cars now as children stay at home longer and people have roommates. The proposed six plex across the street has

three on property stalls, leaving a potential of 9 or more cars unaccounted for parking. Where will they permanently park? Where will my family and friends park? What happens if emergency vehicles can't get through. It's an aging population and likely in higher demand of emergency services
Working as a huge issue in mini of Calgary's residential areas. Already creating more units with less. Parking does not solve that issue. It just adds to making it difficult.
It is necessary to have a car to live in most areas of Calgary. Minimum spaces will help to alleviate crowded streets with insufficient parking. Requirements should vary depending on the access to public transit options.
There is not enough parking as of now. Snow removal issues. Safety with pedestrians. 3 bedrooms 3 parking spots. Parking is a major issue even in the suburbs
People in Calgary drive cars & this needs to be taken into account in any residential area.
Building a 6 until building with only 3 parking spaces is crazy!
Open parking allows developers too much leeway to decide how few parking spots would be available for renters / non home owners.
Generally having no parking requirement is the best option. Let landowners and developers choose how much parking they want, rather than the government telling you how much you have to build, regardless of it being too much or too little.
Developers DO NOT live in their product. They get in, make the cheapest, biggest, densest building they are allowed with the least amount of parking, and then they sell it and leave. They will absolutely abuse no min parking. IF you go to no min parking then you had better be ready to deal the consequences via increased pay and permit areas, more enforcement and increased curb maintenance. Developers making increased profit by shouldering parking into a city cost and that feels very wrong.
If you leave the parking requirement up to the developer they will choose no parking or street parking so they can build more units. This will create issues for bike lanes and mobility accessibility
The reality of where we live means that people are purchasing cars at a higher rate. However, the city has allowed for only .5 stalls per unit. The idea that an 'open option' is even being considered is ludicrous. Developers will NOT build stalls because it saves money. Thus, cars will spill out into the street and adjacent properties causing. This is an obvious safety issue and ruins the nature and aesthetic of a community.
Requires thoughtful design and development appropriate to the residential area. Also increases safety of the community.
I agree with minimum requirements (developers will not provide more than necessary for the most part) - but the current minimum as set by the city (based on new projects being constructed) seems to be way

too small (for example, requiring 4 spaces for example for 8 units on an inner city lot creates a nightmare for both the new home purchasers and their neighbours in car centric Calgary)
Lots of parking space related conflicts in residents lowers quality of life. When quality of life is reduced, people will move to cities and suburbs that will reduce tax base.
People are fighting within communities where there is first come first serve parking.
Not enough parking is a great stress for me. Insufficient parking creates chaos and animosity within the community. I hate going places and struggling to find parking. I usually opt to not go.
Again high density cause issues with parking stop high density and you won't have parking issues will you?
Environmental impact ev pollution cars ev charging stations incredible costs to the consumer and tax payer all green products cause problems and are expensive
We live in a city that has winter six months of the year. People have cars, trucks, motor bikes. Many people have more than one vehicle. People have visitors. Rental homes in our neighbourhood often have more vehicles than home owners. One rental house with six residents had eight cars, and two work vans. Visitors often contributed an additional seven vehicles on the weekend. We need parking; people have cars; regardless what the city pretends.
Any new build should provide off street parking!
On-site parking needs to be provided no matter what
Because North America is so car-centric by default that we will not naturally gravitate away from installing too many new parking spaces.
It should ensure new housing provides adequate parking (and this should be more than the abominable current 0.5 parking spots per unit - this is completely irresponsible)
We need at least two car parking stalls per home... (winter and crazy hail season)
Lets start making more tandem car garages ...
I think too many developers rely on street parking for new builds and do not incorporate enough onsite parking to manage the number of cars that will be added to a neighborhood. Calgary and surrounding areas require a car and although it would be better for more people to take transit that is not a reality yet.
Calgary is turning into Toronto with the amount of driving people do. We need to get people out of their cars. We need trains trams and alternatives.

Maximum requirements will just lead to increased street parking congestion. A minimum requirement designed for the number of homes ensures at least one- two cars per household. Developers will maximize housing over parking if given the choice as that is where the money is for them.
There needs to be at least ONE parking stall per unit
NO PARKING MINIMUMS PLEASE
Parking needs vary widely by area. I lived downtown when zoning changes unfairly penalized condo residents, while wealthier neighbours had more flexibility. It became a “poor tax” disguised as policy. Now in the suburbs, I see different issues—like park overflow blocking residents. Zoning must be equitable and location-specific. We need fair solutions that don’t exclude renters or lower-income residents from basic access.
Parking minimums reduce the viability of density, cost the city money through the costs of maintaining roads (costs that are not recouped like they are through transit!), and encourage the construction of carcentric development, fiscally unviable for the city and socially and physically unhealthy for residents. We can make it easier to make our city walkable, bikeable, and transit-accessible today by increasing the density of destinations people want to go to, by getting rid of parking.
Calgarians drive cars. This reality needs to be reflected in planning. This is never going change, in large part because of our climate. It is exhausting to search for parking.
I don't think auto parking should be made more of a priority over homes & amenity space. Public streets are available for parking. If using (parking) an auto is less convenient, people will make other choices, which is good for everyone in Calgary. For those that don't have an auto, the parking space wastes lot area that could be used for amenity space or trees/shrubs.
Sounds about right.
Many older areas already parked up on streets. Do not relax these requirements for on site parking!
Minimum parking requirements are tied to personal motor vehicle ownership in that it encourages households to purchase vehicles rather than look at alternative modes of transportation. Requiring all residential buildings to have a minimum parking requirement continues car dependency rather than encouraging alternative transportation options. Allowing individual developments to set their own parking minimums is the fairest option.
The Open Options is reasonable for housing meant for people without mobility issues or children. However, housing meant for families should have a minimum of one parking spot per unit. It would be interesting to see what the data shows (do we have a recent survey in Calgary on this?).
With no minimums you have sometimes a family of 5 with the two parents having cars as well as each of their teen kids making 5 vehicles per household which all end up parking in the street

There should be a maximum vehicle limit per household. Parking for residents should be restricted to garage/driveway/stall or parking pad in rear laned homes. Street parking should be limited to certain hours of the day for a certain time period to lessen noise and ease congestion on and crowding on the front Street. Multiplex/ condos etc should be paid parking or have permits. Again, transit frequency, reliability and availability should be considered in all plans
I believe it should be required for each unit to have 1 dedicated parking stall per unit.
Too much street parking does not provide any room for maintaining community character nor allow an opportunity for residents directly affected by new development to voice concerns. Significant issues arise when developments are not reviewed for style, shapes, colors, materials etc. to ensure the wonderful character and historical integrity of our communities are preserved
Parking should be freely available around your home. Don't cram in multi dwelling buildings if there is not enough parking available.
Because parking is a huge issue in over build neighborhoods
Not sure how each of these would actually work in my neighborhood. I definitely don't want the streets plugged with parked cars such as I've seen in Prestwick or Cranston. I went to pick up an item in Prestwick and had to park about 1&1/2 blocks away & walk back to the house. In Cranston I've attended parties where I had to park 2 blocks away from the house because the streets are jammed with cars, In Braeside we can have people over and they can usually park in front of our house
Parking is a very important part of daily life. Each home should be given a parking spot in front of there home for use by the homeowners car, guests, ambulance, delivery etc.
It is very difficult to get up and down the narrow streets in inner city Mount Pleasant area because of the amount of cars parked on either side of the road with extensive row housing. This is increased the amount of traffic and parking on our street. This is unfair to the homeowner who cannot park in front of his own home.
Because although there are ways to get around the city, we live so close to the mountains and so many outdoor adventures that people still wish to embark on. So even if they can perhaps get to their job without a vehicle, everyone we have talked to still as a vehicle on the street. And many families we know have two or three per family unit. The vehicle still exist, even if we're not providing a location to park them.
My street has been negatively impacted by adding dense housing but not enough parking. The reality is, people in Calgary have cars, and assuming that they don't in transit-oriented neighbourhoods is naive.
This question is unclear - very poorly explained.
Current zoning is far too lenient with parking requirements and it is going to create long-term parking issues. Our transit is not robust enough and is not being developed quickly enough to turn the city into a transit city like council wants. People have cars and need cars and there isn't enough parking. Developers

must be required to provide adequate parking, rather than squeezing every last bit of house space out of a lot.
Currently there is very little regard for enough parking and people still need to own cars to get to work, children's activities, shopping etc.
Because people have and want to own cars. They need to park where they live.
I support maximums but the minimum is relative to things such as transit locations
If I want to park my car I should have to pay for its storage. This applies to all my other possessions. The taxpayer shouldn't subsidize one class of storage over others. Especially as we are (hopefully) learning that car dependency is not positive and shouldn't be incentivized
In my area, mostly investors, have taken out entire front yards, laid gravel, to create a parking lot. This is because they have built a secondary suite in the basement. Some legal so not.
It naturally limits density to what the streets can handle.
I should be able to park my vehicle in front of my OWNED house!!!! This should NOT be a privilege but my RIGHT!!!! The City Council of Calgary does not care about homeowners being able to park in front of their homes all they care about is adding DENSITY and who cares where people park, let them fight with their neighbours, students , etc. CofC wash their hands and feel it is a privilege not a right to park on a public street???? BULL CRAP!!!!
Because, if I understand the description, builders would have to build parking on the lot, per unit, rather than depending on the street.
So I don't get traffic parking in front of my house when not wanted
I am a senior citizen and people block my path to the front door quite often. This is rude and makes my access to my home impossible for me.
Parking lots and gratuitous garages don't add to the city. Maximum parking ensures that business and homes can be focused on the people, not the vehicle.
Get rid of the blanket rezoning
Cars take up so much space and so does the spaces cars get parked in. Not everyone has nor can afford nor requires a car. There are other modes of transport that should be considered when it comes to space designation. I think parking could also depend on the location but generally should be flexible.
The baseline should be reasonable and based on the number of bedrooms in a property. On-street parking should be discouraged at the planning stage.

You are asking all the wrong, self-serving questions. Calgarians already responded to the blanket rezoning with a resounding "NO", but the Mayor and Council ignored Calgarians. The Blanket rezoning Bylaw should be repealed.
I have visited friends in infill neighbourhoods in Calgary and you wind up parking blocks away to visit them, coupled with the permit requirements, it makes socializing, visiting with children, etc, difficult.
people drive cars , let them park/charge.
I don't think any of the options are very good but we need to accept that as Calgary has the worst public transport system I have experienced in a modern city, that parking will remain a priority for a long time. enforcing green drain parking areas (permeable surfaces) might reduce impact
Some people in my street have 2 personal and work vehicles. There is a home based business next to me which adds to the parking woes.
Calgary is a car based city and we NEED to ensure there is ample parking available for residential communities
The rcg zoning in my area has allowed developers to tear down a single family home and build a 10plex. If you have 10 single people move in you can guarantee there will be at minimum 10 vehicles fighting for already low availability street parking. This rezoning will not encourage less drivers in this city just more unhappy neighbors
You need to accommodate parking otherwise you Impact existing users who may not have an option to add off street parking. This especially true for lots without a lane
Residential streets are unsafe if every space is used by a vehicle. Houses and condos need designated space
Parking is not a right - it costs the city money to maintain all these street parking spaces.
Increased parking on the street increases the risk of accidents between vehicles or pedestrians. It decreases visibility and makes it extremely dangerous for kids playing outside.
Because u am very focused on the red line expansion south. If we had that, I would not care so much about parking
Some people don't need parking so why force them to build? If the concern is limited street parking then implement permits.
This is unique to every neighborhood.
Parking minimums result in terrible usage of available land and limit the amount and variety of buildings that can be in a place.

Parking maximums will be poorly received.
Not clear on the maximum and minimum options. Street parking is not acceptable for buildings over 2 units.
Restricting a max. parking can bring stress to a community. I believe an open option will allow people who require more space to utilize their own property to fit their vehicles. Others may not want this and do not require it.
Street parking also sucks and turning every community into a parking permit required is a money racket and does not adequately solve the solution to parking.
Parking correlates to road density. Nobody wants to live in a community where nobody can find a place to park when inviting company over.
We need more parking right now. Put it in and IF needs go down we can repurpose then, but its very hard to live around cars parked everywhere, when there isnt enough parking. The way Calgary is designed today, cars are needed!
Because I think it is desirable to manage the number of cars parked on residential streets, and avoid crowded streets in residential neighborhoods where people like to walk and cycle.
You need a car to get anywhere in calgary. Minimum one car per unit parking should be a standard. Stop creating havoc by not applying it minimum reasonable parking requirements. Half a car is laughable.
Stop wrecking communities by turning streets into parking lots. No one is riding a bike everywhere.
I want to be able to park in front of my house. I want room for my friends when they come to visit.
Ideally we should not have on-street parking, as this privileges and subsidizes private vehicle owners at the expense of everyone else.
I don't really understand but I don't like cars and I live somewhere with good transit. I want us to be more reliant on Transiy
Depends on what parking contributors are nearby. Residents should be allowed to park at least one veh for free in RPP zones within proximity of residence.
Give landowners more freedom to decide what to do with their property. Stop dictating minimums and maximums and leave it up to the owner.
Many people(including myself) don't own a car; however, if we are forced to build parking spaces for cars regardless of whether or not the property owner will use them results in lost space that could be used for something else.
All developments must have two parking spaces per unit! in front or in building

too much space is given for cars. reducing car use makes our communities more walkable, environmentally sustainable, and safer. less parking provides a passive impetus for reducing our reliance on cars.
I don't think every residential unit should be required to have parking. Not everyone wants a car.
We all have more than one car as your transportation sucks
Consider Community/Neighbourhood plan
depends on available street parking
consider parking on per home/suite NOT square foot for residential - no residence needs more than 2 vehicles parking
If a building has 8 units, there should be a minimum of 1 parking space per unit not counting street parking. The argument that some of the residents won't have cars is absurd.
Every household has at least one car and should have at least one parking space
Stop the insane push for maximum density and return to a more sane approach to city living.
Limit number of vehicles per unit. Owners need parking permits. Houses should have adequately sized garages to allow for parking
Residential land should have a minimum # of parking on it. And not rely on the streets for mass vehicle parking
Calgary is a city that people needs cars to get around. Ensuring enough parking spaces for residents contributes to a better balance of density and access. Please look at Marda Loop, we don't need massive residential towers with no parking. People can't take transit to the hockey rink with three kids in tow in the middle of winter. Please use common sense.
I do not want to see overabundance of parking in my neighborhood
carparks are extremely ugly and unpleasant to be around, they are a waste of space and contribute to the urban heat island effect. they inherently spread things out which increases car dependency.
even if homeowners live near and use public transit, many will also have vehicles and if there isn't sufficient space provided for parking these vehicles, it will mean there isn't sufficient parking on the street for all homeowners
Obviously, it depends on the location. More rules and regulations are needed in locations where people want to park for school or work, for example.

It is winter in Calgary most of the year and as the city is aware, the average household has at least one vehicle. Unless the housing is immediately adjacent to a train station and grocery store, parking is required
I believe that we need to consider charging all residents for parking on city streets
The type of building must dictate the number of parking stalls on the property. The on street parking should be limited to guests/visitors, and not additional use by occupants/owners or renters.
I live on a cul de sac of 13 bungalows with only 4 visitor spots to service these homes. A proposed town house(6 residences) to replace a bungalow at the entrance to the could de sac will require 3 of these limited spots to be used by the new development. leaving 1 visitor spot for the current residents. - This is unacceptable.
It seems open option will lead people to reconsider our underlying beliefs about parking - if it is something we really want we will have to pay for it.
Residential parking in high demand areas should be managed differently than low demand areas
Developers don't want to put in parking because it is an extra cost. MUST have parking to keep neighbourhoods livable because we have a cold climate and most don't cycle.
See H. Grabar's book Paved Paradise.
People should be able to park their cars on their lots...and hopefully fit 2 cars in a 2 car garage
We need to be realistic - a good proportion of residents DO have vehicles, even if they are not using them for commuting. Vehicles are necessary to go to recreation, etc. (no transit to my campsite/fishing hole). In future more vehicles will need charging, which will not work well if they are parked on the street. A capacity of street parking should exist for ALL residents for when they have guests or need services to their home. Inner city residents should not have to pay for street parking!
Allowing developers to externalize the cost of parking to the surrounding neighborhood so that the City can monetize the public realm of street capacity via fee-based RPZ's in residential areas is a non-starter. Planning & Administration are knowingly causing a problem so that they can monetize the solution. Simply don't cause the problem.
Parking will be an ongoing issue as infills and row houses replace single family homes.
Consideration of access and neighborhood.
Because regardless of what admin wants to create, the vast majority of people have cars and expect and want a place to park them. Perhaps site specific but the formulas for spots need to be reviewed and reasonably defined. It seems like city wants to use street parking, and then use it is a revenue tool in future which is duplicitous. We have a garage and we do not use street parking and I do not wish to live on a car lined street because they have no other option

We are in a city where cars are needed.
No parking in the alley period . You never asked this .
Question doesn't make sense.
Condos and multifamily suites are being built with parking for 1 car, but homes built for many families. Most families own more than 1 car, this leads to cars being placed around the side streets and increased theft.
We should not have blanket zoning for the city. People in further suburbs with no businesses nearby will need more cars. There is also more space for them to have cars and they should be required to have parking. This is different downtown. We also need to allow flexible parking options like stacking cars in higher density areas (like they do in dense cities)
We believe for residential parking, new builds should be required to allot at least 1 parking space per residence.
Despite our hopes to be more walkable, Calgary remains a car city. We cannot afford an open option. It will heavily impact the already sparse parking in inner-city residential communities. Each housing unit should come with at least one parking spot or garage. We should not reduce requirements near transit or walkable areas as it is not an inclusive approach. For example: I need to drive to work and drop off my children to (pre)school (approx. 15 min) as transit would take over 1 hour each way.
I live in suburbia NW Calgary. The parking has become horrible over the years...1 neighbor has 9 vehicles and takes up 4 spaces outside his home and they move infrequently making it problematic for hosting events, the local school and for households with numerous drivers. Now that there are bylaws for legal basement suites there is going to be an influx of cars...we need to have permits in suburbs where parking spots off a driveway is 1 per driver.
I don't think one strategy works for all situations.
I do think if we are considering things like storage when building so people can use things like garages would help provide more availability for other parking needs.
Each unit must have 1 parking spot. Preferably they should be 2 spots per unit.
Not enough parking for 5 units with 5 basement suites! That's 10 cars or more depending on the size of the family
Every house should have the ability to park TWO cars inside in a covered garage and room to park in a driveway and/or assigned on the street. Stop forcing citizens to adhere to your smart city agenda to not drive or drive EVs.

Affordability is in crisis for the young and more 20-30 year must stay in the family home - and Calgary is not a transit friendly city requiring far too much time to reach employment hubs that are not downtown requiring the use of vehicles and those vehicles require parking
New commercial developments are typically under serving parking needs, leading to unnecessary congestion.
Parking for the residents must be on the property to allow guest parking on the street.
Streets are now filled line on line of cars. No beauty or trees or sometimes even sidewalks. Just have a look at the Palm desert area beautiful walkable streets (and highways)
The parking is horrible almost everywhere. There should be more to get more cars off the street. Streets are so narrow now and then lined with cars you almost cant even fit 2 cars passing by at the same time.
It should be up to the market to determine the number of required stalls. If the builder/developer believes there will be a shortage they should have the flexibility to add to meet demand.
Maximum parking requirement encourages the city to grow and it allows a city to account for future increase in population.
Most of the time we see people parking in the streets because there's no place they can park to. This is both a hazard and a risk, especially for pedestrians or even kids when they play outside in the yard in front of their house.
Otherwise street parking becomes a free for all. Public transport is not adequate to reduce current levels of car dependency
The streets are now full of cars. Housing should require proper onsite parking to reduce street parking.
No fees for parking
Parking is the number one issue in my inner city neighborhood. Some old lots in my neighborhood do not have off street parking and cannot add any unless it is in the front yard (no lane, narrow lots)
ability for owners to park at their home
Because downtown is very different from residential.
Every dwelling unit should have a minimum 1 parking spot.
I do not believe the correct answer regarding parking in Calgary is less mandated parking spaces. No matter what people believe to be true I know very few renters or home owners who don't own a car in Calgary. Traffic congestion due to increased parking on streets and limited parking spaces on the street should not go hand in hand with new development.

I think permit parking would be great.
We need to get with the times and allow homeowners to dictate their parking supplies, similar to other municipalities
We previously lived in a street which had very few garages and high street parking usage. One neighbour had 6 vehicles which essentially prevented all other neighbours from parking, despite all neighbours paying the same taxes and roughly the same utilities
I live close to Sait. When I moved to the area I had no parking available on my street due to people parking for the whole day.
There is never sufficient parking for apartment type buildings. The overflow affects the community. The city needs to up the requirements for the number of parking spots, not lower them.
Open parking doesn't work. There is never enough spaces.
Every unit should have a minimum 1 parking spot on the lot. I don't know a single adult (18+) that does not own a vehicle...some take transit to work but all still own vehicles.
Go drive through Marda Loop or Killarney at night time (6pm+ on weekdays) and see how terrible the parking situation has become offsetting these 8-places the city are allowing on every corner lot.
Because as much as the people in City Hall might want it to be different, Calgary will be a city of drivers for the foreseeable future. No one is even contemplating building a truly walkable or bikeable area. Mostly, you are looking at developers that do not want to incur the cost of building parking, so they externalize the cost on the community.
You should be able to park in front of your own house, and not be forced to park down the street due to the 8 plex that has been built next door.
Parking needs are underestimated. A one bedroom home with two occupants often needs to park spaces, even for those outside the downtown core. Residents are often forced to use on-street parking which makes streets very congested. This is clearly evidence by driving around some of the new condo/apartment buildings. like many others, I require a car to get to work and it is not feasible for me to drive, bike, walk or use transit.
Canadians drastically overestimate how much parking we need.
We should never mandate a minimum and we shouldn't waste space.
Most Calgarians own a car even in inner city areas like Marda Loop. Developers do not have the interest of the neighborhood—they care about maximizing their investment. In areas of Marda Loop where there is a lack of parking, streets are not safe for pedestrians and drivers due to cars blocking crossings and site lines.

People lie. Developers misrepresent the parking needs to put in more units and make more money. And then the neighborhood bears the brunt of all the extra cars.
People are not going to stop driving cars and there needs to be off street parking for every house being built, especially each house has a secondary suite that means they need at least four spots
Because otherwise landowners will pack areas that were dedicated to one house with townhomes or condos, adding 20 - 30 people to the area that won't have parking options and that will start breaking laws to find parking, such as parking on sidewalks or interfering with neighbours driveways
Because most people in Calgary have their own vehicle so there should be adequate minimum parking requirements
Unfortunately you can't limit parking too much without drastically improving transit, providing walkable services, building 5A bike facilities, and other strategies.
Too little parking creates havoc in the neighbourhood, and conflict between neighbours. It can also lead to dangerous situations like people parking where they shouldn't but are desperate to park somewhere.
There are already capacity problems with parking in existing and new neighbourhoods
Not having minimums simply dumps the parking burden of new development onto public streets. In addition, street parking should not be a free resource. If you want/need more vehicles than can be parked on private property, there should be an escalating permit cost and restrictions on eligibility.
Housing should have at minimum 1 parking spot for each multi family unit.
Too many recent multi family projects in our neighborhood do not have enough parking spaces.
Not every inner city home needs a garage or parking spot.
Condo buildings should have enough garage parking for each units. Two bedroom gets two spots. One bedroom one spot. Thus eliminating the need to park in the street. Keeps vehicles secure and reduces crime if the street parking is reduced and buildings are actually required to have sufficient parking for each unit. And building should not be charging more for parking. It should come with your unit. It'd be large charging extra for a driveway to park in on a house.
Minimum parking requirements should have flexibility with consideration to site specifics for connectivity, along with proposed development/use/density paired to a review/reconsideration on "size" of parking stall(s)
"The idea of open option parking is interesting if applied to residential; but opens up the issue of builders not including parking space so streets become over parked and dangerous to navigate.

Calgary is a car city so knowing most households have 1-2 + vehicles is important when planning. Also potentially creating a limit of vehicles per household that can be parked on core residential streets may encourage on site parking/vehicle storage. More could be done to make on site parking attractive."
There needs to be a minimum of two parking spaces per home but in cases of multi units or suites there needs to be a minimum of two spaces per unit or suite. Some homes are being used as boarding houses so they should require a minimum per bedroom!
Adequate off-street parking is my biggest concern re: redevelopment and basement suites within communities.
A minimum of 1-parking-stall per dwelling unit should be required for all R-CG designated lots.
**Because R-CG and H-GO will be 'renamed' (to either H-1I, H-1G, H-1Gm, H-2 or H-3), a minimum of 1-parking-stall per dwelling unit should be required for all of these designations.
Other options will lead to parking chaos in many situations.
developers should have the freedom to build how many parking spaces they like, and to modify the parking situation as they see fit
I think the current minimum (0.5) is too little as evidenced by new developments where residents street park and use any parking garages for storage (since storage is totally missing in 4+4 rowhouse developments (bsmt suite vs storage), but at least there is some parking vs overcrowded street parking. We live in a winter city and many people require a car for work or recreation.
These options are not adequately explained: what is the definition of "Minimum," and "Maximum" requirements? Impossible to answer this question without some clarity and context.
Density within transit oriented design should be prioritized if it is in applicable areas. It is a conflicting priority to promote density and transit then prioritize cars.
Every new condo and residential development in this city is short on parking, as well as new retail areas. I support requiring a minimum meaningful amount, even if it means building less units.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
If public transit becomes more efficient and accessible from all locations, shouldn't the parking issue go away?
It is the only logical choice. If you own a home, you should be able to park a certain number of cars for free in front of it.
One development (8 plex) on a 50 ft lot will take up all of the parking on the street. Absolute nonsense.

Homes should be required to have minimum requirements for housing the vehicles at the property without relying on overcrowding city streets. This leaves no room for visitors or contractors or city workers to park.
Different areas face different pressures depending on their proximity to popular amenities and gathering places. Choosing to live close to those places to reduce commute and travel is now being taxed to subsidize commuters - again.
Because people drive and need safe and secure places to park that does not impact their neighbours.
Property developers are incentivised to build inadequate parking if they are permitted. Subsequent homeowners suffer the negative impacts when this is allowed, including challenges parking near their homes, unloading deliveries and hosting visitors.
As things stand, Beltline residents are often given no choice but to park illegally, in the full knowledge that they will sometimes be towed and face fines.
Calgarians have cars, the city needs more private parking.
So the hundreds of low income renters won't be parking in front of my property
Parking!
Sets a predictable amount of parking required for new development. Communities do not want parking overspill from new development to affect their communities' parking.
This is essential in built areas where parking is already an issue.
This should be handled on a case by case basis. Inner city is different from the outskirts. Definitely, there should be a minimum amount of parking for every household. We live in a vehicle dependant part of the world and this will not change quickly.
Parking should be for the residents and visitors (at no cost). BUT too high of building density is causing serious issues.
Because I frequently see a significant amount of cars parked on the streets for high density housing, especially from visitor parking.
They are Building to many row homes and no parking our streets are a mess.
The minimum requirements for parking under R-CG are inadequate, and seem to be based on an unwarranted assumption that everyone will take transit, or commute by bicycle, or live a lifestyle where no vehicle is required for practical and leisure needs. The current parking space requirements under R-CG should be at least doubled.
The City does not understand that scarcity in parking can be very disruptive to a neighbourhood and that transit is not used as much as the City would like. The need for parking is not going away.

There should be enough parking for minimum two vehicles per door as well Visitor parking!
Open option is problematic, the owners can't easily make changes. The builders and developers who do...don't have to live there.
There is rarely available street parking in residential areas.
Each house or unit should come with minimum parking requirement's in the design as it is impossible to live in Calgary without a car. I already have to pay to park in front of my house with the new permit fees. If higher density is allowed without onsite parking then the permit I have for me and my guests will be crowded out as everyone will be fighting for the street parking as they have no option to park on their property due to design.
If density on a site is increasing from 1 unit to say 4 units then a parking minimum should be required. But if it goes from 1 single family home to a duplex then let the market decide and have open option parking.
It depends on how much additional parking is expected. 1 to 4 units + 4 secondary will likely see 9 (2 for above ground and 1 for below ground) new cars, but 1 to 2 units will only see another 2, assuming 2 cars per unit."
I despise minimum parking requirements, I hate parking lots, they are ugly and make me sad.
Some places may need a maximum parking, things like grocery stores and malls should use this in order to limit the size of each individual location.
Residential should have open option parking, since if there are no transit alternatives, then they will need parking, otherwise no one will buy it.
This is all under the assumption that we develop better transit alternatives. Best use of space and allows for everyone to have space to park.
The open option is a joke to me - most people will choose the maximum amount leaving everyone else especially visitors walking blocks to get to their destination. We'll need park and rides within neighbourhoods with this idea.
A 10 plex in a residential area without at least one space per unit - on the property - is also community busting adding a conflict potential. Denser housing should only be allowed within a transportation corridor w transit easily available
In the Crescent Heights neighborhood, none residents park on the residential streets and walk to businesses in the area or walk downtown to avoid paying for parking.
I would like to think that developers know their target market/demographic enough to make the most accurate decision rather than having the city decide and hope it's right.

I think open allows for a flexible amount of parking needed, without separate rules required for every different scenario. However, I think this needs to be clearly communicated to potential buyers and renters, so there is no surprise or regrets.
I don't want to have so many cars on the street that visitors can can never find parking.
People in the inner city need places to park. If a builder builds a huge home and does not allocate any parking, the cars will all spill over into the street. In a perfect world, people may not have cars but they do. Parking authority rarely checks on parking infractions in Crescent Heights and more cars without “homes” become a problem for everyone.
The need for adequate community parking is not going away. Inadequate parking rarely improves in the future. You can always eliminate parking but can rarely add it after the fact. Cumulative impact must also be factored. Living in Calgary is not the same as living in more dense cities with well developed public transportation and well-situated shopping and other infrastructure. We need to meet nearer term requirements and not just assumed future solutions will occur in realistic timelines.
The closer you are to downtown and walk ability the less you need parking unless you're an old person like me, I could never buy a place without parking but eventually, I will lose my license and I need to be someplace with easy public transport close to the city centre
It is reasonable to assume that most families/people in Calgary will own a car. Even in well connected transit areas, there are activities that fall outside of going to and from work (downtown). Neglecting to have parking for each unit creates congestion on the streets and just fills up residential streets with cars. It is also less safe to have a car parked on the street and it creates issues in the winter time especially when people bring cables over the sidewalks to plug their vehicles in.
Different neighborhoods may have different requirements.
Location is the biggest determining factor. It's important to understand the user of communities and how they move through their area and the city. It's important to know where amenities are located in proximity to development sites. Maybe determine parking using a scoring system where a site that scores an A (meaning it has great transit and a lot of amenities within walking distance) can have less parking while something that scores D needs more parking.
Developers will always choose least expensive option - must have some parking assigned or neighbourhood will suffer.
Calgary is not an easily accessible city. you need a car to live here.
To establish a minimum criteria that must be adhered to for adequate parking.
New developments don't have enough parking causing overflow to street parking.
Too many new developments do not provide enough parking for units, leading to increasingly crowded streets

People with limited mobility or small children shouldn't have to worry about finding a spot to park near the front of their house. Every residential property should be allotted at least 1 spot per 20 feet frontage in front of their own property or 1 per 1000 square feet of house size.

Within a block of my home they are adding over 60 new units. There is a requirement for between .5 and zero parking stalls per unit. When all of the units are occupied there will not be enough street parking for all of the vehicles. Where should people park? Assuming everyone will use transit is an unreasonable and unrealistic expectation.

Most people have vehicles in Calgary so parking is needed. These massive complexes with very little parking is ridiculous causing a high demand for street parking and lots of frustration when trying to get in and out of the house. Perhaps it needs to depend on walkability of a location. Most of the city requires a car especially since the green line is not happening.

Quit trying to fix something that isn't broken!

I likely need to learn more, but as most of the redevelopment in my area is only abiding by the bare minimum of parking stalls required. It has been increasingly difficult to have friends and family come visit and a lot of established families have begun to move. I really support pedestrian family development and want to reduce the dependency on cars, but we are not Paris, London, or New York. The reality is almost all units end up having a car attached to them at some point

Removing parking when building is just allowing for developers to be more greedy and squish extra units in. We do not have a population that's looking for studio apartments and don't need parking - that's unrealistic. Even 1 parking space per unit is better than today's 0.75. I get we will go green in the future but we aren't there today or tomorrow. We will drain this city and reduce equity with our proposed direction. Bikes literally fit anywhere so to say we need space for those is a cover up

Parking is the elephant in all proposals. Why is it that a development for 28 Units only provide 12 stalls?? That is so stupid, people use cars to get around Calgary, our weather is not suitable to walk, cycle all year. C-train is not safe to use, only goes downtown. Providing parking is a cost developers do not want to pay, it's time parking was a necessity, our streets and lanes cannot handle the extra vehicles.

The city has seen a disproportionate number of medium to high density built in the past number of years and has left residents with fewer and fewer options to park their vehicles. This has led to numerous incidents of vandalism and confrontations between residents due to a lack of available parking.

It is winter 9 months of the year. Not everyone can bike everywhere. Good luck transporting a hockey bag on your bike. Transit is terrible and unreliable. Plus you probably have to drive to it. Minimum one car spot per unit

Because it's awful to have too many houses on one street and not enough room to park. Everyone should have access to park a minimum of one vehicle in front of their unit. Especially since many people have accessibility issues.

Also, when considering hosting people, parking becomes an issue. No one wants to be friends or visit people when they need to walk several blocks because there is no parking available at a house.
Everyone drives. We need parking spots. We don't need to try to force people to take our transit. Or force people to pay for parking.
Because parking is very limited everywhere I go in this city!
There is insufficient parking in my building, as well as paid permit parking on the residential street. Allowing 2 hr parking as well, takes up the available parking spaces until late evening. With the anticipated high rise building in the area there must be considerable parking for new developments.
We must be able to park in front of our homes
Let people park in front of their house. We live in a cold climate with abundant space for single family homes.
Depends if you are downtown, older neighbourhood or apartment building.
I pay to park in front of my house. If it wasn't permit, there would be no parking. With new developments offering no parking, I see this getting worse.
Developers won't provide parking unless they are forced into it. We don't have a year round climate for cycling, and very little cycling is undertaken per capita even in the warmer months.
Caine neighborhoods in Calgary have a lot of new developer development where parking is limited. Parking needs to be considered in the design of the house, as well as the neighborhoods it's being built in. To check for how busy the streets are, check after work hours for better accuracy. Checking how populated a street is during business hours is not effective or accurate. Need to come after hours during a weeknight.
Cars need to be controlled. Too many vehicles not enough space, especially as multi family homes are thrown up. Environmental impact of too many cars. Changing the neighbourhood with more traffic. Potential attraction for crime with more cars in streets. Safety of children playing in streets
As the city becomes more densely populated, we have been developing larger scale condos/row houses that require adequate parking. Many of the residential streets of Calgary are overwhelmed with parked vehicles. These dwellings should require a sufficient number of parking stalls per unit.
No minimum parking requirements.
Streets are becoming incredibly crowded due to high density housing leading to higher traffic in residential areas. This decreases safety for bikers, pedestrians, and children. Lack of parking prohibits social events as people have difficulties visiting due to no parking. Calgary Transit is not equipped to handle population demands so people will continue to have cars and these need to be appropriately planned for to avoid traffic and parking issues, especially in residential areas

Because developers do not provide anything necessary for their residents than they have to and it's important for the city to regulate to ensure for a liveable city.
Should be enough parking for each House
make homes more affordable by not requiring tons of parking required that ppl may not use
Minimum parking must be considered by developers to ensure that there is adequate parking to accomodate the number of residents. For example, a fourplex should include a minimum of one parking spot per unit, otherwise there will not be enough street parking to accomodate the residents living there significantly impacting quality of life for the home owners and neighborhood.
I think that there should be a minimum parking requirement of 1 stall per unit to keep our streets safe and provide room for everyone to park.
Because most people have a vehicle in this city and parking HAS to be considered. Even space for an Uber/taxi/delivery truck to pull off the middle of the road to make their stop. No parking options causes people to drive and park unsafely and block the roadways.
Cars are a reality in Calgary; the bylaw needs to be grounded in the reality we live in, not the way we wish the world would be.
The minimum parking requirements should be 1.0 stalls per unit. And all suites should be required to have 1-stall-per-suite just like the garage suite requirement.
Open option allows developers to underestimate their needs that leads to parking overflow into neighborhoods.
Street parking is affected by bus routes and zone thus reducing how many vehicles can park in front of their own home.
Off street parking per dwelling offers the benefit of sight lines for safety, less visual 'clutter', ability to clean streets annually. Storage within dwellings should be a prerequisite; or oversized garages for storage of bicycles, strollers, sports equipment etc - leaving space for vehicles as well
There should be a minimum of 1 parking spot required per home, as there is usually more than 1 spot required.
Because Calgary remains a driving city, there needs to be a minimum parking requirement of 1.0 space PER UNIT including secondary suites, for a total of 8 spots for a 4 unit townhome/ 4 unit basement suites
Homes should have enough parking.
There is not enough room on most of our City streets for everyone to park, regularly.

Parking is needed and when it's in place it needs to actually function. Understand that the city wants more people to choose transit however some people can't. Eliminating parking and leaving it to developers is an accessibility issue and it may also be discriminatory to people with certain needs. Consider parkades for middle housing options in certain cases as a way to add value and also minimize space above ground that's needed for cars.
Every situation is going to be different and I don't know what is the best. I think Calgary should look at cities around the world and see how they solved these problems. Mainly Europe because many countries there such as Finland has very similar climate to us.
Calgary is not a walkable city most new builds need to account for a parking space which is currently not being taken into account in the new builds in our area. Street parking will be used ruining our street.
There should be enough parking on the lot for the house. 3 townhomes. Should have 6 spaces on the lot. With your new zoning bylaw a six plex only has three spots on the lot. So now three or more cars are parking WHERE??? The city is making parking in neighborhoods even more challenging !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Everyone needs cars so improve transit or improve parking
Housing developers are not going to provide parking if they can build (and sell) more houses. Unfortunately Calgary is still a car centric city (and will remain so while transit is unsafe), especially in new communities where transit is lacking. In a world where we are moving towards electric vehicles, it is necessary for people to have somewhere to charge these cars.
Too many cars are being parked on others' streets. It MUST be underground parking and 2 cars per unit. Otherwise surrounding areas suffer from traffic and noise.
cars are a nuisance
Because currently it is 0.5 stalls per unit that are required for new homes and that is ridiculous.
I'm unclear on what you mean by minimum or maximum parking requirements. I believe you need to consider the parking availability in neighbourhoods
Because we want to make sure that there is enough parking for residents in new builds in a higher density area.
Existing neighborhoods have the parking they need, increasing density in an existing neighborhood automatically increases problems with parking. Let citizens choose their neighborhoods based on what they offer and DO NOT change the building bylaws once a neighborhood is established!!!
The streets are already highly congested, this needs to be better managed.
Parking is a waste of space, unsightly, and create heat islands. it should be integrated into non-residential buildings (underground) or a solar panel covered car park area

When I'm carrying my child 2 blocks, cause everyone from the new 8 plex that they built on the corner parks in front of my house and leaves their vehicle there for days in end
This city is becoming difficult to navigate in residential areas with too many cars parked on the street. It is congested and difficult to see when there are so many cars. This causes a safety issue and makes accidents, including those involving pedestrians.
Minimum parking requirements should be 1.0-stalls-per-unit
As public transport does not sufficiently service large parts of Calgary and bike lanes/paths are designed more for recreation than utility, new developments need to factor in the need for residents to own and park at least one vehicle
Close to transit means you may not need parking
Lower parking requirements in areas that have a high amount of transit service options makes sense. Calgary is unfortunately not set up well for transit to most of its communities so minimum parking requirements should be standard to avoid congestion. Cars on streets makes for less friendly feeling neighborhoods I feel.
Developers are in it for profit- therefore require a minimum of 1-stall-per-unit (suites should also require 1-stall-per-suite) as the current 0.5 stall requirement is too low. It is poor planning to presume elderly, disabled, and young children are able to live in a home where parking isn't on-site; winter 7-months per year makes for unsafe walking conditions for these populations.
If there is going to be a condo building or row housing, there needs to be enough designated parking space available to those units so as not to take street parking from neighbours living in detached homes nearby.
Because it depends
Residents should be encouraged to park in their garages instead of using garages for storage.
We need availability to have two vehicles for every living space. Families and couples want two vehicles unless they can't afford them.
Stop with the nonsense that a significant portion of people are going to bike to work, grocery store, run errands.
Calgary is a vehicle / driving city - - and lack of parking creates tension among neighbors, especially if 'common' courtesy (e.g., park in front of your own home) is not adhered to. "Wish"ful approaches (e.g., increased use of public transport) doesn't work. Secondary suites must supply onsite parking.
Regulating parking in downtown areas is fundamentally different from doing so in suburban neighborhoods.

Calgary needs to invest heavily in alternative transportation if setting parking rules. I support this shift - but as a city - we are not equipped to move people around efficiently or effectively using transit. It is a big barrier, and yet we keep investing in car-centric infrastructure.
consider the street and block, limit to reasonable amount
Cars don't build community. Cars take away from housing space. Cars exasperate poverty. Cars kill. Lets help people get off cars. The flip side of this is demand buildings have class one bicycle parking equal to occupancy.
It depends on the location. In dense, walkable areas with good transit, maximums or open option parking make more sense—they reduce costs, traffic, and land waste. But in suburban or poorly connected areas, some minimums may still be necessary. A one-size-fits-all rule won't work—zoning should be flexible and reflect local infrastructure, not just car ownership habits.
european studies suggest less parking increases visitation rates to businesses, and increases harmony by dictating housing mix bringing residential and business closer together.
Building parking is known to be expensive. Developers therefore are incentivized to minimize it. We live next to multi-residential structures - the streets are always packed with parked cars and I've never yet heard of a building that has parking spots unutilized. That said, users should absolutely pay the costs of a parking spot if they need it rather than just parking on the street.
Calgary could benefit from parking pressures, encourage transit and alternative transportation
It's unrealistic to not have a car in Calgary, transit is very poor and it can be very cold. Parking is frustrating and difficult throughout the city.
There should be a minimum number, but the current 0.5 stalls per home is not enough. It needs to be at least 1.0 for all residential zoning. Again, our transit is not good enough and street parking is too limited
"We need to become less reliant on cars if Calgary is to truly densify.
Parking spaces per home should be limited"
A minimum of one stall per unit (and suites should be required to have one stall per unit as well) should be required in ALL new developments instead of the current 0.5 stall requirement. To not put a minimum of one stall in place per unit will discourage families and discriminate against seniors and disabled individuals.
Adding parking in the form of driveways or underground parking massively increase project costs and reduce greenery. Developers should be allowed to add parking if the market demands it, except in the case of transit-oriented-development where more walkable urban design is to be encouraged. Minimum parking requirements should be abolished.
Impossible to find parking in many inner city neighborhoods these days.

One parking spot per secondary suit, 1.5 parking spots for primary suits
Open option only works if there is lots of excess street parking or if there is an equitable approach to permit parking. The City should be ok with identifying areas that may need permit parking in the future and giving those residents plenty of time to understand that permit parking is coming so they can make changes as needed.
You should not be able to build for more capacity without the available parking. there is no way to restrict how many cars are registered and calgarians still drive and own cars. building properties without the parking spaces hasn't changed that
A better solution that meets the community standard. I don't understand why communities like Bowness, Montgomery, Ogden (for example) have the same or even worse parking ratios than communities such as Sunalta or Hillhurst. Busses from Bowness take 50mins to 1 hr to arrive downtown. The supporting transp. infrastructure in these communities does not align with a 0.5 parking ratio.
No less than 1.5 stalls per unit should be the requirement for missing middle buildings to encourage families with young children and for seniors and disabled to live there.
Too much parking means less density, uglier streetscapes, and less safety for other road users.
Parking should not be a barrier to building housing. I have 1 vehicle and 2 bikes for our family of 4 living in a new 4plex. My neighbours live in an older single family home with two adults and have 6 vehicles. Parking is not always linked to density!
New housing developments do not currently provision for adequate parking. This is demonstrated in various neighbourhoods, where street parking is fully occupied and safety becomes a concern with visibility of pedestrians inhibited by the volume of parked cars.
In residential areas multiple housing units do not have enough parking spaces so the streets become overcrowded. It is an urban myth that people will use public transit . They will always want their cars.
Ensure there are two parking spots on site (NOT ON THE STREET) To preserve the streets. This will go a long way in helping neighborhoods accept more density
I think this is a fair way to calculate parking requirements
Developer will have all parking on street causing congestion in front of others houses so they can maximize profits. Why would they provide parking if they don't have to. Open parking is a terrible idea for residential areas where children play outside
Forcing more people to live in areas where there were fewer people will create parking headaches.
"The High Cost of Free Parking by Donald Shoup.
In our culture, there is now a built-in entitlement for free street parking that never should have happened."

If a single family home can have 8 cars without restrictions, why should someone building another project be forced to build parking spaces if they are not required by the future residents.
Not everyone drives nor do they need to drive. If we construct parking, we incentivize driving. If we don't construct parking, then people will not drive reducing our reliance on vehicles.
Do not allow open option. Developers will provide no parking and make getting around and visiting these communities a nightmare.
It depends because older streets may not be able to accommodate minimums
Parking minimums encourage vehicle use and discourage Transit and active mobility expansion and development.
High and medium density housing (up to rowhomes on the lower density side) should not have required minimum parking spaces. Detached housing, more common where public transport reach is poor, should have parking access.
Unfortunately Calgary does not have strong enough transit or bike infrastructure to reliably get around the city without a car. Therefore the vast majority of households need at least 1 or 2 cars to thrive. Mandatory parking minimums open up more space for street parking which allows friends and family to visit.
Because otherwise the streets will be littered with vehicles.
This still allows for enough parking per home, but prevents an owner from paving their entire yard and making a parking lot.
There is not enough parking spots, residentially, just about anywhere in the city, except older mature communities. The front of the lot is shrinking, which means less parking when it comes to row houses and condos and apartments that should be a design plan of the developer not on the nearby residents to have to deal with and hate the neighbours parking in front of their houses.
Apartment buildings should provide underground parking for at least 1 car per unit to decrease overall congestion for street parking and existing neighbors.
vehicle crowded streets are unsafe for kids and bicycles. Accessibility is also an issue.
Minimum requirement for busier/more dense areas where free or public parking is limited; Maximum requirement for less dense areas to ensure efficient use of space. No open option parking for now as population growth likely will make land owner decisions outdated very quickly.
There is not enough parking and streets are full. Every property should have adequate vehicle parking for their tenants. No exceptions.
I'm inner city and can't park in front of my own house because of all the other people parking there. It's ridiculous.

Developers focus on PROFIT. Require 1-FULL STALL-per-unit (INCLUDING SUITES) We already have congestion issues with 4+ 4 suites and this is discriminatory for seniors and disabled people. They're denied equal access to housing due to mobility/accessability needs (can't park and walk far, especially in winter re: slip/fall risk). Public transit isn't close enough nor reliable enough in the winter. Lack of parking effectively excludes elderly/disabled from living in areas without adequate parking
Putting a business in an already busy residential settings clogs up the area and makes residential parking a battle.
Landowners are greedy and will never provide enough parking and the streets are already too crammed due to landlords over crowding houses
I'm in an inner city neighborhood and it seems that new developments are not taking parking into consideration, leaving our adjacent streets very very crowded.
We are seeing more rental properties in traditional neighborhoods. This means more cars at the residence. Less people are parking vehicles in garages. Work trailers are on driveways.
I don't fully understand this one.
Inner city should have much less parking than the suburbs
Your transit system sucks so people have no diversity in transit options - so they drive! Parking is essential and so is transit - this isn't a "this or that" comment - have BOTH!
Calgary is not a great transit city and never will be. Cars are a necessity here.
If a business is to be successful it will need space for people to come and go, park as needed. If you only have one or two spaces per business it will affect the ability of customers to frequent and access the business.
Parking regulations should depend on neighborhood location, age of neighborhood, proximity to transit (especially CTrain) etc.
Minimum parking requirements should be 1.0 stalls per unit (as the current minimum is too low)
The city needs to be realistic about the amount of cars residents have and provide adequate parking.
Because I think enforcing minimum parking perpetuates a car centric city but at the same time people need places to park their cars
Depending on occupation of each home there need to be both minimum and maximum limits to parking. More often children are staying home longer due to the price of housing, so parking allowances need to be made.
New builds must supply sufficient parking per unit (0.5 spaces per unit is NOT sufficient)

The landowner should be able to determine how much parking is required. It should not be left up to the City because they want to minimize parking.
We live in Calgary where cars are a necessity, anyone living here knows that. If a building is going up, it should only be allowed if it can meet this basic need.
Too much city space is wasted on parking cars.
No matter how many parking spaces you give, even if everyone has a parking space, they will still choose to park on the street out of convenience, unfortunately. We should be incentivizing people to use transit and have no more than one car in a family - to take cars off the road.
Residents need to have assigned parking and not be dependent on street parking.
Developers will build what will sell. We cannot overpark anymore. Things have to change.
I've lived in Edgemont and CBF Currie. We have overbuilt parking in the outer suburbs at the expense of extra wide streets. I have no issue navigating tighter streets.
I think buildings often over allocate parking based on parking minimums. Providing a maximum will enable to market to dictate how much parking will be included in a given development.
Make a custom approach based on the neighborhood. High density areas less parking low density more parking.
The developers cheap out and provide less parking to maximize their profits and negatively impact the neighborhoods for decades. Put the onus on the builders to make it functional from the start
Setting a maximum limit would only bleed into street parking, which would directly affect neighbors.
I think regular residential parking should be permit for the houses on that street most importantly when a home is across from a business and it's so busy you can't park in front of your own property because the street parking has been taken up by store patrons
Encourage the building of parking within cadastral boundaries for single homes, and mixed use/high rise residences should not be allowed to use up a certain amount of land space for parking, but rather build underground spaces.
My family lives in a home with a parking space. We do not have a car, but most houses in the area have one so our options were limited. This is a waste of space and the idea that a bylaw should decide how much parking someone needs is ridiculous. If people do not have enough parking on their property they can pay to store their car somewhere else or build a spot themselves.
I came back up here to say whoever made the question on Parking Supply - select 3, should be fired. Horrible question construction. Answers are confusing and you don't put positive and negative statements in the same question. You use a different format (not a checkbox). Sheesh. Come on guys.

Solve transportation with density, not cars.
People buy 6 cars and take up road space
None of the options are great. Customers of local businesses should b3 forced to pay for parking in neighbourhoods where residents are forced to pay for parking permits. The city should actively enforce restrictions including towing.
Match parking to dwelling and occupancy size. Must be contained off street
If you want parking, you should have to pay for parking. I'd rather have a bigger garden than parking. Or maybe put a little parklet in front of my home instead of parking.
I would generally tend to open option parking. However, in communities or areas that are less suitable to alternative transportation means it is important to have enough space for the vehicles that are an unfortunate necessity of life in those areas. Counter to my counter, I generally want to see us allow a diverse range of options that cater to other transportation forms such as bikes and transit.
We don't have enough parking and we continue to put more and more structures up that we can't support
Tired of development decisions that do not provide parking on the development. Calgary parking bylaws and bylaw management need a complete overhaul.
Having a minimum amount of parking is the best approach because many people currently abuse parking outside their homes. For instance, I live in a cul-de-sac and I have a neighbour who parks three vehicles outside their house. This is excessive and home owners need to be given a limit. If they exceed this limit, then people should be charged.
Within the inner city too much parking worsens pollution and congestion.
If you build a multifamily building, steer parking should have to be angled for safety reasons. The west district is terrible because everyone parks out on the street and blocks traffic.
Parking must be provided for all developments, the .05 for a car is a farce. To claim everyone will walk, cycle or use transit is a joke. People have vehicles, we need parking provided and not permit parking on our streets. Where do visitors park? Due to a poor transit system we require cars. No one walks to buy groceries with small kids when it's snowing and cold. Time to face reality.
There should be at least one parking stall for each residence.
I dont want a unit with 16 suits and 30 cars trying to park in the same space that a sfh used to occupy
Cars are an eyesore and waste of space
Parking takes up too much of out shared space. BRT, larger sidewalks, more trees I think are better uses of space.

Minimum parking requirements destroys walkability, and consumer choice. If I do not own a car, I should not be forced to buy an unnecessary parking space. Its just that simple. Especially if I live near transit.
We are a winter city and most families have at least one vehicle. Cars need to be plugged in in the winter sometimes. This must be taken into a count.
Entirye should be able to park their vehicles alongside their property. I'm case of condos, ensure secure adequate parking is available.
Let the free market decide. Plenty of people live without cars. If someone needs a parking stall, they can buy or rent a place with parking - just like they would if they needed an office or a gym. Costly parking mandates drive up the cost of housing.
context is required, especially where there is residential in close proximity to commercial property.
Every house should have space for 3-4 cars excluding garage space. Children grow up to be drivers, space is needed for your typical 4-person family where everyone has a drivers license.
We have created car sewers (e.g. Walmart parking lots) throughout North America due to minimum parking requirements. We need to try something different.
Let the market decide how much parking is required and you can pack more housing into a smaller location.
I am not signing up for the Calgary plan that tells developers of new downtown buildings that they can't have underground parking. I'm not up for the City dictating how I can cross through downtown from the SW to the NW by adding more traffic calming measures because you want us taking transit / walking or wheeling. I'm not taking my bike to the mountains. I live here because of proximity to the mountains so quit trying to tell us how to live. We NEED cars to get around.
Landowners are in the best position to make this decision, it shouldn't be mandated by the city
Most households have 2 vehicles. With the current zoning of 8 units on a single home parcel there is not enough street parking for each household
Lack of parking in a car-society creates social AGGRAVATION, which is something city planning should avoid as a core value. Planning decisions should not create anger-by-design. ONE SIZE DOES NOT FIT ALL. Careful consideration of each situation with a balanced approach as opposed to forcing minimum parking spaces everywhere means: discard ideology, think democratic, stop being lazy, and find the design that MAKES PEOPLE HAPPY!
On a normal residential street the addition of an infill should not change the percentage of on-street parking per inhabitant. I don't trust developers or the City to manage that properly. The "open" option in residential would be a disaster.

Calgary will always be a very car focused city due to its sprawl. With poor transit options with little positive outlook for improvement I'd say we need to get away from the single car garages that many row/townhomes have and find creative ways to get them two parking stalls.
I don't know which would work best.
In most cases, the maximum requirement for parking shall be used. Too many people are not using their vehicles designated parking area on their property (ie garages) to park their cars, and instead they park them on the street. Resident should pay extra if they choose to not use their garages for parking their car and expect to park on the street.
keep minimum requirements for parking. We are a cold weather city with garbage limited unsafe transit. Removing parking doesn't get cars off the road it just creates more conflict
that question is biased and already assumes that all areas are to be managed
Maximum number of cars per household as some neighbours clutter the road with cars they do not use.
Flexibility
Parking should be forced onto private property not public streets
We've overbuilt parking in this city, it's time to remove the regulations entirely, so we can let the market course correct by itself while the City focuses on transportation investments instead.
All I know is that the streets in these overdeveloped areas are crowded, unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists, and the parking without consideration of capacity is very poorly thought through. Cars park illegally blocking crosswalk and intersections making for poor visibility and increasing the chances of a collision.
The City is having people register vehicles and pay for parking in their own communities. This is NOT what I want!! Leave the parking to homeowners and regulate those who park big trucks in communities, which takes up valuable space for residents.
Still want street parking available and unpaid
If you take something away from humans (parking), then you have to give them something else as an alternative: dedicated pathways (Bow River Pathway) with NO vehicle crossings, an efficient citywide rail system, etc. I want to see integration of the Parking Reform Network with City of Calgary official policy.
Transit users and availability
All new detached or semi-detached should have at least 2 on-site spaces. Families have 2 cars these days. Apartments should have at least 1 on-site space. Parking on streets for both home-owners and visitors is incredibly important to Calgarians. Current planning documents do not recognize this.

Builders for inner city infills seem to have one thing on the mind which is maximizing profit with the number of units they can squeeze in. If we don't mandate off street parking the builders and designers will not do it because it is not their problem. Instead it becomes everyone else's issue.
I have noticed in many new areas, e.g., East Village and others, that parking provided by the buildings is grossly inadequate and streets are narrow, offering little parking, leading to congestion and nowhere to park vehicles, neither for the residents of the area, nor for visitors and shoppers. It has to be assumed that there is at least one vehicle per occupant, and many occupants have 2 or more vehicles, e.g., both a car and a motorbike; or car and ATV, or car and boat; etc.
I don't like the fact that now buildings are being built in older residential areas without assigned parking to their building and people are parking on the street! The original road/street design does not have the room for this. People renting out their homes to numerous individuals are parking on the street as the owner no longer has to provide a parking spot for them! It is dangerous!
To many cars parked on street in residential areas
There has to be garage space provided. Existing neighbours need to have availability to park and have visitors.
High density buildings should not rely on street parking - that isn't sustainable or realistic.
It's bad enough that we subsidize drivers throughout the public realm, it's even more ridiculous to insist on continuing their subsidization on private property
Being an inner city homeowner, the current system doesn't work well. It's clumsy and rules not enforced for permitting. Many churches are located within our area and no enforcement happens during events.
Minimum parking requirements of over 1 car per "unique living units". The average family has over 1 car. A minimum of 1 parking spot per household is obviously required.
Developers don't make money from parking. If we leave it up to them, there will be more dwellings & not enough parking. Have you ever driven through Killarney or other older neighbourhoods with lots of infills? There is no where to park & the streets are jammed. It's unsafe.
Do not build multi family homes in single home neighborhoods and there will be no parking issues.
The obnoxious inconsiderate nature of residents abandoning their vehicles on the street for years with no support from city bylaw management despite repeated engagements. Tow abandoned vehicles !!!!!!!!!!!
People who do not own a car should be able to choose homes that use this space for other purposes.
Check the stats. Two car homes are the norm, so quit building 8 unit R-CG townhouses with four single garages that you can barely get a vehicle into.

The public transit system in Calgary is a joke, and therefore it is a car City, like it or not. Street parking is out of control, and a very real problem in winter months (snow removal). Each residence should have parking at the address, which should be required to be used, instead of just parking on the street.

Open option parking allows more freedom and denser living arrangements. I'd also be fine with a very low minimum requirement and open option near transit stations.

Open option parking allows the market to dictate the desired level of parking. While some people may argue that developers will just stop building parking, the reality is, if you build a home for sale or rent that does not have parking when the market wants it, you will not be able to sell/rent the unit. There is therefore a baked in incentive for developers to build in a requisite amount of parking based on market demand.

You already have this option and it is not acceptable. Your minimum requirements per dwelling should be increased to a bare minimum of 1 parking stall per unit for a condo (unless along the C-Train line - NOT A BUS STOP) and 2 parking stalls per dwelling unit for a townhouse/rowhouse/single family dwelling.

We asked: What strategies could help reduce potential negative impacts of your preferred parking approach? (select top three)

Options were:

- Manage on-street parking with tools like permits, time limits, or pricing
- Allow or encourage shared parking between businesses or residents
- Include bike parking, scooter parking, and other mobility amenities
- Reduce parking requirements near rapid transit stations
- Reduce parking requirements in walkable areas
- Provide more trees or landscaping to reduce the impact of surface parking
- Use design standards to make parking less visible from the street
- Monitor impacts over time and adjust parking requirements if needed
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Resident parking only zones should be used and enforced. Street parking should be encouraged for adjacent residents in low density areas.

None of your choices appropriate. All basically no parking. 2 spots per unit not by paid permit either

New builds in mixed density must include 1 parking stall for every unit

Daylight residential intersections (ie using curb bumps) to prevent parking too close to intersections and improve pedestrian safety at crossings

Stop builds that would increase existing parking congestion.
Offering minimum parking for homeowners does not require mitigation as homeowners have access to parking.
Don't approve developments that generate too much on street parking, and leading to a safety issue for residents crossing streets on foot, etc
People need a space for their vehicles. None of the options above provide parking options, they all just try to discourage it. Please be more realistic about what is needed.
Always provide parking
Don't allow development where it will negatively impact existing residents. This means developers must build underground parking.
Really - these are all ridiculous suggestions. If I live on a street and can't park by my property - that's stupid
Require developers to design one parking stall per residence on duplexes row and walk ups
JEeze just stop with the redevelopment, stop the zero lot lines and go back to civilized lots that have lots of parking. bring on more land.
Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
Have enough parking all citizens can get to where they want to go without being forced into using public transit.
If on a residential street, sufficient parking needs to be attached to a housing development to ensure sufficient parking.
No developments unless 2 cars spots per unit
Ensure there is adequate parking per house to not have the overflow problem.
Never paid parking near schools
Make sure the building design provides at least 1 off street parking space per house unit.
Don't approve a new development if there is no clear solution for a parking issue.
For every unit that a builder develops there should be at least one spot for parking. Street parking is limited and causes greater friction between neighbors. Building lots of units and relying on street parking is poor. It affects a community in terms of aesthetics and can create parking wars/neighbor tension & friction. People will become territorial about their spot, even if it is on a public street.

you cannot reduce negative impacts of overdensification
Stop reducing parking requirements. Get rid of bike lanes that limit parking. Stop putting concrete structures in the middle of roads for traffic calming
Do not approve large developments without appropriate parking
Don't allow min parking
Force developers to build appropriate amount of parking spaces.
Require a minimum numbers of spaces that allows for at least one vehicle per dwelling unit.
Maintain minimum parking requirements
Ensure at least one parking stall per unit.
Stop high density projects and rezoning and upzoning
Enforce more onsite parking requirements for multi-residential units, duplexes, row houses, town houses. Repeal blanket rezoning and H-GOs.
Improve transit options
Reduce the number of for profit parking spaces downtown or reduce the cost. It's unsustainable and there are so many empty lots downtown that citizens don't benefit from, only the owners of the lots.
Public transit, including more affordable tram lines, like the one in Salt Lake City! If people have viable alternatives to driving, they will not need cars, and this should be our goal as a city!
Require new builds to have parking built in, ie condo buildings with underground parking
Make sure each multiplex builds enough parking for their own structure
make sure there is enough room to park by not over developing neighborhoods
Keep RV parking away from residential areas. It decreases safety in residential areas beside being totally ugly.
Plan to have sufficient, available parking from the outset. Do everything possible to reduce the amount of government regulation and overreach.
Require more parking spaces on the property in new developments - especially multi-family developments.
Simply put, require all construction to provide 1.5 parking spaces for every unit as a bare minimum.

New construction need to include parking
New housing should include off street parking
The City is using this to make people pay for parking on the street in front of their own homes. Disgraceful practices.
Just accept that enough parking is required and provide or legislate for it. Provide enough as a good average and accept it will be filled. If this is done in association with good refuse and recycling collection planning that the major deconflict will be gone. Also don't claim 'Fire Lanes' if you're going to accept zero lot line set back - they cannot have it both ways!
Less dense housing will bring less vehicles and less parking issues.
Maintain a required amount of parking spaces for residential properties.
Red line expansion south
The strategy of not overcrowding neighborhoods with insufficient parking per household.
Mandate garage space
Be realistic about parking goals. The average household has at least one car, if not more. This is not going to change anytime soon, especially because transit is not safe.
actually enforce against illegally parked vehicles (e.g., parking in the bike lane)
Actually enforce no parking limitations in applicable areas.
See above comments and parking in front of your OWN home should be free!
Allocating a minimum of 1 parking spot per unit is not a negative impact
To punch in more condos and townhouses then neighbourhood can support. Less vehicles will follow
Educate, educate, educate. Street parking and parking lots are things we currently take for granted and many don't know about the hidden costs, downsides and alternatives to all this parking.
hourly (time limited) parking near facilities and LRT are necessary (residents excepted), residents did not cause the demand and thus should not have to pay for what other Calgarians get for free. City should NOT rely on street parking as permanent residential parking, especially won't work for electric vehicles
Stop building houses with no parking availability.
Consider location when assessing parking strategy.

Again, people need to recognize that the vast majority of people want appropriate and reasonable parking options. They don't want to be subject to more fees from a city that already user fees above and beyond comparable municipalities within Canada
What problem are you trying to solve? There was no problem with parking until you created it! Garage parking, street parking, driveway parking should not be limited except for size (like an RV) or if a vehicle is abandoned and needs to be removed. You are just making a mess of parking in your attempt to curb our ability and desire to drive a car based on your adherence to a UN agenda.
Increased parking with less restrictions.
All the others that are not selected are for aesthetic. We need to be mindful that we focus on functionality.
There are no negative impacts of requiring proper on site parking.
Offer to add permit parking because the city poorly managed the parking issues because they allowed the development in the first place is infuriating. Try listening to affected neighbours before approving the developments.
More parking spaces on the site whether apartments or single detached, would keep people from having to use the street for parking.
These are all stupid - make every single builder have a minimum of 1 spot on property per unit.
There are no negative impacts, other than fewer people are jammed into the smallest possible space.
Parking needs are very personal and site specific. What works in the core will not work in the suburbs
Help Calgarians move on from their Car addiction by creating an electric bike incentive.
Provide adequate parking
Having minimum parking, but also being a little flexible in common sense situations with it if it can be shown that the area around it can handle overflow.
None of the above address the problems in placing multi family units into former rC1 neighbourhoods.
No on street parking of business vehicles
Requiring developers to provide appropriate parking based on residency.
Police illegal suites and boarding houses!
Ensure adequate off-street parking in all development configurations. Calgary is a winter city. Encourage walking with carrots, not sticks. Life without cars in Calgary is a utopian fantasy.

Residents should not be forced to pay for permits when city mandates, eg near LRT stations, colleges etc
People do not drive 0.5 of a car. 1 stall per unit minimum
Restricted parking but without fees for the homeowners
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Make parking a priority
How about providing enough parking spots/units built? Build fewer houses, with more green space and have enough parking spots or garages for each unit. Novel idea...
Make 2 parking spots for every home built.
Make builders and owners provide enough onsite parking, a minimum of 1 and preferably 2 parking spaces per unit.
all Units require minimum parking spots on site!
Less high density housing on residential streets that were meant for single family homes
Education and required disclosure from builders! This "cheap" residence does not include parking, street parking is unavailable. You are expected to walk or use public transit"
underground parking for high(er) density units.
Make it a requirement that the builder must provide a minimum of one stall per unit.
None of these are good. Assign parking spaces . Make yards have parking lots and make businesses have adequate parking. Using design codes. Stop street parking!
Provide enough parking for the number of bedrooms in a development.
Require developers to build below ground parking in higher density developments.
Ensure there is a MINIMUM of one parking space per unit off street.
Allow room for people to park cars without being gouged to death by greed. Have enough parking spots for all cars that are going to be accessing the site.
Parking permits
Insist that onsite parking is provided
Ensure the development is designed to have adequate parking

Require a minimum of 1 parking stall for each primary and secondary suite across all rezoned areas
Don't build where parking will be compromised and impinge on surrounding homes
Stop pretending Calgary Transit is a safe and viable option
have a minimum one parking stall PER UNIT and do not consider making residents pay to park in their own communities.
Homes should have enough parking on their lot
None of these options really relate to the question. These are either intentionally leading answers or this survey is very badly written.
Include parking pads, garages etc when building homes.
DO not change density in established neighborhoods!!! Change the bylaws back to single family homes!
2 parking spots per unit! If it means under ground so be it
Ensure the developer creates enough parking for the units they profit from.
Ensure that enough off street parking is provided
Allow front drives in all communities if the property owner wants it
Requiring 1-stall-per-unit keeps streetscapes safer and less congested, allowing for adequate space for emergency vehicles, deliveries, guests, and other service vehicles
Prioritize public transportation
Shared parking and mobility amenities reduce car dependency while making the most of limited space. Reducing parking near transit and in walkable areas supports sustainable growth and encourages people to use active or public transportation. Good design isn't anti-car—it's pro-choice, letting neighbourhoods evolve with smarter, more flexible use of land.
Increase train lines
Require a minimum of one parking stall per unit (including suites)
Not realistic. Developers must ensure 2 spots per unit to avoid overflow onto streets
Increase other forms of transport (public, active)
See previous comment

Above a certain number of vehicles per household, registration is required for additional vehicles.
Incentives to NOT buy a car (improved transit) so fewer parking spots are required. In no way should new builds in existing neighbourhoods overwhelm street parking because of ridiculously low minimum parking requirements
Smaller homes aka no duplexes/4 plexes in areas where the parking can't be handled. There's no space!!
we need more parking all your examples are a reduction and is a failure to support the city
See above
Provide parking at all developments for residents and guests.
Reduce or remove parking requirements city-wide
Build multi store parking buildings instead of parking lots on the ground.
Is one pays taxes based on property size, that should include the sole right to park along your property. Don't appreciate a vehicle lot along my lot on my street.
Leave it alone and do not concern yourself with this. Every house should have a driveway also.
Encourage solar panels to be installed over top of parking lots
People drive to C-train stations. Make sure they have parking otherwise, it ends up in communities.
Face reality, we are a car-society. Don't skimp on parking availability. Reduce aggravation.
Over 90% of Calgary homes have at least one car. To provide fewer than one parking space per unit on multiplex lots will lead to increased pressure on available street parking.
maintain minimum onsite parking so street parking isn't overwhelmed, we don't want your agenda 2030!!
none of the above.
Amenity and transportation investments that replace the need for parking
Calculate that 2 working adults in Calgary require 2 parking spaces per unit as transit is not reliable or efficient to go without a vehicle and be able to afford to live in and work to pay to live in these pricy developments.
Keep street parking available and allow for parking on property. There should be no permits or paid parking in areas other than downtown core.
Increase transit to reduce parking requirement. Cheap transit



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Ensure minimum on-site spaces for cars for all residential developments.
Allocate more money and resources to expanding transit and bike lanes.
Buildings must provide adequate parking for the residents and their visitors, so that street parking is available for shoppers etc.
Provide garage space so there is less pressure on the streets
Buildings that have more units than street parking allowed, should have to have parking spaces on the land. Stop charging for parking everywhere.
PROVIDE MANDATORY MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENTS OF OVER 1 car
Do not build multi family homes in single family home neighborhoods and there will be no issues
Leave the parking alone all you want is to charge more to park on streests that i have already paid taxes to build. Heres an idea fire all the useless people doing these useless surveys and save that money
Calgary has winter and extreme cold. We need cars. Quit making us pay to park on the street.
DO NOT INTRODUCE PERMITS, TIME LIMITS ETC. strictly because the city CAUSED the parking issues. The citizens shouldn't have to pay as a result of City Hall's poor decisions. If new builds have resulted in permits being needed then the city should immediately assess why that occurred and fix the issue by learning from it.

We asked: What factors should influence how much parking is provided for new housing? (select top 3)

Options were:

- People who own property in my community have freedom to choose how much parking they build on their property
- I have a say in how much parking private landowners near my home must provide
- The availability of parking at home
- Having different options for getting around Calgary, such as biking, walking or transit
- Lower cost of housing for new or redeveloping homes
- Being able to park on the street directly in front of my house
- Customers of local businesses don't have to pay to park in my community
- Less red tape for businesses wanting to open in Calgary
- The cost of maintaining street parking is paid by all Calgarians through taxation
- The cost of maintaining street parking is paid by the drivers who use it
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

In a residential area people should be able to park for free in front of their own house for free and if they would not be able to then the development should not be built.
These options make no sense. Every person is a development must have some way to access to parking. The think there are other influences on how much parking is to fail at planning for Calgary.
There is very little to maintaining residential atreets. Nice try on threatening additional taxation to keep street parking in front of your house. I also don't want neighbors paving over their whole yard to make commercial parking lots. Again, blanket upzoning was the wrong decision.
There is currently enough room to park about two cars per household on the street, and it is mostly used. Additional residences should not overload available street space. The assumptions as I understand them do not require enough parking.
Parking on-site needs to be provided at a minimum of one space per dwelling unit including suites.
In sufficient parking is a big issue, a safety issue. Every unit must have designated parking.
It's not that I want a say in how much parking must be provided, but it should be regulated. Not solely up to the land owner or developer.
These sentences are odd. Essentially, there should be parking with each residence that is not street parking. That would leave the street parking for guests. For houses, it should accommodate 2 vehicles.

Jamming streets full of big vehicles is a risk for people as kids or pets may run out. visibility is reduced. Again, it can also cause tension in the neighborhood.
Minimum one spot per unit. 1/2 a spot was ridiculous and it seems the city is trying to reduce that. We do not live in Europe and never will. Nothing can get built to improve infrastructure so we have to live with what we have. People drive. It is reality. Wake up
What a biased question. Developers ARE NOT RESIDENTS. You keep forgetting.
Simple just stop building high density areas and it won't be a problem
Land use bylaw should require onsite parking. We all have cars, we need to build to accommodate that need.
Need more clarity
Reducing the private parking industry
We have a housing crisis, and a walkability crisis! We need to reduce costs for development, which are oftentimes high for parking, and encourage healthy city design by providing viable alternatives to driving! This starts at discouraging carcentricism by removing parking requirements.
Based on occupancy of the building should be how many spots are built into underground parking for a new building, it's not rocket science guys... if you have a new 8-plex building the builder will need to include in the design underground parking with at least two parking spots per unit.
I don't feel like any of those capture the idea that for new multifamily residences, there should be at least one spot per family unit on the property.
All new housing needs to have parking for all units or not approved.
Paid parking where it seems necessary. The system for this appears to work.
These make no sense. The number of dwellings is all that matters
New housing should include off street parking for at least one vehicle.
This is a non-question. The only influence should be enough parking provided as the city fails to provide suitable public transport. On street parking effectively has a zero cost and is just a revenue stream. Older areas (50s/60s/70s/80s developments) had much better provision but then the parking spaces were allowed to be eaten up by housing density. Fix the appalling public transport before attacking the parking!
Red line expansion south
Not sure how less red tape for businesses fits in this question. The question is about housing and parking. Should be removed.

The factors listed are strange. The factors that should influence how much parking is provided will depend on the context of the neighborhood.
Residents and guest should not be penalized and have to pay permit fees when other citizens park for free on streets adjacent to their homes in areas that are mostly single family.
See comments abovewhen did I not pay for parking in front of home when I pay outrageous property taxes?
open street parking, no permits/payment required; 24-48 hour limit enforced
How can we successfully phase in these changes so that any unanticipated down sides can be identified before they do irreparable harm to some neighbourhoods (especially the inner city neighbourhoods where there is/will continue to be lots of redevelopment.
Permits restrng number of vehicles per site
developers are not 'people who live in my community' and they will do as little as they can get away with and still sell - there needs to be a minimum so that vehicles are not imposed on neighbours unduly; I do NOT expect to park exactly in front of my house - I do expect that my guests or service people can park somewhere nearby
These questions are worded in a way to get a desired result. Street parking cannot become the standard for new developments. That's offloading burden from developers who are making a profit onto the taxpayer: in suburban areas, one spot per unit should be standard
A specific amount of parking per number of bedrooms and how many people could possibly live on a property
Houses with driveways and garages must use this space. Drivers who live but not own the house can have 1 permit
If you stop the blanket rezoning and go back to properly building communities in shared-style (multiplex in one part, single family homes in another, businesses in another) there won't be much of a problem with parking. You created a problem with blanket rezoning and now pretend to "fix" it!
All housing should have adequate onsite parking. The number of units should dictate the number of parking spaces required. .
Build garages in rear
1 parking spot per unit that is built. Anything less is idiotic
Accessibility

The cost of providing parking for multi family units should be carried by the developer that is building these structures in former rC1 neighbourhoods.
Police illegal suites and boarding houses!
Most of these are not relevant options. Do the math. How many people/how many cars in Calgary? Housing should include parking
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
A realistic acknowledgment that we do not have the transit infrastructure or climate to support .5 per residence. Doesn't mean the city cannot get there, but as a city we simply lack the infrastructure and transit to make this a reality any time soon.
What was wrong with the old minimum requirements for parking associated with the building type being built.
The wording of this question doesn't really make sense
Permitted street parking should have a cost, however I don't think it needs to be a fully self sufficient system. Roads are paid for by all taxpayers, regardless of usage. Unpermitted street parking on a wide suburban cul-de-sac should have a cost too
The fact that we live in Calgary and a car is required for most people.
proximity to amenities and whether there is rapid transit accessing them
User pay - if you live close to transit or are in dense areas and want parking for more than one vehicle for every two people then you have to pay
Within a block of my home they are adding over 60 new units. There is a requirement for between .5 and zero parking stalls per unit. When all of the units are occupied there will not be enough street parking for all of the vehicles. Where should people park? Assuming everyone will use transit is an unreasonable and unrealistic expectation.
Just provide enough parking for the potential number of residents in a development.
Not allowing 30 minute or 2 hour parking when residents have to pay to park on the street near their home.
The market
Because it's about feasibility, not "reducing red tape" for developers or affordability, they can afford the parking pad.
Requiring a minimum of 1 parking stall for each primary and secondary suite across all rezoned areas

Emergency vehicles, which aid all Calgarians if needed, use the roads so of course the cost of maintaining Street parking is paid for by all through taxation (the same way we all pay for schools even if we do not have school- aged children)
minimum one parking stall per unit.
Again, most of these answers don't relate to the question. Cities need to give guidelines on parking because developers aren't going to consider what's best for the city, they will only look after their wallets.
The estimated number of vehicles expected by occupancy
Require a minimum of 1-parking-stall-per-unit. Require suites to have 1-parking- stall-per-suite. Allow front drives in communities with less than the 30% required (or whatever the % is) of existing front drives the bylaw states
While flexibility matters, landowners could take advantage—underbuilding parking to cut costs or overbuilding in car-heavy areas, worsening traffic and street crowding. So parking should be based on real mobility options, affordability goals, and community input—not just landowner preference. Balance is key.
Developers and property owners should be required to provide 1-FULL stall-per-unit. And have front drives if they want them-
The current requirements for RCG zoning is TOO LOW. It should be increased to 1.0 stalls-per-unit in order to properly provide for seniors, disabled individuals, parents with small children, and the winter conditions.
Anything above the max needs to be registered and paid for.
Minimum off street parking requirements to meet dwelling occupancy rules
We need more parking and you continue to build more housing with less parking. Definitely more parking by transit
New houses should have underground parking or attached parking.
Don't take away our freedom. You win lose the next election.
If my neighbour builds a 4 plex with secondary suites and only has 4 spots, inevitably the residents will park on the street. There must be a recognition of this unless you want to give homeowners parking zones in front of their houses to ensure that residents can actually park close enough to carry in groceries or help aging parents get into your house. Also, the language of your options is leading.
this question and answers don't even make sense, terribly written, keep adequate mandatory on site parking so streets remain available

enforcement of vehicles who are not insured or those that use street with parked car unsurance
The developer pays for a traffic study to see the impacts of their proposed development on the neighbourhood access, safety, and possible conflicts with snow clearing if they do not incorporate off street parking for all adult residents in their new construction.
More transit, cheaper and improved transit
Do not build multi family houses in single family home neighborhoods and there will be no issues
This question is poorly designed and written. How does the City control the cost of housing?

We asked: What types of businesses would fit into residential areas?

Options were:

- Home-based businesses (e.g., consulting, tutoring, personal services)
- Artist studios
- Live-work or work-live units (e.g., ground-floor workspaces with home above or behind)
- Small neighbourhood stores (e.g., corner grocery store or cafe)
- Neighbourhood services (e.g., hair salon, yoga/spin studio, repair shop)
- Small offices
- Daycare

We also asked **Why? Do you think there is anything else important to consider?** and received the following feedback:

Corner store fine but I didn't buy next to one. Stop forcing business in small streets.
Businesses local to residents builds community and supports sustainable transport.
What does this have at all to do with the City's alleged housing crisis? This is nothing but an ideologically driven view of how our communities should be configured by our current City Council. It's almost like there should be a plebiscite on how the communities that all tax payers in Calgary live in should change as time progresses. Just because CUPE and Developers bought this Council does not mean that the majority of Calgarians agree with any of this.
Limit retail in residential areas. If there is retail, ensure there is enough parking to allow the retail users to visit the business.
In each case, level of activity of business matters. City used to have Class 1 or 2 home-business license, depending on the # of employees, frequency of clients, traffic generated, etc. Licenses were granted for 1 year initially so if the business was too disruptive to neighbors, they could comment on it. If no problems,

license was extended for longer period. No hard and fast rule on the above. Ex. a tutor could have one or two students, or a revolving door of dozens. Should depends on usage.
The traffic and parking impact to the residential area.
Access, small local businesses will do better if they're easier to access through walking. This will also improve the sense of community as people will know their neighbors better.
Mixed neighbourhoods have always existed. Keep making them work rather than over-regulating and over-planning them.
There should be an emphasis on local businesses within residential communities. Garden stores, restaurants, medical clinics, dentist offices, postal offices, entertainment spaces such as theatres and arcade-type spaces should all be considered and promoted within communities in order to improve the experiences people have living in new development areas.
we need more AFFORDABLE basic amenity type stores (e.g. grocery, pharmacy, convenience/dollar store, post office, etc) in most neighbourhoods in Calgary. The absence of such amenities is a large barrier to walkability
Stop forcing intergration. You are causing a huge problem with the social contract we have between neighbours. Stop with the density of neighbourhoods, it doesn't work. You are taking away our personal freedoms. Go live in disgusting New York and realize how amazing we have it. Also NO, NO, NO to home business. Again your breaking our social contract.
I believe that context is really important for the inclusion of any businesses. Nobody is particularly bothered by someone working from home as long as there is minimal to no traffic/noise/environmental impact. FYI - some restrictive covenants prohibit businesses.
The daycare is best on a busy street with parking available for the parents to pick up their children. There is a daycare on Elbow Drive and 89 Avenue that only allows for 4 cars to pick up the children. The concern is they will park on 89 avenue where only one car could pass at a time. Or alternatively park in the alley blocking the neighbours access to their garages.
businesses must provide parking for client
Businesses also generate traffic, noise, and parking concerns, but in general these would make our communities more livable and walkable.
It all depends where a business is located within an existing residential community as to whether it fits in or not.
The developer of these retail spaces needs to be able to provide ample parking for the 'business' and there should be no overflow into the residential areas. This includes for the staff of the business to park on the property, not in a back alley or on a side street.

<p>Corners stores, cafes, and other daily amenities are the most important to fit into residential areas.</p>
<p>Calgary should aim to have everyday necessities within a 15-minute walk.</p>
<p>Like to see daycare but feel depends on size and location because of traffic.</p>
<p>The type of traffic the business requires and it's impact on neighbors.</p>
<p>All of the listed businesses are crucial for daily life. Everyone needs a place to work, a place to get food, a place for kids, and a place to have fun. Thus, all of these businesses fit into residential areas.</p>
<p>Issue is the size/height of building for these businesses. It's the multi storey buildings that cast shadows, have too many customers such that there is no parking that is the concern</p>
<p>It depends on the community and the availability of parking and access to transit and other services. If the amount of people in an area goes up then inevitably so does crime and the cost of policing. Needs to be taken into account.</p>
<p>One of my pet peeves of many new developments is the large size of their retail/business units. A florist, a barber, a coffee shop, and even a restaurant do not need that much space and, in fact, will drown in it. Most of our foundational daily businesses need less space than developers currently provide.</p>
<p>Integrating more business into neighborhood both new and existing is a MUST-DO.</p>
<p>Calgary needs to make up it's mind. You can't tell developers you don't need to provide parking for an 8-plex because we're a walkable City (we certainly aren't now) while continuing to allow development further and further out (where then people have to drive to work, schools, services).</p>
<p>Far more integration is needed, especially if you want to remove many of these parking requirements, and increase transit use</p>
<p>depends on business size; residence should not be able to be converted into any business without the business owner living there.</p>
<p>Neighbourhoods should have retail complexes to provide for businesses listed above (ie: 16th Street in Altadore; Lakeview Plaza; 33rd Avenue in Marda Loop prior to over-densification)</p>
<p>Sprawling mega-retail complexes are a waste of valuable land; any new retail complex (small or large) should be REQUIRED to build residential space above.</p>
<p>Businesses must have sufficient parking for expected patron numbers</p>
<p>Unless it causes health issues, every business fits into where we live. If we need it to live, and it doesn't kill us, there's no good reason to push it away from where we live.</p>

Yes, what people don't want is a crazy busy over capacity business in a small residential area. For example, a day-care with 5-6 kids is fine, not 50.
Not at this time
Businesses that require a large physical presence or lots of traffic should not be allowed in residential areas. We have a mechanic in our neighborhood who works out of his garage. He often has many vehicles parked behind neighbouring properties waiting in line. He often has vehicles up on jacks and works on them in the alley. He will often leave a vehicle up on jacks in the alley. This is not okay for a residential neighbourhood. Quit this free for all and start enforcing some rules.
I lived in Germany, this is already how zoning works there and its wonderful - I loved having access to more commercial amenities closer to my home.
The corner store that people can walk to. Not a strip mall with 200 hundred parking spots. Get people out of their cars.
Let businesses open where they want.
Given the rising cost of living, allowing people to earn income from their homes is more important than ever. Supporting home-based businesses helps residents stay afloat financially, encourages entrepreneurship, and keeps wealth circulating locally. With the right guidelines in place, this can be done without disrupting neighbourhood character—and can actually strengthen community resilience.
Healthcare facilities (physical wellness like massage therapy/chiro, dentists, vets, clinics)
Cities are healthier when people have shorter commutes to their workplaces, gathering areas in their communities, and resources they need! Bringing businesses into communities enhances street life, strengthens communities, reduces traffic and pollution, and stimulates the economy! We must make sure that, as these businesses come with a customer-base within walking distance, that there are no minimum parking requirements for these businesses, as that may be the most disruptive thing to areas.
Dog daycare/boarding businesses or other business types that tend to generate a lot of noise are the only things that should be restricted to only certain parts of communities, like beside arterial roads not on side streets.
Consider parking and traffic. Owners of a single family corner property have applied for a child care facility for more than 60 children. The narrow side street has 15 SCHOOL BUSES and dozens of family vehicles for a middle school limited to 7:45 am to 8 am dropoff. Many impatient drivers use the lanes when they are delayed.
Integrating services and commercial businesses into residential areas reduces the need of personal motor vehicles and alleviates cross-city traffic. It can also bolster alternative modes of transport that are either too inefficient or take too long to use to access daily needs and services.

Businesses that add amenities to the neighbourhood, or allow people to work from home make neighbourhoods better. They increase walkability as it's not necessary to drive to further out amenities, restrictions on when certain businesses can run may be necessary to avoid congestion.
Let's make more walkable communities
Allowing local communities to be built around social businesses such as groceries, shopping, cafes, and art, will make neighborhoods safer - both through social connections, as well as greater foot-traffic vs requiring a car for everything. Let us build social cohesion through public spaces and shared businesses. Siloing businesses to strip-malls leads to decay and urban blight; we want integrated communities!
No noise or pollution from home based business. Too easy for a home owner to claim this isn't a business so these restrictions to all home owners. Power tools running all day from 7am to 10 pm at night is totally unreasonable.
It is ok to generate traffic, but not too much traffic, and not concentrated traffic.
Need to consult with community.
Size - I'm keen for businesses to be present in residential areas but they should conform to the neighbourhood style/size
Live work or work live units must not be allowed to tower over existing homes causing shadow to cover existing/neighbouring houses. Must be a reasonable height and needs its own underground parking!!!
Rather keep businesses in nearby malls.
"Before building multi unit housing on R1, R2 residential area, city should encourage (strongly) development on dilapidated or just old strip malls and build taller, better there.
Makes more sense
But city probably not interested in taking tough decision for the good of the city"
It will be nice to have business in residential areas , it creates a sense of community and more walkable spaces , reduces carbon footprint
The vibrancy and culture that small businesses bring to neighborhoods is very important to me. Being able to run all my errands by walking and supporting small businesses is ideal. Mixed-use (residential and business) neighborhoods have always felt the best to me.
All can easily fit into a residential community given there is enough space for more frequent and numerous access to the building.
Designated parking for home businesses.

Always important to have amenities available for walking to in a community BUT there must be adequate parking provided on site if needed.
The type of business matters less than the exact location. I'm fine with a pub on the corner so long as I can't hear it from my house. Not everything has to be a loud impactful place, just go to Europe or Asia and see
As long as there is some thought put into where these types of businesses appear. Parking and access need to be considered. Safety also needs to be considered.
Small businesses should be placed throughout an area to prevent crowding and encourage smaller trips, especially by foot or by bike. Various business categories should be close at hand so residents don't need to crowd in to businesses in other neighbourhoods.
If the above businesses are not already in the areas, they do not need to be added to residential areas. Specifically cafes and grocery stores.
You have to consider parking and traffic flow. If these businesses are doing well like we all hope for, they will bring traffic. You must provide enough parking and access without causing traffic jams within these communities.
Keep my neighborhood single family
The kind of business matters. how much noise, traffic does it generate? Are there any associated odours that would negatively impact the adjacent homes. A piano teacher with one student at a time is very different than a brew pub or a daycare with 20 screaming kids and their obnoxious parents.
Location - on a main street versus mid block on a quiet street
The only time a business should not be allowed in a residential area is if it is in some way noxious or disruptive (loud, smelly, etc)
I NEED A WALKABLE CITY SO BAD AHHHHHJ
Business needs to provide some parking if it draws customers in cars.
The best cities and places in the world mix residences and businesses. Let people walk to the businesses they frequent by having them close to home.
"businesses that demand additional parking need to be considered.
community shared work spaces should be encouraged."
traffic, noise, composition of buildings in the same block do not want concentrations of businesses vacant or very busy between 6pm and 7am disrupting residents.

Doctors office and dentist office should be available in every neighborhood
Impact on availability of parking that needs to be allocated to additional businesses.
mixing uses increases walkability and decreases car dependency. its also just convenient and nice to have.
If and when there is an issue, processes need to in place for the residents to be able to address it. Usually that is related to traffic and parking.
I would not want a car repair business being run at home.
Size matters. Impact matters. Any of the above may or may not support community. Any of the above has the potential to draw more vehicle traffic than the infrastructure can support. On the other hand, any of them could be beautiful additions to the vibrancy of the community. It all depends on the forecasted impact.
"Size matters. It should be geared toward small independent business, not chains.
Stop designing neighborhoods for cars. Prioritize walkable community so people can walk to get groceries, neighborhood pub, etc. that will help to make trees more valued, respectful neighbors, more sustainable living, etc"
Hours of operation and traffic and parking impact for any business in residential areas.
The amount of traffic (vehicular or otherwise) and parking on small quiet residential streets is important to consider. It is the load of people coming in that makes me check 'never' to a couple of these (but 'seldom' would be a better answer)... The 'look' and built form of a dwelling should also fit into its surroundings, not stand out as a contrasting building. Corner lots are often more suitable for consideration of a 'corner store'.
Larger grocery stores needed ! And it's important to attract grocers who aren't here , like Aldi.
More grocery options in suburbs. Small neighbourhood grocery stores would be amazing.
It is important to put in what the community needs vs what can be built. Some communities are aimed at families, these need more child and family friendly amenities. Speak to the communities and find what they want before allowing permits
We need these businesses in every neighborhood. This is the only way to decrease car dependency.
Again you created this problem with blanket rezoning! Keep it the way it was with local area plans that create separate types of zones in a community.
Residential and commercial should be in separate specified areas

These uses should be at nodes that provide adequate parking not sprinkled through a residential area
Depends on if these businesses can provide their own parking or not, so again, the street isn't the only option.
Depends on the size of the business and how disruptive it is to neighbors and the community.
Business licensing, safety, and accessibility should always be considered. They're also concerns with businesses that create noise or otherwise infringe on other residences.
Businesses and homes should always be close, reducing our need to travel long distances and wasting of time.
As long as the business and the patrons who come visit don't have an outsized impact on people quietly living out their lives at home, it should be allowed.
It's usually context dependent. Some areas make sense to have certain things more than others.
"The core of community is the people in it. If there are no local places for people to meet, then it's harder to foster interpersonal connections, which are foundational to community building.
Small businesses located within communities, primarily those that serve the community they are in, can be excellent places to build a relationship with your neighbourhood. Local serving businesses also reduce noisy car traffic, and keep the streets safer, by having more community members walking the streets"
Traffic and parking
Limited/short term and/or permit parking to encourage "limited" impact from smaller scale/at home business
Must provide adequate parking and suitability should be dependent on the total quantity of traffic generated by a business. Different regulations for a main drag within community vs a quiet street deep in the neighbourhood = total impact different in these 2 scenarios.
give people the freedom to build businesses near their customers. this way i don't have to drive all the way across the city causing traffic and road infrastructure decay, which would eventually cost the city money.
Any business which has customers/clients coming to them MUST provide adequate parking so the strain on residents is reduced. Residents (owners specifically) pay property taxes which should include an ability to park on street in front of their homes WITHOUT causing a situation where guests can't park anywhere, or must pay to visit, or risk tickets/tow.
Cul de sac builds MUST provide parking as well. Too many of these provide no on-street parking near the homes for visitors.

Community vibrancy is an outcome of the environmental cross over in public spaces such as businesses and parks. These should not be isolated and require a car to access
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
We're often dependent on buying things online to the point that I feel like when something is delivered to me, it feels empty despite waiting for my package as I'm waiting to Santa Claus.
When shopping for something in person while supporting local businesses, these can have impactful influence that we can connect with the community and at the same time, improve social and mental being.
Looking and walking only to be seeing the same house again feels dystopian and boring as well.
We don't live in Japan where it is relatively easy to open business in small ground spaces. There is simply no room, not to mention the permit process is onerous for home-based business. Some RCs also forbid them on land. There is ample and open office spaces throughout Calgary and it is my opinion that we should have a clear segregation between residential and commercial spaces. I see few home-based business except the old converted homes in Beltline, but people don't live there.
Need to reduce traffic in residential areas
Businesses that provide services to the community always fit in, as long as there is suitable planning to manage parking and noise.
Home occupations and offices fit in as long as they are small scale in terms of likely traffic impacts and don't cause pollutants or noise that could adversely impact neighbours.
The main conflict in my neighborhood is parking. There is a shortage and the local tutoring has caused major problems that cascade down the block. Calgary Parking Authority is not responsive and implements rule changes without good data and without consulting. This has inflamed many people on my street.
All of these items may work in some situations and not work in others. This needs to be determined on a neighbourhood-by-neighbourhood basis, and even on a street by street basis. A busier thorough fare maybe be better suited to small businesses than a quieter street further within the neighbourhood.
The obvious advantage of operating a business in a residential neighbourhood is that your neighbours will keep an eye out for your business after hours
What I think needs to be considered is when a home based business, artist studio, etc. are serving the public and there would be a significant impact on the parking in front of someone's home.
Car mechanic shop does not fit into a residential and is too noisy.
Put stores inside residential neighbourhoods! Separation of concerns only reduces the liveliness and livability of both areas. I like interesting places, and we lose a lot of those places when we don't let things mix.

It's more convenient. Adds diversity of people and opportunities for everyone. More activity, more aliveness, more community.
It depends on if the business drives vehicular traffic. If there will be clients / customer's coming to the location there needs to be parking so it should be in a business area. If it's someone working at home solo that of course is fine. Corner stores should be on the edge of the residential area in the more defined business area where there is parking and also more visibility for the store.
You can not necessarily group like business types, it depends more on size. You must also factor cumulative impact of a number of business and the specific nature and situation of the residential community.
Daycare's are important but should be located close to amenities (parks, libraries, etc) and ensure the market does not over-saturate itself by setting a maximum quota of dayhomes/daycares that can be located on the same block.
We need parking, who would want to live with commercial property right under them?? Not interested in being trapped in one area.
Your definitions you provide are manipulated
A city can plan and make decisions on applications presented.
These businesses should be in mixed use residential. Developers with mixed use lots should be forced to include some amenities instead of just cramming in additional density. Low density residential does not need businesses other than home based offices or business that does not generate noise or traffic
Day care for animals such as dogs
There should be business corridors in communities. The store front businesses should not be allowed on residential blocks
Please allow neighborhood stores, food & beverage service, and indoor sales & service as a permitted use OR ATLEAST a discretionary use in all of the housing zones (H-1, H-2, H-3, etc.). Our residential communities need to be vibrant and have amenities close by without the reliance of a car. We need small local businesses such as corner stores, cafes, restaurants, salons, etc. that contributes to the local economy and provide a unique character and identity in our neighbourhood.
***Please add neighbourhood stores as a permitted (or atleast a discretionary) use in the new H-1I and H-1G(m) zones. We NEED small corner stores and local businesses in residential areas to improve walkability, convenience, and accessibility to amenities without needing to drive long distances with a car!!!!
Artist studios can sometimes be almost light industrial. Need to consider this. Convenience-based commercial uses with more intense quick stop or pick up/drop off activities would be better nearer main roads rather than sprinkled through neighbourhood. A cluster creates a draw for the businesses - mutually

beneficial. Again make some choices about where this happens don't just make this everywhere and anywhere.
I think Vancouver is a good example of small business integration into residential communities. More businesses there rent out houses and convert them to their services allowing a blending of live and work, commercial and play, and integrating into the community context.
small mechanics operated out of ppl's garages, as long as it's small
Disruption to an otherwise quiet area by increasing traffic with people coming and going.
Off street parking for the above should be a requirement
Too much traffic and noise. Losing character neighborhoods. Parkhill is a park. Not a business zone.
Depends on noise level and parking needs. Repair shops are fine if they aren't noisy mechanic shops.
The City of Calgary should set the minimum requirements for businesses parking. All small businesses should provide parking for drop offs, deliveries, and customers
No
Small business provide economic benefits, and vibrancy to neighborhood - but managing PARKING is critical. Businesses don't get to earn profits by taking my ability to park in front of / near my home.
I believe that by ensuring a mix of uses, it is possible to create healthy, vibrant, and safe environments. However there are some specific uses that aren't completely compatible with residential, so it is important to regulate schedules, noise impacts, capacity and use of public spaces, and the placement of advertising elements.
traffic to business must be in line with neighbourhood, daycares can be huge and very busy do not always fit
If a nuisance is created there should be a way to deal with it but if no nuisance let's not pre-decide there is going to be a problem.
Mixing low-impact businesses into residential areas builds community, walkability, and access to essentials. But scale and design matter—too much noise, traffic, or bad fit can disrupt livability. Zoning should focus on how a business functions, not just what it is. We should support vibrant neighbourhoods without turning them into commercial strips.
daily-needs business. Placemaking business. and the 3rd space. Schools included in the walkable/short cycle commute with protected lanes and pathways for children.

Consider where and what businesses need to be to attract and retain customers. Even a home based salon needs street parking for customers and a cafe or grocery store needs high customer traffic to be viable. High traffic routed to a quiet residential street is never appropriate.
Having amenities close to home, means less driving
By adding business into a residential areas incurs an increase in traffic, speeding, noise, parking spaces all used by non-residents. Less room for guests, family, visitors. Not everyone is able to use transit due to time or safety or lack of frequency. Everyone is not young enough to cycle everywhere .
A mixed-use neighbourhood is a vibrant neighbourhood. All the business-types listed favour locally-owned businesses and increase the economic resilience of our city. It reduces car-dependency and promotes community.
Very light industrial uses like automotive repair shops NEED to be located within communities and are completely appropriate on Main Streets. These are essential services that need to be accessible to everyone but we shy away because we classify them as light industrial.
Half way and treatment centres not in residential
Thoughtful Mixed use in residential neighborhoods is always a great way to build community
Residential neighborhoods should appear residential.
One of the reasons everyone drives is businesses are so spread out across the city
Noise restrictions should apply to all.
By segregating services from housing we create urban deserts where amenities can only be accessed with a vehicle. I would like to have the ability to walk and bike to basic services within my own neighborhood.
I would love if I had more services that were a walkable distance from my house. Allowing small businesses to open in residential neighbours would solve this as well as be a boost for the local economy.
I believe that businesses within the community should be proposed, brought to the community for input, and then approved on a case by case basis.
Parks, dog use areas and playgrounds and access to schools should be considered
Accessibility to services within walking distance help reduce stress on street parking and reduce cost to maintain street parking.
Grouping business into clusters away from single family dwellings

The same small business is opened on every corner. There is no discernment for type of business being opened and competition. Not every store needs to be a pizza, donair, and dentist storefront. Competition should be limited so businesses aren't constantly closing.
Parking and traffic makes or breaks this situation.
Balance is important - NO 15 MINUTE CITIES!
Walk-in clinics, pharmacies, veterinary practices etc. should be considered in some neighborhoods as well.
Promotes community and walkability!
The development of big box stores needs to be shared between communities, and small businesses and shops given space to keep the walkability of each community.
The size of the business. Only very small businesses should be allowed to operate in residential areas, unless it's a commercial node.
Drug/alcohol stores creating an unsafe environment in that area of the community.
There needs to be more flexibility of a variety of uses in communities. I want things to be closer to home, to make the community more vibrant.
It's already difficult for a small business to get started. Why should zoning make it harder?
It's way more convenient to have shops near household. Not only for reducing emission by cars, but also making the city more walkable.
No major retailers or mass market in residential
PLEASE ALLOW CORNERSTORES TO BE BUILT AGAIN!!! Not only in heritage areas, but every block should be allowed to have a small cornerstore to be built, allowing shopping amenities closer at home without the need to drive and support local businesses!
ANY business can fit in residential areas, I don't want to live in a sea of McMansions where I have to drive 30 minutes to get to a ATM
Functional neighborhoods with easy to access businesses needs to be more important than NIMBYism.
There is no reason that these businesses should not operate in residential areas.
High traffic businesses don't fit in. Low traffic businesses do.
Why in the world did we ever separate them. The most vibrant neighborhoods in our city are centred on commercial areas

Customers of these business should be required to pay for street parking in neighbourhoods where residents are obligated to pay for parking permits and the city should actively and consistently enforce its parking bylaws, not just on a complaint basis.
It'd be nice to open a business on my property. Like a cafe where my garage is. Or if I can live on top or something.
I think it is good to have a wide range of diversity in the options for our communities to help make them more walkable and to promote entrepreneurship within our communities by lowering barriers to entry where possible.
Putting a daycare with 60plus kids on a residential street without parking is short sighted
Too many cannabis and liquor stores.
Should be street/location dependent, both for logistical business related decisions, as well as neighbourhood consistently, unlike RC-G rezoning which was applied too broadly.
I think that allowing people to develop nearby places will allow for more walkable communities. All suggestions types are minimal to no impact to residential neighborhoods beyond making them more walkable.
Near apartment buildings, all non-industrial businesses should be allowed. Mixed use zoning would help enable that.
Restaurants being allowed nearby all neighborhoods would be great.
More convinient and accessible, can walk at a near distance without the need of a car. It also supports small local businesses, and providing a sense of place or uniqueness to the community
Keep added noise down for a peaceful environment that is a right to individuals.
Accessory Commercial Units (ACUs) by right would be awesome! If people could build and operate a small café in their yard, or convert their garage or something. This could really improve our sense of community and neighbourliness.
We should live and work on the same place. These islands of commercial jnt he city perpetuate car dependency
Mid-block businesses don't make sense. People may not want to live beside a day care nor do I want a Circle K going in the lot beside me. There needs to be an appreciation of what's already there is older communities and an acknowledgement that the new master planned communities have it figured out with single family here and townhomes there with a retail area in the centre. We'd like our residential streets kept residential and don't want a weed shop next door.
The city shouldn't be micro-managing business placement, let people be entrepreneurs!

Life becomes easier when small businesses can operate in a community. It also allows more people to be entrepreneurs with more flexibility . Very important for our economy
Businesses can fit into the inner-city, but much less so in the suburbs. The overriding factor of city planning needs to be citizen happiness. Business traffic, vehicle or pedestrian, brings people that are not part of the community and who disrupt the peace of a neighbourhood. Neighbourhood peace needs to be the priority over non-community traffic.
I answered this from distrust. Of course it's fine to have some visible businesses in the neighbourhood, but not on a purely residential street. We've done a good job of this for a long time with designated areas for storefronts and businesses, although certain home-based businesses are already problematic - for example, landscaping businesses with large loud trucks, flatbed trailers and loud gas equipment in front of others' houses every single day.
This would encourage people to walk more and would increase a sense of community.
Walkable neighbourhoods, usually found in old neighbourhoods, are now the most desirable places to live. In new neighborhoods, you have to get in your car and drive everywhere even for a carton of milk.
respect citizens desires to maintain the R1 residential zoning we brought into
Galleries
Parking and traffic management is critical
Do you actually listen to our considerations? That's right, you won't.
You should be able to reasonably walk to mo
Residential areas need small businesses, not big buildings with homes above and businesses below. More traffic issues, issues with loitering and littering, are all concerns; especially if the businesses are alcohol/marijuana based. I worry about schools being close to these sort of businesses.
Mixed-use is the lifeblood of a functional city
Transit services
In new developments, including corner stores or small mini-malls throughout makes sense. Trying to add a corner store to a 100% residential neighborhood after 60 years does not make sense.
Smaller, more local grocery stores
The only way to create walkable communities (the only sustainable type of community) is to put the services people need within the community
immediate context, access to active transportation networks, exterior design and form

Please allow much more commercial uses in residential land. There's so much opportunity for building local wealth that we're limiting for some archaic reason.

Offering more amenities also cuts down on the need to commute for work or other reasons. It means everything is accessible in your own neighbourhood.

We asked: What are the most impactful features of home based business which should be regulated? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Number of customers or client visits
- Use of accessory building (e.g., garages or sheds) for the business
- Use of business vehicles
- Outdoor storage of equipment or materials
- Number of employees who don't live in the home
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

All of these used to be considered in the Home-based business license Categories 1 and 2. That seemed like a reasonable approach.

I don't think any of these need to be tightly regulated

Volume of traffic generated. Noise.

Noise from the home based businesses in the garage if they are in construction. wi

Noise, smoke, dust, etc.

I don't think # of customers is the issue, vs. how are those customers accessing the space.

limit all of these features to 1 per feature listed; VERY minimal outdoor storage

Hours of operation

Please stop allowing people to operate businesses that disrupt neighbours enjoyment of their homes.

Mixed use! When possible, businesses should come with housing above them, to maximize our land use in Calgary and further strengthen customer bases for these businesses! To this effect, FAR requirements need to be rethought throughout the city.

Noise impacts & things like dust/smoke and amount of waste generated.
Noise levels
Noise and operating hours. The number of businesses - specifically daycares and rentals per street should be limited.
Noise and pollution.
Minimize regulation as much as possible. This bloated government is causing more harm than good when you consider how much this government costs citizens and compare that to the cost if their government was, instead, efficient and effective.
volume of customer/client vehicle traffic and parking requirements
Garbage - left out for neighbourhood to see!!!
Availability of parking
Noise, smell
Associated noise which impacts neighbours
Keeping the area tidy. Customer parking does not interfere with other residents on the street.
None of this should be regulated. We should just specify reasonable standards and examples and allow flexibility.
The overall impact to the adjacent neighbors and the community. For example, let's consider yoga/spin studio. The loud overwhelming music of a spin studio has a very different community impact than a yoga studio. They can't be treated as equals.
Hours of operation and noise that is generated
large number of employees utilizing street parking in front of homes
Hours of operation . And a clear approval of opening a business in your home . Also the amount of space you can use for storage is too small
Noise
Must have off street visitor / employee parking
Customers parking private vehicles. If the customers are coming by bike or walking the number of visits doesn't matter. It's the traffic that does.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Parking spots should be limited through RPP programs, and no on site customer parking.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Operating hours, sound, smells
Should have off street parking for clients
Amount of parking required
Parking and traffic impact
Noise
Size and scale of business is important. No idea how you would regulate this effectively. That's why it is better to cluster these closer to main roads. This will be a headache to enforce if you regulate it
Customer & employee parking
Cars and lack of parking for visitors
What a biased question - asking 'what more can we regulate'? If this government wasn't so immersed in it's own propaganda, the question would be less biased or the contrary question would be asked: 'what regulations should be reduced?'
All/any of the above which impact my ability to park in front of / near my home, or create unsightly views from my home
Related with the type of business initially, schedules, noise impacts, capacity and use of public spaces, and the placement of advertising elements.
Business hours that could impact neighborhood.
Noise, pollution from extra cars, increased traffic during certain times of day, decreased parking for residents
Noise disruptions depending on use (ex. tools, vehicles)
Deregulate
Adequate parking for clients.
Please remove the parking requirement for home base businesses to encourage businesses
Use of disruptive equipment/ noise

Use of potentially dangerous goods is the only motivating factor for restriction. Otherwise let the market decide
Hours maybe? Like not being open too early or late. It'd also be great if they made sure there was bike parking so it's a little less intrusive with car traffic.
Paid parking for businesses that get re-invested into that same community would align incentives.
Operating hours.
How disruptive the business will be to neighbours. I'd move if someone opened a day care next to me as that would seriously impede the daily enjoyment of my home. I don't want to have a bunch of cars parked on the street that is already full.
None of the above
Businesses can work, but need to be strictly regulated to avoid disturbance and traffic to ensure a peaceful neighbourhood.
it should not be disruptive to the neighbors in any way
Infrastructure requirements, Transit services
this is a poorly worded question and should be removed from the survey
Opening hours — businesses in primarily residential areas should not be open past midnight and not open before 6 am.
None
If it is a manufacturing business, additional permitting may be required to reduce noise, etc.
Parking availability. Frequency of business vehicles might be better than use of business vehicles. If business vehicles are entering a residential street 2 or more times a day, then that is concerning. But less than that, would be fine assuming there is only 1 business of a residential street.

What do you think are the most important features to make your experience more positive walking on a commercial mixed use street in the Greater Downtown? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- More space for walking
- Landscaping, trees, or greenery
- Patios, seating, or activity space for businesses
- Being able to see into and enter shops and restaurants from the sidewalk
- Thoughtful placement of uses within buildings (such as avoiding offices or lobbies dominating the street front)
- Buildings that are attractive and enhance the sidewalk and street
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Safety
Provide parking
Imposing high rises that change the entire character of the neighborhood
Unique shops and services instead of big box retailers and Tim Hortons
I know I have checked every box, but that is because Calgary has the space to support all these things.
NO SHADOWS, NO WIND TUNNELS
Public safety, cleanliness
Not to much high density Calgary has never had so many issues since high density stop building
Remove drug users and vulnerable people who are begging for money or clearly mentally ill. Make our streets safe to walk down.
Make a plan first. Then build infrastructure. Anything but what is currently being done in Marda loop.
Bike lanes
Removal of on street parking and reduction in traffic speeds and volumes, to make these spaces for humans, not for cars. Humans buy things, not cars, and so humans should be prioritized at all times.

Safety downtown and anything that deters crime
Competence in government should be the top priority. Wasting more than a billion on the Green Line, destroying the River Run homes for no legitimate public reason, taking Olympic plaza away from citizens for many years, taking more than a half decade to redevelop Eau Claire plaza etc. Bad governance is causing so much harm to citizens that restoring competence at the highest levels of city leadership should be the priority.
More people. More residential.
Safe street crossing to quickly access businesses on both sides of the street
Security-so many drug users visible downtown!!!!
Parking, free for business users
No cars (noise and pollution).
What is greater downtown? I would not want to see any of this in communities that are currently residential.
Safety
Clean up the garbage, no homeless people or drug addicts, ample parking
Parking
bike racks
Vehicular noise (loud mufflers etc)
foot traffic and general mix of purpose, do not want to walk past long stretches of walls or parking lots, does not feel safe
Personal safety for everyone walking in the downtown area.
Safer crosswalks for pedestrians.
I dislike going downtown. It's not convenient and besides having to deal with the brutal traffic when I go to the office. I avoid downtown.
Increased parking
Let the market determine the needs. There is a surplus of commercial and these styl of businesses end up having frequent turnover due to lack of access and populations around them.

Safety
It is difficult to park downtown. More street parking.
Public safety. No drug use or panhandlers
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Scale and proportion, access to light
Not over crowding narrow streets.
Weather protection and space for storing snow in winter
Fewer/separation from motor vehicles (they are noisy)
Address the growing number of vagrants/addicts. you can make it as nice as you like, but if its full of people doing drugs, no one will use it. look at the East Village.
Bike & family friendly
Accessibility and safety for bicycling and other similar modes of transport
Parking
Providing parking
A government that is financially transparent and responsible. This incompetent government has wasted over a billion on the Green Line - taxpayers pay for that everyday and it makes their lives worse. This question is like asking what pretty things do you want to look at while walking from your first job to your second job of the day because you need to pay for a financially irresponsible government whose reckless spending harms most citizens every day.
Pedestrian only streets or time slots where streets close down for pedestrian walking only. Allowing small businesses the opportunity to thrive by lowering small business taxes as they're the vital organ to vibrant downtown culture.
1-parking-stall-per-unit/residence downtown is critical
Removing vehicles and slowing traffic
Safety and security and not feeling like you might be attacked
Not taking public spaces away for the better part of a decade (see, for example, Eau Claire Plaza and Olympic Plaza), destroying less trees and not demolishing waterfront homes for no legitimate public reason (see River Run).

Cleaning sidewalks (eg. 14th street gravel on sidewalk is dangerous)
A mixed use street should improve the experience of walking not only by generating new pleasant infrastructure but also by dealing with climate and comfort issues
How much traffic is going by the building and at what speed it is travelling.
away from busy/fast roadways
More bike lanes, bike and scooter parking. More covered patios all year, More art and music that is city sponsored
Less space for cars. Every city I've visited where I enjoyed walking had much less spaces for cars and car parking.
Varied building fronts
Discourage vinyls on windows which obscure sightlines and natural surveillance
Walking areas are well lit in the evening.
Bike access and parking
Benches on the street (not just parks)
Street designs being less reliant on cars
MORE PUBLIC TOILETS PLEASE also fewer homeless people
Can we pedestrianize more streets, please? I just want a beer in peace. I'll park 6 blocks away if I have to. Just let me sit and enjoy my meal without the loud cars.
Having plus 15 network open later would help enhance the later evenings downtown.
Less car-centric development, pedestrianizing roads, having dedicated bike paths, small corner stores and local businesses
Less car traffic. I really want to enjoy the patios on 17th ave, but the cars are sooo loud.
Less car traffic
Public washrooms with change tables
parking
I don't go downtown

Reliable transit access. Barrier free design!!!
Transit services, patios, seating area
Drug addicts must be removed! People passed out, peeing, puking, doing drugs. Safety!!
What's wrong with open parks? Seems we are just allowing towers on traditionally green spaces where kids play..All that Design" in mardaloop. Hard for mobility. So many many uneven surfaces even in the newest "designed" areas.
I don't go downtown because the mental instability of the homeless population since covid is dangerous. Street art downtown is amazing and adds a lot to the city and walking around downtown. Also, cars often try to purposefully hit pedestrians downtown - I've seen people speed up at a charge at pedestrians.
reduction of car lanes. no matter how nice you make the pedestrian realm if there's a four lane high-speed thoroughfare through the shopping district nobody's going to want to be there. it smells it's noisy and it's dangerous
Tom feel safe
Improved sidewalks (fewer tripping hazards) and no social disorder.

We asked: What types of shops, services or amenities would you like to find along commercial mixed use streets in the Greater Downtown? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Shops and retail
- Cafes or restaurants
- Medical clinics Counselling or wellness services
- Banks or financial institutions
- Offices
- Commercial kitchens
- Religious or cultural facilities
- Housing units
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Entertainment venues (e.g. music venues, bars, clubs, or similar)
SCHOOLS. How could you miss that?

Fitness - gyms, yoga; NGO; government services; education; schools; daycare
No limit. Let the market decide and lead what works and doesn't work.
More digital signage to increase vibrancy
You would be hard pressed not to find these in the GDA already... What we really want are PARKS AND RECREATION AND POOL
Having more respect for history and citizens rights, instead of just steamrolling citizens (see, for example: 1886 Cafe, Barley Mill, River Run, etc.)
No tent cities or homeless destroying the environment
Remove drug users and vulnerable people who are begging for money or clearly mentally ill. Make our streets safe to walk down.
Child spaces, to play and be children in safety
Daycare, art venues (cinema, galleries, studios)
Parking, free for business users
I am not against any shops/services/amenities on mixed use streets. If the people will use it, it belongs there
Bars and entertainments
Grocery stores. Should be integrated into tall buildings (like 33rd ave SW project).
if there's not enough parking we won't be coming downtown
Allow all kinds of land use in these areas.
Whatever market demands. It shouldn't be specified as to what is selected. Let a business decide if it's viable.
Local cafe/bakery/hair salon
University
Patios
Bike valet

Thoughtful consideration to size of the mixed used building is more important than any of this. Building need to fit the aesthetic of the community.
Zoning can't determine what businesses will be viable. That is the market. how would this possibly impact zoning? You either allow for business and it occurs or it does not.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Everything
Public toilets
Market viable
Adequate parking available for businesses
Everything should be welcome keeping bays small so one use doesn't dominate the space is key.
Art studios, galleries, maker spaces, and cultural hubs
small-scale public transit shuttles. Hop on/off free zone. grid-based, not strip
Active frontages, but other business uses above or behind - also housing above
Pedestrian only (Stephen Avenue)
I think it'd be ideal to have the offices and housing upstairs, letting the bottom be more retail oriented. A ground level lobby to housing could be cute. Maybe do some gated arcades for housing? We could get really architecturally creative.
More bars, pubs, nightclub districts. Eliminate rule that bars or nightclubs can't be located too close together.
Basically everything. No drive-thrus, though.
Public washrooms with change tables
Grocery store
Bike parkades
None
Transit services, patios seating area

Offices and residences can be above street level. Mixed use should be the key but with all the construction chaos and lack of infrastructure planning. City has ensured the bankruptcy of small businesses. The expensive signage budge for Shop local is irritating at best when customers cannot access businesses they have been loyal to for years... just saying.

Office spaces converted to residential- that are not forced rentals amd isntead AFFORDABLE!

anything and everything

Small format offices

We asked: What do you think are the most important features to make your experience more positive walking on a commercial mixed use street outside of the Greater Downtown?

Options were:

- More space for walking
- Landscaping, trees, or greenery
- Patios, seating, or activity space for businesses
- Being able to see into and enter shops and restaurants from the sidewalk
- Thoughtful placement of uses within buildings (such as avoiding offices or lobbies dominating the street front)
- Buildings that are attractive and enhance the sidewalk and street
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Less crime

Safety

local ownership, not chain stores

Same as previous question

NO SHADOWS NO WIND TUNNELS NO HUGE TOWERS

Remove excessive shop signange

Public safety

Up until 2015 Calgary has always had a great and vibrant downtown areas to enjoy safe walking pleasant areas then all stopped when oil companies left and downtown became a ghost town and high density rentals has caused high crime
Remove drug users and vulnerable people who are begging for money or clearly mentally ill. Make our streets safe to walk down.
Consider pedestrian safety and mobility.
Competence has been absent in the City's downtown planning for so long that basic competence should be a priority: don't demolish homes when there isn't a public need to do so; don't spend over a billion on the Green Line without having a competence, approved business case; don't drag out construction for more than 5 years when it should be done in 1-2 years etc.
Parking, free for business users
No cars.
Leave residential communities solely residential.
Safety
no garbage on the streets, no homeless people, sufficient parking
Historical preservation
spacing of commercial buildings, short walk between amenities with groceries, pharmacy, cafe nearby
narrower streets and lower speed limits to reduce car noise and increase safety
Personal safety
Safer crosswalks for pedestrians. More pedestrian bridges.
Increased parking
Safety
Well maintained sidewalks, snow clearing, no clutter of signage
Size of building and impact on densification of community based on infrastructure. At the risk of sounding NIMBY - I think thoughtful densification need to take centre stage over developer wishes.
Parking availability to get to an area and stay in an area to shop etc...
This is a repeat of the first question

Offices always located above street level: for businesses where client confidentiality is important, street-level offices may expose information to those passing by; for medical/healthcare, street-level also exposes patients/clients to being visible to passersby.
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Building scale
Keeping bicycles and scooters from running me over on sidewalks.
Have a plan for snow clearing, bus stops not in main pedestrian flow
More cyclists and walkers (aka. fewer cars)
Public toilets bike & skate friendly infrastructure built in with coping for street training and recreational use
Parking
Provide parking
Traffic calming measures to reduce speed. Close off streets permanently
Adequate parking is critical to attracting people
Removing cars and slowing traffic
A government I can trust. So many decisions seem to obviously have costs that grossly exceed their potential benefit (downtown library, platform building, green line etc.) such that just the sight of City Hall is embarrassing. Such large scale government misuse of taxpayer funds makes the downtown hard to look at. The vast majority of taxpaying citizens are worse off because of financially irresponsible government.
Side walks that have enough space (no signage in the middle)
other foot traffic and safety
More sidewalks in general, and more sidewalks connecting bus stops and entry and exits of businesses. Right now a lot of areas outside of downtown don't have proper sidewalks for people to safely walk to bus stops.
No vinyls on windows obscuring view
Safety and cleanliness
Sufficient crosswalks where needed. Well lit areas in the evening.
I once again come before you for a proposal: more public toilets

Arcades. We should have more arcades to break up blocks and let people pass through a little more.
parking
Safe streets to walk along. Walking next to high speed traffic is unpleasant and feels unsafe.
All of our nodes should be turned into MU. I'd love to see my local restaurants able to have some patio space with apartments on top. Encouraging developers to build walkable streets and just put the parking underground. Let the humans live above ground, enjoy parks and walkability... not asphalt.
Less car traffic. Bring back trams (street cars)
Public washrooms with change tables
parking
how about safety and less fringe loitering
Seating and plazas by trees
I don't go downtown
Materiality consistent with urban context. Not EIFs or vinyl siding on commercial, but brick, stone, or sustainable enduring materials. Street level activation!
More transit
Safety.
Considering mobility. Smooth walking surfaces. Parking and drop off areas.
removing old but one lane for cars in the downtown call
Safety!
Safety - some of downtown struggles with an ongoing sense of questionable safety

We asked: What types of shops, services or amenities would you like to find along commercial mixed use streets outside of the Greater Downtown? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Shops and retail
- Cafes or restaurants
- Medical clinics Counselling or wellness services

- Banks or financial institutions Offices
- Commercial kitchens
- Religious or cultural facilities
- Housing units
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

SCHOOLS
Fitness - gyms, yoga; NGO; government services; education; schools; daycare
No limit. Let the market decide and lead what works and doesn't work.
Honestly, why is this a question those already all exist in the GDA
Same as above question other
Remove drug users and vulnerable people who are begging for money or clearly mentally ill. Make our streets safe to walk down.
Child friendly spaces like play areas that are safe
Daycare, art venue (cinema, galleries, studios)
Bars and entertainments
Do it all and do it well. Look at great population dense cities within Japan. The accessibility to everything from food, transit, shopping, businesses, offices all amongst each other.
Allow business owners to decide what to do with the space. No need to regulate this.
NOTHING over 3 stories tall; businesses open to the public, NOT private office buildings
Grocery stores.
I don't want to see any commercial mixed use construction built randomly among residential homes. We need our zones back and not blanket rezoning.
Hair salon, nail bar, etc
This is a repeat...
Again a repeat



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
Vet, nail bar, hair,
Everything
Public toilets. Bike friendly infrastructure that allows for use with skate boards and scooters
Market viable
This government's incompetence in the downtown and lack of regard for citizen input makes this question another fake attempt to pretend this government cares about citizens (see, for example: (i) wasting a billion on the Green Line to go to Eau Claire; (ii) decades of delay at Eau Claire market because the City is focused more on helping a developer profit as compared to the well being of citizens; and (iii) harassing the River Run families for years and then destroying their homes for no actual public need).
Everything should be welcome keeping bays small so one use doesn't dominate the space is key.
Art studios, community spaces, maker workshops, tool libraries
Shared work space
Bike parking
Every community should have a decent amount of mixed use. A lot of people can't drive and would probably enjoy more community activation.
We need everything. Mixed use! More! Please!
adequate free parking
None. I shop in suburban areas
Transit services, patios, seating
Places for parking and drop off
Parks and green spaces
None in a residential neighborhood
small format offices

We asked: If a developer provides a public space (like a plaza or courtyard) in exchange for additional building height or density, what design features make that space more inviting and usable? (select up to two)

Options were:

- Comfortable and accessible seating Landscaping and greenery
- Active amenities (such as play features, fitness equipment, space for events)
- Public art or cultural elements
- Good sun exposure and protection from wind
- High-quality design features
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

This shouldn't be allowed. Stolen sunlight
Heritage aspects along with art and culture
Landscaping MUST BE maintained besides just providing it.
This swap should not be allowed. Height restrictions are too important
Public access
The public space should be truly public.
And the award for the most biased question goes to... this question. Every box checks supports higher density. This is not a serious survey.
Feeling safe and able to walk down streets without threat of drug overdoses and drug induced people it's never been so bad shame on this city and country
Stop the density. You are ruining what has made Calgary a wonderful place to live,
I am generally opposed to this entire concept. Nobody wants a plaza in the middle of winter. The only types of public spaces that should qualify are large parks and skating rinks.
This should not be allowed. These should already be requirements.
Behind closed doors meetings where developers are granted higher density sound like a recipe for corruption. Far more transparency is needed for citizens to trust the manner in which this City regularly benefits developers.
We do not let the builder control the narrative.

Not allowing shadowing on existing homes in neighborhood and provide parking in the building for ALL their residents and not allow a free for all parking on the street.
Multi sport infrastructure so sport programming can be delivered for the community
Basketball courts, tennis courts, mini soccer field.
Safe for people to actually use comfortably. Not just an encampment or dim lit open space
Developers shouldn't be allowed to increase density at all!!
Privacy and natural light
Shades areas.
public accessibility with visibility from the street
Why would they get to gain more height for adding a public space? The density should be what fits the area regardless of any plazas.
Neighbourhood acceptance and fit.
This should not be a trade off that is encouraged. It either fits the lot and design and concept of spaces around it, or it doesn't. Some things shouldn't be sacrificed in pursuit of developer dollars
There needs to be a limit on height.
Added parking spaces
None it should not be allowed.
Not acceptable
I would prefer that density is kept in check vs an exchange like this.
Do not exchange height and density for public space. Offer other incentives for providing good public space
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.
I disagree with bonus-ing. It is essentially bribery.
Do not like the tradeoff
Nope they do not need to go higher no one can afford those fancy units. Although I know you are greedy to get lots of tax dollars that is very apparent from the developments you have approved.

A developer should have to provide public space, not for the exchange of additional building height or density. They should be providing public space period! Developers do not care about disrupting an existing communityn they're only concerned with the profits from the new builds. Start thinking about the existing communities first before the profits of the developers.
This question is a great example of how to ask a leading question to secure a pre-determined outcome supporting the City's desire for more density.
Public toilets. High quality design that allows mix use of seating and bike/ skate friendly infrastructure. Installing coping goes a long way to preserve the integrity of seating
Don't support this exchange
Income based affordable housing of at least 20%
This should not be an option
What a corrupt question - by design, any answer will support the pre-determined outcome the City wants which is that more density is always good. It's like asked: 'have you stopped beating your dog, yes or no'. Improper, unfair question from an engagement team that is too biased to do any good for this city and, instead, is part of the corruption.
This shouldn't be an allowed option. They should have to create an minimum amenity space anyways and then no deal on allowance for extra height or density, they have to stick to the land use they apply for
I don't agree with allowing additional additional height or density
Climate resilient designs like shaded areas and drinking water
Developers shouldn't be able to horse trade. A building height fits in and is appropriate or it isn't.
This takes the cake as the most biased question. Embedding as a given in the question that developers should be entitled to higher density is gross. Any answer supports the City's pre-determined outcome. Shameful.
In an established single family neighborhood there will be nothing that offsets the negative impact on the citizens for this violation of a previously established single family zoning, developers win and cash out leaving citizens feeling violated and angry.
Require the Developer to build to the Passive House building standard
PUBLIC space, security
This is only helpful if it is not adjacent to a car sewer. People don't enjoy car noise and pollution.
None - height should be limited

This is a BAD idea as this make housing more expensive downtown. Forcing dense housing to pay extra for public amenities directly, or indirectly via development charges is one of the largest housing policy failures of Toronto/BC. Don't copy the losers policies, copy the winners like Edmonton.
Businesses around the Plaza, such as cafes , restaurants, small bars. Similar to European Plazas
no crack heads
None. Don't let developers virtue signal for discounts
Please consider nighbourhood context. There is a giant building on 24 Ave that dominates the neighbourhood. It is completely out of scale and does not fit the neighbourhood at all. It overlooks and overshadows all surrounding properties. No "make-up" amenities could ever compensate for this terrible lack of oversight by planners and the city.
Transit services, comfortable and accessible seating
Place to park in order to use it.
Public washroom access
Depends on the development. Again, it's about cost vs affordability.
No. No add on plaza for the buildings front that wouldn't be used and seem like part of the private building. This seems like a scam and abuse tool for developers to scam people by providing some concrete "plaza", which many put outfront of their buildings already. This is a trash idea.
Public washrooms and other facilities.
Safety
Developers paying the city to cram in more density is disturbing. Hey city hall - listen to Calgary citizens

We asked: How would you prefer to access a commercial site (such as shopping centre)?

Options were:

- A larger, shared parking lot with safe and comfortable walking connections between stores
- Smaller parking areas located closer to each store, even if it means reduced walkability between stores
- No preference
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Increased public transit options that make shopping centers more accessible.
Outlet malls provide parking around the mall and walkability throughout the main shopping area.
Dedicated walkways between separated stores
This question is difficult to answer. There seems to be missing context. Walkability should be improved, but large empty parking lots should be avoided. Parking lots should not be untaxed.
A larger mall with a large parking lot
Improved design for underground parking on all new developments to allow for higher density but equally available parking.
Transit accessibility! Viable alternatives to driving! Walkability goes beyond turning a shopping centre into a mall! It involves building residential use into the area, as is done by many malls in many parts of the world, from New York to Tokyo to Paris, and it involves transit accessibility!
Underground parking
By walking biking or transit. I would prefer most of all to not drive.
this question is flawed and assumes you own and drive a car. preferably, if people are driving, to have underground or above ground *parkades* near transit stations (not surface parking lots!!) so people dont bring their personal vehicles into the city centre. also please make the suburban transit stations more pleasant and useful, move the surface parking lots into parkades of any kind, just do anything to make them better. they are almost all car sewers with nothing easily accessible nearby. all that land is perfect for businesses and communities but is wasted on ugly free storage of 2 tonne metal boxes
Least overall impact on community
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.

A small shared parking lot with excelent connections to other transportation modes. I like comfortable walking connections, but I also like hectic enviroments, something like a big convention center would be great.
sidewwalks that actually are big enough and aren't hard to walk on
Imagine if we put our transit stops at the front doors of the mall.
Prioritized pedestrian circulation throughout parking area.
THE GREEN LINE
Multistorey parkades to provide enough space for parking while keeping walkability to stores
Underground parking or parking garages, no surface parking
No parking visible from the street
I WANNA BE ABLE TO WALK AND USE TRANSIT TO GET THERE I DON'T CARE HOW ITS IMPLEMENTED
Public transit access which drops you off at the commercial site itself instead of across a 6 lane dangerous road.
Parkades. Market parking underground so we can enjoy the shopping area and some fresh air. And maybe some quiet patios.
Bike
I would prefer improved transit connection to large commercial sites.
Transit and train access
Put the shops closes to transit. Dont make transit users walk through parking lots.
Parkades. Let the people enjoy the air. Parking can go underground. 130th, Signal Hill, Deerfoot City, and all those other commercial sites should be massive mixed-use walkable areas. Put in parkades and let the people live! Please!
Ease of getting in and parking and then out later. No forced path towards buildings. Park immediately.
Efficient citywide rail, preferably free, with excellent geographic coverage
Transit
transit, walking or cycling

parking should be behind or off to the side, hidden away. main entrance should be facing the street with minimal setback.

The developer and tenants are the experts in how this functions best, it should be left up to them and not dictated.

We asked: What features are most important to support a “park once and walk” experience on a commercial site? (select up to three)

Options were:

- Safe and well-marked pedestrian crossings
- Seating, shade, or weather protection on route
- Direct walking paths between stores and buildings
- Clear signage to help people navigate
- Centralized parking areas
- Minimal driveways or vehicle crossings through walking routes
- Other

Under ‘other’ we received the following feedback:

Not having to park at all. We have a surplus of unproductive and ugly commercial developments in Calgary, and we should prioritize retrofitting transit accessibility and walkability into current sites before the construction of any new ones.

Underground parking

Pedestrian paths across vehicle crossings should be elevated like a speed bump.

Cost of parking is insane in this city. You want people to park and walk? Incentivize it through affordability so people can afford to park there.

Integrate solar panels into parked area for shade and sustainability

Park once and walk is unrealistic for the Calgary climate. Have any of the people who signed off on this question actually spent a winter in Calgary? You would create economic dead zones if you tried this. Lovely idea. Impractical in Calgary.

Landscaped and trees to feel less industrial. Stormwater and snow melt could be improved the previous surfaces.

Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Think about scale. What does a path between a store and building do?
Elevated pedestrian crosswalks that stays the same elevation as walkways. Helps slow cars down, improve walk ability and safety.
This feels like it is overstep. Retail evolves and commercial developments evolves with it.
Direct walking paths between stores and parking and adjacent areas (connected at the corners and along desire paths)
People will walk if it's safe, direct, and comfortable—but let's be real, free parking still matters. If it's a hassle or costs too much just to show up, folks won't bother. Prioritize clear walking paths, safe crossings, and weather protection, but don't ignore parking access entirely—it's still part of the equation, especially outside dense urban cores.
I'm going to be honest. Large stores like this should be de incentivized and phased out.
No parking visible from the street
Just park underground. Please limit allowable limit of surface parking.
No wasted space for EV charging
You make it clear to drivers that these stores are built for pedestrians, and they are intruding on a space that was built for humans, not cars
Maximum transit, clear signage
free parking!
there is none cause cars should be banned from the downtown core



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

We asked: What amenities or services would improve the daily experience for people working in Calgary’s industrial areas? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Restaurants or cafés
- Personal services (e.g., haircuts, dry cleaning, fitness)
- Child care or daycare services
- Improved access to transit
- Better walking or cycling connections
- Outdoor spaces to eat or take breaks
- Nothing is needed — current services are sufficient
- Other

Under ‘other’ we received the following feedback:

Sidewalks

We asked: How do you usually get around in Calgary’s industrial areas? (select all that apply)

Options were:

- Personal vehicle
- Work vehicle or company shuttle
- Transit Walking
- Biking
- Other

Under ‘other’ we received **no responses**.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

We asked: What improvements would make it easier or safer to move around in industrial areas? (select up to three)

Options were:

- Better sidewalks and pedestrian crossings
- Safer and more connected bike routes
- More frequent or accessible transit service
- Improved signage or wayfinding
- Better lighting and safety features
- Nothing is needed – the current setup works well
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Tree canopy, and shade. Reduces heat and increases sense of place making it feel less “industrial”.
Better roads and parking, we are constantly trying to reduce traffic on roads and we don't have any other good options...
Why isn't improved roads a choice for this one?

We asked: What are the most important things to consider when industrial areas are located next to residential communities? (select up to three)

Options were:

- Visual screening and buffering (such as trees, fencing, or walls)
- Reducing noise, odours, or other nuisance impacts
- Safe walking and cycling connections between areas
- Managing traffic and truck access near homes
- Visual design and appearance of industrial buildings
- Access to shared amenities (such as parks, services)
- Other

Under 'other' we received the following feedback:

Should not have impactful odours, noises etc. at all.
Not being racist and putting marginalized people in direct harm of industrial effects
Listening to Calgarians and stopping this.



City Building Program

Phase 5 What We Heard Report – Verbatim Comments

October 2025

Dangerous goods mitigation
None. Don't waste our money
I selected "safe walking", because industrial sites are generally hostile to pedestrians and to public transit
Transit