



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

Project overview

The Heritage Incentives Area program will provide eligible property owners with additional development opportunities to encourage them to keep their character homes. These incentives will be enabled through amendments to The City of Calgary's Land Use Bylaw(1P2007). They will not prohibit new development or restrict demolition. They will provide additional, low-impact development opportunities for character homes. This tool is incentive-only and does not protect or designate any buildings as [Municipal Historic Resources](#).

The Heritage Incentives Area applies to homes from Calgary's early (pre-1945) development period, which substantially maintain their historic style, design and details. These homes were identified through the 2019-2020 Heritage Asset Windshield Survey. Properties meeting the assessment criteria during the Development Application process are referred to as character homes.

The Heritage Incentives Area includes the following communities:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Altadore• Bankview• Beltline• Bridgeland• Capitol Hill• Cliff Bungalow/Mission• Crescent Heights | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Elbow Park• Hillhurst/Sunnyside• Inglewood• Killarney/Glengarry• Mount Pleasant• Ramsay• Renfrew• Rosedale | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Roxboro• Scarboro• South Calgary• Sunalta• Tuxedo Park• Upper/Lower Mount Royal• West Hillhurst• Winston Heights/Mountview |
|--|---|---|

Engagement overview

For Phase 2, we hosted three online workshops and an online survey on the project Engage Portal page. Registration for the workshops was open for two weeks prior to the sessions. The workshops were held at the following dates and times:

- February 1, 2023, from 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM
- February 2, 2023, from 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM
- February 2, 2023, from 7:00 to 8:30 PM

The online survey was open on the Engage Portal from January 16 to February 10, 2023. Questions asked of participants during the workshops followed the same survey used online, with additional time set aside for general questions about the project.

What we asked

The online survey included the questions below. As mentioned previously, the online workshops followed the same series of questions.

- First three characters of your postal code?
- Do you own a character home?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe
- Are there any other housing, professional or light commercial uses that would be appropriate for this incentive?
- Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of these uses?
- Are there any proposed uses that should be removed from this incentive? If so, why?
 - Dwelling Unit(s) (including all suites)
 - Artist's Studio
 - Bed and Breakfast
 - Consulting Service
 - Health Care Service
 - Office
 - Retail and Consumer Service, provided any products sold are also made on the premises or directly related to the service provided
- Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for character homes with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping?
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe
- If no or maybe, what would a more appropriate lot coverage be?
- Does this proposed increase provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space?
- Do the requirements for the exempt addition (no taller or wider than the retained character home) appropriately mitigate concerns? If not, why?
 - Yes
 - No
- Do you support Council waiving fees for character home applications?
- Are there other procedural incentives that should be included?



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

What we heard

In general, respondents online and at the workshops were supportive of the incentives but felt that financial incentives to maintain and renovate character homes will still lead to better outcomes. Some respondents continued to favour residential uses over commercial ones, with particular concern over uses that may lead to increased traffic and parking within a community. Respondents were largely in favour of the proposed increases to lot coverage and allowable sizes for additions. In addition to waving fees for character home applications, respondents expressed interest in finding ways to fast track character home applications as well.

- For a detailed summary of the input that was provided, please see the [Summary of Input](#) section.
- For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.

Next steps

Feedback from this phase of engagement will be reviewed by the project team. It will also be used to help shape the draft incentives provided for feedback in the final phase of engagement, which will occur in the spring of 2023.

Summary of Input – Engage Portal

First three characters of your postal code

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
T2E	22.16%	74
T2G	8.68%	29
T2M	13.17%	44
T2N	11.08%	37
T2S	8.38%	28
T2T	18.86%	63
T3C	11.08%	37
T3E	2.69%	9
Other	3.89%	13

Do you own a character home?

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Yes	61.10%	212
No	31.99%	111
Maybe	6.92%	24

Are there any other housing, professional or light commercial uses that would be appropriate for this incentive?

Theme	Summary
No other suggestions	Most respondents did not have any additional uses to suggest.
Food service	Some respondents suggested allowing food service businesses such as coffee shops and cafés, restaurants, bakeries and bars.
Retail	Suggestions for retail uses included shops, bookstores, boutiques, flower shops, craft shops and consignment stores.
Education	Some respondents suggested uses that incorporated some level of instruction, such as education and workshop spaces, music lessons and rehearsal space, cooking classes and yoga classes.
Aesthetic services	These suggestions included salons, pet grooming and tattoo parlours.

Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of these uses?

Theme	Summary
Parking	Some respondents indicated they want businesses to have on-site parking or that parking for businesses be limited.
No additional rules	Some respondents indicated they did not have any further rules to suggest.
Hours of operation	Respondents suggested they wanted specific rules around hours of operation, with some suggesting regular business hours.
Noise	Some respondents wanted rules to limit the amount of noise from these additional uses.



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

Theme	Summary
Maintain heritage character	Some respondents wanted rules to ensure that the character elements of the house, both inside and out, were maintained regardless of the use.

Are there any proposed uses that should be removed from this incentive? If so, why?

Total - 347

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Dwelling Unit(s) (including all suites)	10.1%	35
Artist's Studio	4.0%	14
Bed and Breakfast	8.6%	30
Consulting Service	9.8%	34
Health Care Service	17.9%	62
Office	11.5%	40
Retail and Consumer Service, provided any products sold are also made on the premises or directly related to the service provided	20.2%	70
No answer	68.9%	239

Why

Theme	Summary
Parking	Some respondents were concerned with parking from certain uses, especially retail and consumer service, health care service and bed and breakfast.
Traffic	Respondents were concerned with increases to foot and vehicle traffic, and the impact this may have on traffic congestion and noise. This concern was associated with all uses, but especially retail and consumer service, health care service, consulting services and additional dwelling units.
No issues	Some respondents indicated they had no issues with any of the proposed uses.

Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for character homes with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping?

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Yes	52.41%	174
No	23.19%	77
Maybe	24.40%	81

If no or maybe, what would a more appropriate lot coverage be?

Theme	Summary
Don't increase	Respondents did not want an increase in lot coverage or felt that the existing lot coverage was already too high.
60-65%	For all development types
50-55%	Mostly for RC-1 and RC-2, but some respondents also indicated this for RC-G.
45%>	For all development types
Depends on the site	Some respondents indicated that lot coverage increases should be dependent on the extent of their associated impacts, including loss of green space, lot size and requirements for on-site parking.

Does this proposed increase provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space?

Theme	Summary
Additional space is adequate	Most respondents indicated the proposed increase provided for an appropriate amount of additional development space.
Not adequate	Some respondents felt that the proposed increase was not adequate. Several respondents provided clarifications, indicating that the increase did not address specific issues such as garage suites or height restrictions.
Not sure	Some respondents were unsure about whether the proposed increase was adequate, with several indicating that there was insufficient context provided to help form an opinion on the matter.
Opposed to increases	Some respondents indicated they were not in favor of the proposed increase, for reasons including that exemptions will continue to occur, that the permitted addition size should remain at 40sqm and that additions can compromise the original form of the character home.

Do the requirements for the exempt addition (no taller or wider than the retained character home) appropriately mitigate concerns? If not, why?

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Yes	63.28%	193
No	36.72%	112

If not, why?

Theme	Summary
Retain character design elements	Some respondents indicated that they wanted to ensure that the character elements of the home were maintained, and that they carried through to any additions.
Impacts to neighbouring properties	Some respondents wanted the requirements to prevent impacts to adjacent properties, including shadowing and issues of privacy.
Neighbourhood feel	Some respondents felt that the additions will negatively impact the character of neighbourhoods, as the additions and secondary structures will be too large and out of character with surrounding homes.

Theme	Summary
Larger additions	Some respondents shared scenarios where larger additions should be allowed, including where adjacent homes are already taller and for small bungalows. Some respondents indicated that additions taller or wider than the original home should be permitted, especially for height.

Do you support Council waiving fees for character home applications?

Answer Choices	Percent	Count
Yes	78.70%	266
No	21.30%	72

Are there other procedural incentives that should be included?

Theme	Summary
Grants and incentives	Some respondents were interested in grants and other financial incentives to help cover the cost of upgrades and maintenance to their character homes. These items include upgrades to plumbing and electrical, windows, insulation and retaining character elements of the home during renovations.
Property tax	Several participants suggested a property tax incentive program to help cover the costs of maintenance and upgrades to character homes.
Application fast track	Several participants suggested creating a fast track for development and building permits related to character homes.

Summary of Input – February Online Workshops

Theme	Summary
Application process	Participants were interested in learning more about how changes to the application process for character homes will be made, and what those changes will look like in practice.
Project scope	Participants had several questions about the project scope, including how The City decided on the boundaries of the Heritage Incentives Area, whether demolition of character homes can be controlled and the possibility of neighbourhood-specific incentives.
Commercial uses	Participants were split regarding commercial uses. Some felt that mixed-use developments added to communities, while others felt they could not support the project if commercial uses were included in the incentives.
Parking	Participants shared concerns regarding increased parking from additional residential and non-residential uses and requested that this item be considered when developing incentives.
Heritage Inventory	Some participants were interested in the heritage designation process and had questions about the Heritage Inventory.

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments presented here include all feedback, suggestions, comments and messages that were collected online and in-person through the engagement described in this report. All input has been reviewed and provided to Project Teams to be considered in decision making for the project.

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 submissions remains. No other edits to the feedback have been made, and the verbatim comments are as received. As a result, some of the content in this verbatim record may still be considered offensive or distasteful to some readers.

Engage Portal

Are there any other housing, professional or light commercial uses that would be appropriate for this incentive?

All Light commercial should be allowed. Shops, bars, bakery, etc Pre-1944 light commercial would have been allowed in these homes. Its silly to recognize these houses as historical but not recognize the history that they where built up to
Any commercial or light industrial use should be permitted in these homes. So long as the form remains, the use inside the building should be allowed. There are coffee Roasters, plant shops, dentists offices in heritage homes though the city and the use in the heritage home supports the character of the neighborhood.
Corner stores& cafes, I.e. remove the requirement for fewer visits Tutoring/training services to be included
Hair dresser, estheticians, lawyer, engineer, architect, interior designer,
Home day care. Grooming and beauty services. Animal services. Any home based business that can make the space work should be allowed
Recording studio (unless that is encompassed in the Artist studio portion). Hair salon, barbershop, tattoo parlor, Cafe or Bistro's.
with those rules book shops/consignments, craft stores are not allowed - and they should be. 8 visits a day is one an hour - not much at all, and difficult to enforce.
Coffee Shops, Boutique Stores, Cocktail Bars
Lawyers. Architects flowerevshops
Retail, with more than 8 visits or selling items created elsewhere. I do not see the purpose in limiting. Large commercial stores will opt for larger locations. Many small businesses don't meet this criteria.
Also, restaurants and cafes should be added. What comes to mind are Charbar, Dean House, Rouge, and Bow Valley Ranch.

Studio space for yoga, art classes, workshops, private tutoring etc.
Character houses are often in areas that are quite built up/densely packed. And quite often accessory buildings are decidedly not original. It would be great if, as part of the ability to have a backyard secondary suite, rules around setbacks for two-story garage, etc could be relaxed (let it go to property line and still up).
I disagree with this approach. It islands homes for people who want to continue living in them solely as a home. Greater emphasis should be placed on encouraging restoration and livability of the existing structure. Also, the urban forest and permeable ground should be protected as part of the heritage.
Perserving an "hertiage" infastructure should be incentivized not through direct grants but through tax incenvtives. Whether commercial or residential. The main threat it appears to any heritage building is our massive sprawl in the city, actively repurposing 'derilict' properties (funeral home on 17th sw) then there would be innercity dev opps.
Antique Furniture refinishing/restoration In home pet sitter
Book stores and cafes
Boutique fitness studios, cafe
Cafés, boutiques, maybe brunch spots? I think owners should also just be incentivized to keep these homes and permitted to appropriately update them as well to make them comfortably habitable.
coffee shop, bakery, etc
More types of residential suites should be allowed. Basement suites and/or 1st and 2nd level split suites should also be considered as these options would be more financially feasible than the addition of an entire backyard suite. Backyard suites also can compromise parking on site.
Perhaps a hair salon or dog groomer?
Pet care/day care Kids artistic center
Repair shop; live/work; law office; photography studio.
Skills based home services ie accountant, cooking classes etc
tutoring or speciality education such as music (likely falls in the broad Consulting Service category though)
yes, architectural, landscaping desing, engineering/consulting services
I think it would be appropriate to cast the net as wide as possible so as to encourage the retention and reuse of these house-form buildings. In theory, a parameter for the selection of permitted uses could be how likely they are to want to pursue interior alterations (i.e. can the use operate in a series of small distinct spaces?).
The city should consider tax breaks as well as energy saving incentives for homeowners who need to upgrade these features for heritage and characters homes.
There are restrictions in the neighbourhood
yes, old/historic storage buildings
Your list only provides incentives to densify and thus will only change the original concept design of these homes and communities. If you follow the intent of your program you will just ruin these homes which will be treated like revenue apartments, only to be torn down to put up one.
Additional living/housing in the back should compliment the existing home and not deviate excessively from the 'feel' of the community and heritage it is sharing land with.
Can gardens / greenhouses be considered as part of an incentive? (e.g. for produce or seed selling)
Heritage or character homes in residential areas should always conform to the same residential zoning, development and use guidelines as other properties in that community.

it is unrealistic to think there will be a retail/consumer/office/health care service that will not generate more than 8 visits a day. How could such a business remain viable?
landscaping that is regenerative - trees and other plants that add shade, wind protection, beauty, fruit, shelter etc. including front and back yard vegetable gardens; and that captures moisture to enhance the soil
Not sure why it's important for all retail products sold to be made on the premises?
people who are training in heritage building/structures
Perhaps residential should comply with existing residential guidelines in other inner city neighborhoods.
short term rental
should not be absentee landlords. No air bnb.
Street scape (street lights, sidewalks, old trees, etc)
This incentive is a complete waste of money and program should be scrapped immediately
We should fully open up these properties for unique and innovative approaches to preserving their core heritage features.
Why limit the nature of uses? The size of the existing building will naturally limit the scale of potential uses. Less rules, more flexibility
Would airbnbs also qualify in this category?
Would help maintain the façade and character of the area
Change in use would not help protect our character home - our community association would vigorously oppose any of these uses and we would not pursue any of them. The only thing that would save our place from demolition/redevelopment would be property tax relief or financial supports for maintenance. We have already restored it without grants.
City planners will do whatever they want no matter what we write in this survey. Their engagement process is there for appearances only!
I am not in favour of this proposal. It will gut the special social and community elements of our community where we know all our neighbours.
It seems that the priority of Calgary City Council is for densification at any cost. This part of the city should not receive special incentives to keep things as is. Zoning should be changed if required to allow densification as it was in Wildwood.
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis.
No. The proposed uses will definitely impact the use value and enjoyment of neighbours as these intensities go well beyond residential impacts
2 Secondary units is almost a must, especially for folks up keeping the beautiful appearance of these character homes. Our house in particular is 30-40% more expensive to maintain than a larger home and property that was build in the past 30 years. A secondary rental unit above the garage would dramatically assist us in maintenance costs.
Affordable housing.
Authorized guest parking
Book club meetings, literary salons
cannot comment at this time.
cannot think of any
Cannot think of any at this time.
Can't think of any...
childcare facility
Coffee shops

Coffee shops!
consulting services
any occupation where there is no commercial traffic
Day home for child care. 8 Visits per day would mean maximum of four children - consider raising that to 6 by exemption.
day home, as long as all is secure inside for the kids. It could be great for the kids to see how an old house is different from a new house.
Daycare
Designer's Studio/Office, Architect's Studio/Office, Interior Architect Studio/Office
Dwelling (ADUs, basement suites, secondary, etc) are the most appropriate use as they allow density increase without disturbing the heritage streetscapes and existing structures.
Dwelling Unit(s) (including all suites)
Artist's Studio
Bed and Breakfast
Consulting Service
Health Care Service
Office
Retail and Consumer Service, provided any products sold are also made on the premises or directly related to the service provided
elder care
General retail.
Hair salon
Hair Salon (1 chair only)
I think certain home-based buisnesses could also use the same types of homes and still keep the neighborhoods' character.
I would add retail of locally made or artisanal products even if they are not produced directly on site
I'm not sure if group senior's housing has been included in the Health Care Service above but I could see that as a very valuable addition to our very walkable community.
In our neighbourhood most of the "character" homes are old and run down but do take up a small part of the lot. While, I wouldn't want a woodshop on the backlot other small 9-5 businesses would be fine to have.
Let me get this straight. You are suggesting that "character homes" which are not designated heritage assets should get incentives to remain "character homes". Many of these incentives are upzoning that further reinforces inequality in the neighbourhood by encouraging monster homes. Yes to any use change such as retail etc.
List looks good
Local history museum
Music studio. Band rehearsal space. Occasional house concerts or yard concerts (3-4 per year) supporting the music studio while inviting neighbours.
N/A
N/A
No
no
no
No
No



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

No
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
no
no
No
No
No
No
no
No
No
No
No
no
no
No
No
No
No
no
no
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
No - I feel the proposed uses are too broad.
No as I don't think they city would enforce any reports of breaking the rules
No definitely not.
no, above sounds good
No, absolutely not
No, and I would remove retail & consumer service.
no, I am very concerned about air B&Bs as they have caused major problems at a recreational subdivision we are familiar with
No, leave character house property as is
No, the above list is extensive enough and sufficient
No, this is already too many uses for this type of home, in a residential neighborhood. There should be no businesses allowed other than an artist's studio.
No.
No.

No.
No.
No.
No.
No. Fewer are appropriate.
No. Maintain the residential character of these neighborhoods and do not allow other uses.
none
None
none
None of these incentives are appropriate. There should not be a distinction between character homes and non-character homes. Why would the city want to incentivies people to keep our city looking old? This is illogical.
None that come to mind
None.
Nope
Not on the street I live on
Not sure...
Not that comes to mind
Not that I scan think of
Nothing else that I can think of. I'm assuming retail could cover a food establishment? like a catering business
Parking
Perhaps a museum that represents the development in question
Pottery making, wood work,bullet making.
Products not made on premises
Recording/video production studio (arguably a type of "artist studio"
Music studio (teaching)
Salons for hair, nails, aesthetics
Seems thorough
Small restaurant
Small restaurant
Sounds reasonable and diversely creative.
That covers a good amount so no.
That's a pretty comprehensive list, I think. I would say small trades such as furniture refinishing, upholstery, etc, which I assume already fit in the above, would also be appropriate.
The city of Calgary is hugely deficient in small performance and rehearsal spaces for musicians. In situations where houses are situated on large lots with a significant space between neighbours, I would like to see a provision for a use that permits musical performances, recording and rehearsals. Limits on sound amplification can be specified.
Therapy service - Speech Pathology, occupational therapy, psychology etc.
There should be no incentives of any type. This is a ridiculous proposal.
Two secondary suites is 100% the most important. Also getting rid of the parking requirements, one parking spot required max.

Use of the space for small scale Educational or workshop purposes provided foot traffic and parking considerations are adhered to.
Workshop/makers space
Yes
Yes We would love a office/guest tiny house in our backyard while maintaining the integrity of our smaller character home
Yes, anything that is environmentally conscious should be considered.
Yes, many other uses would be appropriate.

Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of these uses?

-no part of the property can have additional paved parking for commercial use -residential parking permits would be mandatory in the area -regular business hours
?
8 visits a day seems too much. As someone who works from home I would find that many visits to my immediate neighbour's house a nuisance. I suggest no more than 5 or 6.
Address the parking impact from their customers and how it will impact the residents of the surrounding residential community. Have homeowners supply off street parking for their customers ex. parking off the back alley. Inner city is already too congested without mixing in more vehicular traffic and parking for heritage home businesses.
Adequate parking (permits paid by homeowner or driveway).
Adequate parking.
Aesthetic considerations to retain the character of an area. Planning restrictions on signage, etc. Use of cladding materials ought to reflect the historic character of the area
Air B&B's should not be allowed.
Allowance for outdoor concerts in the summer.
animal restrictions?
Any renovations should not upset the character of the house
Appropriate for area.
Appropriate measures to ensure good street parking, especially if there are multiple suites on a given property.
Appropriate on or off street parking, or access to transit
arcitechural control of the addition unit built on the property. The look of the secondary suite should match the look of the house, one building should not be a character home with a modern secondary addition.
As you say, minimizing additional traffic, especially in areas where residences only have permit parking.
Back of property parking.
Be very careful about massing/overlooking
Bulldoze most of the heritage fire traps. Give the wood to homeless for firewood & build affordable housing in its place.
Calgary's noise bylaw is *very* aggressive against music rehearsals. Any neighbour who doesn't find the music to their liking can apparently complain at any time of the day. The noise bylaw should be adjusted to support the local music industry with sensible decibel limits and times of day. Musicians typically gravitate to character neighbourhoods
cannot think of any

can't think of any the survey doesn't seem to want to complete
Character home neighborhoods are typically tighter than suburban neighborhoods but I don't see any rules or comments regarding parking. Commercial/professional uses should be responsible for providing more parking on site if they generate visitors to the area to not disrupt local residents ability to find parking. Or another strategy assessed.
City should not be spending money it doesn't have, if we are going to protect heritage buildings the city should try to avoid developing in environmentally sensitive areas or waterways or valleys that are main corridors for wildlife.
Consider flexing the parking requirements for some of these uses. If these houses are typically located in inner-city neighbourhoods, parking could be reduced? Consider whether non-residential uses would be eligible for on-street parking permits (I don't see why they shouldn't be, but maybe it would depend on the specific condition in the area).
Considering the limited street parking in the area, 8 visits a day would likely cause some challenges in my neighbourhood, particularly if there were multiple houses taking advantage of these incentives as well as additional dwelling units.
Could consider the external appearance of the building and the historical context (e.g. painting colour, black not used on houses before 1945) Melbourne Australia has done a wonderful job.
Do not allow secondary suites
Don't change the rules specifically for heritage homes.
Eliminate the incentive immediately and reallocate the money to helping the underprivileged
Enough with the rules. This city is terrible to live in due to all the rules. It KILLS vitality and turns the place into zombie suburbs. We mandate parking spots but not maintaining old tree canopy on private property in these neighbourhoods.
Establish parking when creating these units.
Existing caveats
Exterior signage limited in size and not illuminated
Have permission from Neighbours to run such a business. Such as approval Of shares parking on the street. Provide guarantee that this addition use will not impact the integrity of the heritage house. Perhaps the owner agrees to put work into the house on a regular basis.
Heritage trees should not be cut down
hours of operation
Hours of operation, noise, no additional parking allowances
How does parking relate to an allowance for light commercial?
How much parking is available
I assume the employment restriction is to have two non resident employees working on the premises at a time not total? May need more than two employees.
I believe the rules are too stringent as proposed.
I cannot opine on this
I don't think "manufacturing " should take place in these homes
I don't like 'rules' or restrictions, but incentives are a great idea.
I think it should depend on where the house is situated to allow it to be anything other than a home. If on a main road, it would be okay but if in a residential street, then no.
I think the rule should be that this should not apply to heritage homes.
I think there should be a proposal on the types of trucks that can be used in regards to delivering and sending of goods and services through the proposed unit types. This would help reduce worry of traffic,

both in front of the character homes and in the back, where there may already be limited space through an alleyway or other such roadway.
I worry about increased parking on the streets resulting from the increased traffic. The streets are already JAMMED
I would like to see a strong emphasis placed on the preservation of existing trees if the lots are to be further developed. Like favouring development in a way that retains them as much as possible. I would be open to a corner grocery store too as another Use to encourage walkability.
Impact on neighbors re street parking, Many inner city neighborhoods already have parking concerns so the use should be respectful of the street parking concerns.
Include customer Parking Hours of operation No Light & sound infringement on neighbors
Insurance req'ments
It is important to include rules that address excessive noise and any fumes or exhaust which result from the business activity. It is a primarily residential area and should not be overly noisy or smelly. Also, there should be restrictions on the number of vehicles that the business can have, as street and alley parking is already an issue.
It should be imperative that the additional units built on the property must use heritage characteristics to fit seamlessly into the neighbourhood. There should not be allowed these new horrendous "modern" boxes with no character allowed to be built in heritage neighbourhoods. These typologies have a place in the city, but not in heritage areas.
Keep renovations and disruptions of the original home to a minimum, other than safety related issues such as electrical wiring.
Lack of parking is an obstacle.
LESS visits per day! Keep only one secondary suite or commercial/professional space per property.
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis.
limit on number of chairs to 2 max
Limited renovations, especially external. Surrounding development to be considerate and respectful of heritage.
Management of parking so does not adversely impact neighbours
Hours of operation restricted to weekdays between 8 and 6
May want to consider impact on parking and its availability.
More traffic shouldn't be a problem if they are near transit. People complaining are worried about street parking not people. Learn to separate the two
Must also have space to provide parking for all uses, in particular for the professional and commercial uses
Must demonstrate commitment to upkeep of the Heritage building, and in the case of business-use, perhaps a reserved fund dedicated to those purposes would be something that should be required.
Must have adequate parking for clients/tenants.
Must have dedicated parking for guests/ customers (ie must register their license plate in the current visitor system) but have restrictions so visitors registered as customers aren't eligible to park in the area for 2 weeks without further registration. There is simply not enough parking.
Must provide private, off street parking for all residents and visitors. Alternatively, streets with properties of this type would be permit only parking. The concern being streets that are overburdened and

ultimately detract from the very character of the neighborhood that you are attempting to protect (ie marda loop/33rd ave)
N/A
NA
Need to ensure that parking congestion does not become an issue
no
No
No
No
No
No
no
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
No
no addition of large dwellings e.g., apartment blocks,
No future redevelopment
No incentives for non-heritage designated homes. If the point is to preserve heritage than all policy must depend on heritage. Character homes is a euphemism for elitism.
no major modification to the historic features of the home, restoration is ok.
No major neon or lit up signage allowed to be displayed past 8pm
No parking requirements.
No private health care agencies should own and use these homes for assisted living.
No secondary suites should be allowed in heritage areas. They destroy the character of the neighbourhood.
No, there are too many rules. This acts as incentive for busybody neighbors and community associations to bully people they don't like.
No. I think if you make too many rules on the use, people won't be interested in using the grant.
no?
noise thresholds, signage restrictions to preserve the residential context
None
None.
Not in favor of 2 secondary suites - either one in the house or alternately one above the garage. But not both - too much massing on the lot
Not so tall that it blocks sun / changes lighting of the character house neighbours properties.
Nothing else except for business hours. Rather than limiting the visits in a day can we restrict the hours (except for a B&B where people may arrive later at night)
Older, healthier trees should not be cut down to accommodate these secondary buildings. We are already losing too many!

on street parking, limit to the number of cars associated with the property, not have one place use all spots on the street (like Steveos garage on the corner of 16 St and 35 av SW)
Only one secondary suite should be permitted. In residential communities Heritage or Character homes should NOT be developed to include business, commercial, tourism, health care, retail, office or artist studio uses.
Parking have had instances of tenants "loaning" residential parking passes out to allow someone to park in residential only areas in order to walk downtown.
Parking control
Traffic control including speed bumps on residential streets that people might use to cut through
Parking for potential visitors.
Parking for such bussiness must be mandatory on their property . As it will clutter traffic & be a nuisance to neighbors.
parking for these would have to be on site not street
Parking is already tight in most of the neighbourhoods. Could you allow drive ways in the front of the homes?
parking is essential
Parking issues year round, winter sidewalk and road maintenance,
Parking limits
Parking needs to be accounted for. Many character homes do not have garage, or have a garage that is unusable for parking a car. As a result, lack of street parking has been a big problem. Adding secondary suites, especially for commercial purposes would likely increase parking congestion.
Parking needs to be addressed. Additional units and customers cannot be accommodated without additional parking on-site. Street parking is not an option, there is already not enough street parking in these areas.
Parking on-site should be required on-site. The use of lighting should ensure that the residential character is not impacted by the intensity of evening or nighttime activities. Hours of operation/impacts should be considered as well as the privacy of adjacent neighbours if these uses are next door.
Parking requirements
Parking requirements for customers/employees would be helpful. Many of my neighbors street park and our houses are narrow enough that there isn't room for more than 1 car to park as is.
parking restrictions
Parking restrictions for businesses being approved. The business must provide parking on their premises.
Parking restrictions on property, on adjacent streets?
Limit the number of sleeping rooms / occupants in Bed and Breakfast.
Limit number of workers/work stations in office occupancy
Parking should be considered. Higher residential density can exacerbate street parking issues. For example if there is a house with a basement suite and backyard suite and all three units have two cars per household that will be hard to accommodate in an older neighbourhood
Parking, for staff and visitors. What does that look like?
Garbage
Per above, there should not be any incentives.
possible parking requirement relaxation. Unsure if these incentives are enough.
Possibly hours of operation
Preserve urban forest and permeable ground. Preserve and restore historical elements - both interior and exterior
Professions and/or activities linked to the build environment

Providing parking on premisis.
Recommend altering the rules regarding visits to be flexible depending on the use type. For example, 8 visits/day is likely appropriate for a consulting service, but may not be appropriate for an retail environment or a health care service.
Also, I think that the limit of 2 non-residents being allowed to work on the parcel is too limiting.
regulate and control parking
Remove the 8 visits per day requirement. That would be a detriment to a small business
Restricted hours for visitors in some cases
retail products should not be allowed to include restricted substances of any sort (alcohol, cannabis, etc)
Retaining mature trees for the green canopy.
Retaining the look of the original home is so so important. I want to say if adding on, try and keep it to the same style?
Robust noise bylaws
Rules are needed to noise, smoke, chemical vapours, and storage of autos or large trucks on the street and in the alley that is generated by the commercial activity.
Rules: must not exceed the current parking limit of 2 visitor passes per property (applies to both non-resident employees and to patrons of the business)
Security first. To ensure that any business is safe to be done inside a heritage home. Business or residential should not impact the character of the home. We should do all we can to protect what makes this type of home so beautiful in their architecture and style.
See above
Should encourage higher traffic than 8 per day - activity and engagement with character homes should be encouraged
Should not allow secondary suites
Signage. Should be allowed but compatible with heritage character.
Since parking would be at a premium, I see nothing but problems with this idea. 2 secondary suites as well as dwelling ? Ridiculous idea
Some limits on signage - size and number of Parking limited to the site/ lot
Some restriction on the noise created by making products on the premises should be included. Parking should also be a consideration of customers are visiting the premises. There should be parking on the lot for at least one customer vehicle.
Sound limits (decibal max.)
sounds good
Stop allowing them to be uncared for then knocked down for redevelopment
Street parking can be an issue, making sure there are appropriate parking locations that don't impact homeowners
street parking congestion and negative impacts of commercial activities on residential streets must be considered
sufficient parking, signage placed outside of the dwelling, etc.
Sufficient street and on site parking should be available in the immediate vicinity so as not to negatively impact the adjacent dwellings or businesses.
That adequate parking is available (on street/private driveway). That significant trees are preserved and not demolished (unless they are at risk of damage to property and drains)

The 8 visits per day rule is terrible. A business shouldn't be penalized for being popular, and removing this would generate additional awareness of the historic building.
The additional dwellings must follow the same characteristics in design of all additional dwellings. This should be applied retrospectively to apply for the incentives
The business should not require heavy equipment or loud machines
The city should generally be encouraging people to retain existing homes, character or not, for sustainability reasons: the City should be encouraging and incentivizing renovations on existing homes rather than permitting anything goes zoning for terrible developments like rowhouses everywhere. The City should value sustainability and character.
The potential parking volume & accompanying nuisance to neighbours associated with a house becoming a business should be addressed proactively. E.g., limiting it to no more than 2 additional vehicles parking at any one time could address this. I'd feel very sorry for the neighbours dealing with patrons parking constantly in front of their houses
There may need to be a rule related to parking permits and visitor passes
There needs to be rules that will maintain the exterior of the abode
There should be fewer rules for the types of businesses. If they can respect the character they should be allowed operate.
There should be very clear indications of where businesses can open within the community and developers should know that it will not be appropriate in all areas. This type of development s/b kept to the busier thoroughfares
There should only one additional rental unit allowed on such properties: either backyard suite or basement suite but not both. Backyard suites should not be two-storey as they impose on the surrounding houses by reducing the amount of privacy.
They are so unethical that they put planners and developer on the board of directors of community associations to go to City Hall and lie. When faced with opposition, they'll claim "The Community is on board with this development," when it's not true.
This concept needs to be scrapped. If someone opened a bed a breakfast next door, I can assure you it would not "blend into my residential context". What it would do, is prevent my kids from playing street hockey in front of my house. This disregards the wishes of current residents.
This is a way for a neighbourhood to resist natural densification and development. If the home is not over 100 years old then it should not be considered.
Too many restrictions makes the rules unusable - flexibility and ease of implementation will be detrimental to success. IE, secondary suites and ADUs should not need an individual approval in a council meeting
Use of back alleys clarified
We are against any rules that would increase the density in communities that contain heritage homes.
What about air B and B - could an owner have two air b and bs with the swelling out back and other rental unit - hope NOT!
While I appreciate the option, parking is something that should be considered as well. Will these businesses have customers regularly going in and out? In addition to the max 2 staff members? I.e. a psychologist or massage therapist swing clients 1 at a time is much more reasonable than a small retail space.
Yes, heritage homes should be incentivized to replace their lawns with pollinator friendly gardens and native plants.
You have lost your intentions of protecting heritage buildings

Are there any proposed uses that should be removed from this incentive? If so, why?

Depends what they are making for Products. Not sure you would want a welder or machinist back there.
No, but most of these "services" will generate more than 8 visits per day. Nearly every home is also used as an "office", and that usage should not be regulated.
concern that businesses expand beyond original plans and overwhelm residential streets
Current use should be consistent with nature of property, to the extent possible
The limitation that the product must be made on site should be removed. The limit of 8 visits should be removed. Who is going to monitor and enforce that? It just encourages busybodies to waste city bylaw's time.
The rule could be extended to include " in Dwellings" as this would detract from the historical value.
There is so many bylaws that work against the property owner. It is not fair the home owners. People work hard the afford their houses and the mayor keeps putting the Finacial burden on the home owners.
I want to see these homes preserved for families to live in, too many are only in use by commercial and retail businesses
One dwelling , all those businesses? It's wrong.
Property should not be changed
Should be residential oriented or similar.
products created on site must not create odours and must be approved by community development guidelines
R1 is an area asset
Both suites should not be allowed to be used for living quarters. One for living and one for work purposes only.
Retail should be restricted/confined to specific areas in order to provide a "critical mass" of activity.
See above
Two dwelling units is too much
Retail can often turn rogue once they get licensed and deviate from the original guidelines. Enforcement by the City seems spotty to non-existent.
Existing home occupation rules exist within the permitted and discretionary uses contained within each land use district. How do the rules listed above, for the 4 uses I checked, differ from the current land use bylaw? Is there a rationale for treating heritage homes different than other residential areas. This has not been made clear.
Signs detract from the look
Remove them all. Most of these heritage homes are junk. They are fire traps, lack insulation, proper electrical installations, foundations have deteriorated and are a poor investment of public money. In fact there should be no public money invested.
Bed and breakfast BUSSINESS has being a problem to families around it esp in downtown & my area . Rather 2 suites are better . No bed breakfast please
How can you have a maximum of 8 visits/day?
These could be located in more appropriate medical buildings
These intensities are not appropriate. Neighbourhoods close to downtown will be overrun with short-term offices, retail and health use that far exceed home occupation impacts!!!! These uses will definitely impact the use value and enjoyment of neighbouring properties. Without limits on any intensities or hours of operation.
This is a ridiculous proposal. Calgary is just over 100 years old. There are way too many heritage sites already for a city that is so young. The scope of heritage building should be narrowed significantly. There

are at most a dozen sites that have had a profound impact on the growth of the city. The rest are just job justification
too much parking
With all of the vacancy of office and professional property in our dt core we should be incentivizing business to return to these areas with all of the appropriate infrastructure already in place. Renovictions are already a concern if not already a reality for people who have lived in these areas for years and this will make it much worse.
You are going to spoil the character of these heritage neighbourhoods. Calgary has destroyed enough of its heritage as it is!
Introduction of parking, traffic issues into residential areas. Discordance with use and aesthetics of adjacent residential properties. The impractical nature of trying to police and enforce some of the proposed rules.
It would be hard to police the "must not generate more than 8 visits per day" regulation. That category could be in a later phase of regulation.
Designation of residential units as residential. Creating a conservation area. These are usually closely controlled in other countries and administrations
Bed and breakfast as long as owner remains resident - no air b and bs
No residency outside the main building
Adding business or additional dwelling units will destroy the fabric of our community, consisting of single-family dwelling units.
AirBnB's drive up the cost of housing and ruin neighbourhoods. Keep short term rentals out.
Alcohol, 'massage' services, adult-only stores, and cannabis locations shouldn't be permitted.
Allowing other uses creates a disincentive for people to use these structures as homes. Homes should be the primary goal. Other cities have very strict conditions for historical areas. We need to discourage other uses. It feels like the approach calgary is taking is apologetically trying to preserve rather than proudly trying to preserve.
As noted above, wholesale expansion of residents will gut our community.the Anderson Caveat seeks to protect this very essence of the neighborhood with No commercial activity which would undermine community.
attracts a clientele not good for a residential neighbourhood
Bed & Breakfast: clients will need parking. There should be a limit as to how much demand will be created for off-site parking. Dwelling Units: restricted to one only, preferably basement suites as they infringe the least on parking and privacy for surrounding neighbours.
Brings users with parking needs to quiet residential streets area should remain single family no heritage restrictions should be placed on any home
Calgary should not encourage "keeping it looking old". We are a young, vibrant, educated, growing city, full of motivated self-employed people. We are not a slow paced, rural visitor attraction where people come to admire the history. These guidelines are misplaced and not in keeping with the character or spirit of our city. Discontinue project.
Cancel this program completely. It is a waste of taxpayer money. Level heritage homes and rebuild with green technology

Character homes were built as single family homes and they are generally in residential neighbourhoods. With very few exceptions having a retail or healthcare service or additional suites would affect the remaining parts of the neighbourhood that includes similar homes.
concerns over increased traffic and increased parking on already busy residential streets
density of second suite is too high and not consistent with the neighbourhood
Don't want businesses in the immediate neighbourhood.
Health care services could not only generate more visits to an area creating parking concerns (unless parking is addressed), but could also require more invasive renovations to the character home, compromising its original character and making it more difficult to revert the character home back to a residential dwelling if the business sells/moves.
Home business where they make stuff to sell elsewhere and home based artists are okay as they own the home and can do what they want. The moment it becomes a visitor based location it is no longer a residential dwelling
I have concerns about dwelling units being used as airbnb, especially those in the back yard. This may increase noise and pedestrian traffic and may result in a party atmosphere.
Retail will result in the same.
I suppose it depends on the health care service, but some of these could generate more visits per day than the other uses
I think having these types of businesses in a historic property would depend on the neighbourhood in which the character home is located. If the area is primarily residential and on a quiet side street, it wouldn't necessarily be appropriate to have a retail space, etc.
I think the uses bordering commercial, such as office and retail need to be carefully considered as not to change the fabric of a neighbourhood. Random people coming and going many times a day, parking issues and daytime only occupancy impact the livability of a neighbourhood for permanent residents.
If bed and breakfasts had their own parking spots and didn't use street parking, I don't see an issue; but otherwise I could see it adding to parking stresses in our area.
If the home is in a residential area , other residents may not want the additional traffic in the area
I'm not sure what types of health care services are being considered, but cleanliness/sanitation may be a concern in the home.
it will generate more trips and also too much modifications to the home
It will reduce the value of the homes
Keep it residential to minimize traffic and strangers (build a cohesive community-consistent neighbours)
licensing concerns, increase traffic in the area, attraction of transient persons around a health care service - break-ins, etc.
likely that street parking would suffer so existing residents (tax payers) would have to park unreasonably far from their residence
Limit the number of office units that can be on a single property. If all units were office space then the property would be vacant at night and over weekends which would not be as desirable. Health care services could have the same effect. This could be remedied by requiring at least one unit per property be residential.
Maybe along major roads only as it may affect parking for residents
Most of the character homes are in residential areas, retail might change too much the nature of the area
Need to retain a feeling of residential.
Neighbourhood not suited to rental suites, businesses etc. it is already "overrun by student parking (Western Canada HS)

not compatible with an inner city residential neighbourhood
Parking is a concern
parking is already a huge issue and this will make it worse
Parking is already really challenging in our neighbourhood and having a retail business will increase demand for parking on the street where it's located over and above what would be the case if it were one of the other proposed uses.
parking is limited and too much foot traffic
Parking, it's already an issue.
Parking. It's already awful thanks to other city bylaws
Potential to create vehicle congestion
Retail businesses should not be allowed in heritage neighborhoods. Even online businesses that sell sketchy products such as drug paraphernalia and sex toys should be disallowed. Allowing any retail has the potential to cause many problems in the neighborhood (traffic, crime, etc.)
Retail is not conducive to a neighbourhood feel. And Health Care would be too busy and could include things like rehab or halfway houses.
retail products should not be allowed to include restricted substances of any sort (alcohol, cannabis, etc) - becomes a slippery slope, opening the 'back door' to other potentially problematic substances, home-made or not
Retail service if it creates extensive foot and vehicle and or exhibits increase noise levels if products are being made in premise
Retaining the character of a home includes the lot, trees and landscaping. Overbuilding a lot destroys that character. Heritage Incentives should include tax breaks and monetary incentives and not just building incentives. Additional dwellings/suites have the most impact on the lot and existing landscaping.
Additional suites and dwellings Suites an
See above. There should be no businesses allowed in this residential neighborhood. There are many children and there is already too much traffic cutting through the neighborhood. There also is a parking shortage. NO BUSINESSES!
Seems out of place to have business' in the middle of residential areas
The broad category could include services that generate a lot of visits from clients. A less-broad category would be better.
The heavy traffic both foot and vehicular would cause undue negative impacts on the surrounding neighbours and likely accelerated deterioration of the subject property.
The only worry I have with there being the bed and breakfast clause is that it could be used for Airbnb and other types of larger rental services. Could there be an allowance for Bed and Breakfast units, without the ability to rent it through these larger corporate entities?
There is no room for extra dwellings and this is not a commercial corridor that lends itself to retail and the accompanying traffic, signage, deliveries, etc.
These do not fit with having the majority of the home be used for residential purposes
These homes are typically in residential areas and having excessive traffic (secondary suites) and mixed business and residential is not conducive to the character of a heritage area
These types of businesses would be difficult to operate in a character home's interior layout. They would be required to make material changes which would result in a Frankenstein impact to the property and be counter productive to the incentive purpose.
Too much density such as we are seeing in Marda Loop. No main road to accommodate the traffic - just single lane each way. The congestion is becoming horrendous and will get worse with the new condos being built. People don't walk, they still have cars much as the city wishes people to use transit or bikes.

too much foot traffic
Too much traffic with too few places to park.
Too much traffic, compromised parking availability,noise.
Too much traffic, people & vehicles.
Too much traffic, the area I live in is already too busy (I get between 250-500 people a day passing by my home and can you imagine increasing the density of this area - HillHurst on Memorial Dr)
Traffic/parking
two suites in each house would cause parking problems as the cars at a property go from 2 to 6 unless off street parking.. A classic B&B is Ok because an owner is resident with the guests and keeps order. Air B&Bs are not OK as the guests have the whole unit and no one to keep order. traffic and parking would be difficult to control.
We are against any rules that would increase the density in communities that contain heritage homes. We are particularly concerned about traffic and the increased density damaging the community aspect of the area.
We don't need any more 'massage' parlours
When I moved into my area, I chose it for a reason. It is quiet. It has traffic flow provisions in place. It is 100% single family dwellings. I paid a lot for these features as I had just started a family and was specifically looking for all of the above. The proposed changes will fundamentally change the area that I live in. this is unacceptable.
Will likely utilize overnight street parking, when there is already very little available.
zoning

Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for character homes with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping? If no or maybe, what would a more appropriate lot coverage be?

Anything that has a decent setback from the street, and allows for more trees / preserves trees onsite.
It will be necessary for multi unit dwellings for densification.
People will build up instead and ruin the character home community.
the neighbourhood should maintain the set backs and side property allowances as per the caveats- otherwise the properties around the character homes will be torn down and redeveloped and the owners of the character homes will be stuck, unable to sell and surrounded by people who benefit from them while providing no benefit to them
Lot coverage should include parking spaces visible from the street.
no property line to property line development it defeats the purpose increase
Size ok, but should have environmental building requirements for any expansion if they're keeping an older home
Coverage should be calculated on proposed business need to allow for minimal parking infringement to home owners. This mayor is taking away our right to park in front of our properties. I pay a lot of taxes and should be allowed to park in front of my property without additional cost to me
Imagine being a neighbour next to a dwelling being 'developed'. Not only is parking a problem, now the neighborhood is now breathing down your neck. Loss of trees and green space
Keep existing homes and preserve urban forest and permeable ground. I don't understand why the Historical Committee is so willing to create historical areas in name only without preserving the actual

historical asset. This includes the ratio of building to land and supports the ecosystem in the area. It seems like the priorities are wrong here
Percentage should take into account all buildings in property (ie free standing garages and sheds) when calculating the percentage
Retain existing footprints as much as possible. The City has granted far too many permits for megahouses in our neighborhood which are not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
The lots in inner city (Sunnyside) are already very small. Consideration should be given to context and intent of the heritage incentive.
if these homes are to be retained in residential areas, they can't increasingly encroach on each other. The benefit of green space in and around a property is a very large part of its appeal. Removing it systematically makes the neighbourhood feel commercial, regardless of whether the property is being used commercially or residentially.
Additions should only be allowed in the rear or side yard to preserve the heritage facade on the front of the building.
The additions are typically not going to be built on the FRONTS of houses - so you'll still be conserving front yard landscaping and mature trees that contribute to the streetscape. Rear-yard landscaping is less important from a streetscape character / heritage perspective - more of a NIMBY issue about seeing neighbours' rear yards.
It's ridiculous to have any size restriction if the house can be demolished and not have a restriction apply.
setbacks and gardens are key to beauty of heritage areas and front setbacks should be maintained and even 45% is a very high lot coverage ratio
Yes but suggest stick as well as carrot: stricter limit on lot coverage and/or height (2 not 3 stories) for new single detached houses to disincentivize current trend here of tearing down heritage and multi unit to build huge single detached. (Vancouver is doing this, albeit to incentivize multiplexes due to Vancouver's affordability challenges.)
No comment
stop building huge homes. build more bungalow. we need green space too
The bigger concern should be the loss of "green space" in the community. With the increase in lot coverage and the charge for parking, properties are going to become parking lots. That is not a sustainable practice.
The coverage should be the majority of the original lot size.
There is not that much green space to begin with
The trees are mature and are history. They should never be removed
To keep the existing heritage home without adding a secondary building.
All of it with a new building for affordable housing.
don't rely on random people giving you numbers of their heads, use your professional judgement.
Green space can be small yet useful if well designed, conversely if poorly designed can be within parameters but useless and unattractive. The idea if I'm not mistaken is to maintain a historical, groomed atmosphere.
If single detached home on RG lot can increase its footprint to 65% why would you limit the same single detached home on R1 or R2 lots? Same lot size, same home, same rules should apply
I'm not sure why additional development space is needed when the character is being preserved.
Let's not get technical when we talk about character.
My comment is specific to my lot, which is zoned RR-1. This is an archaic zoning with restrictions that should be updated to align with RC-1 guidelines.
There should be no distinction for character homes.

With current rules, trees are already at risk. New builds can use area underground that does not count toward lot coverage but eliminates the possibility of planting. If it is increased this loophole needs to be eliminated
It's probably OK, but the % age rule doesn't encourage protecting trees — could there be incentives there? Also, I'm on a weird shaped lot (not a full-sized one w/ laneway access) and would be curious to hear more about how these %s would work in some of these scenarios. I have a feeling my house is already close to hitting that extended percentage
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis. Don't force them to maintain a landscape around their property. It's not enough.
Lot coverage should not be higher than for non-heritage homes. Green space is equally important for both.
Probably depends very much on the house, sorry I don't have a response.
Renovators and developers will simply find a way around the rules to build more McMansions where they don't be one and don't fit in to the character of the area.
The lot coverage rules are already overly generous - at least all the new build infills seem to have little to no lot space left for pleasing proportions - these homes dominate streetscapes, loom over and shade neighboring properties. We desperately need to shift to smaller, higher quality but more affordable housing, NOT bigger homes.
The maximum will become the minimum. It has been thus with every change in the building by-laws to date. That is way too much lot coverage and is a huge threat to the Urban Canopy and landscaping which is already completely ignored in favor of development in the inner city.
Heritage homes are located in mostly urban areas. You changing this is to only incentives the destruction of this heritage communities
How do you hook up to the city water and sewer from the lane way buildings without undermining the heritage home?
I am not in favour of this change. Loss of space will change the character of the neighborhood and change light and trees which are essential.
I am sick of losing trees, and structures just about touching mine. This proposal will not help a character image.
I don't know if 20% is appropriate or not, but you could rule out removing trees
If the lot coverage is as stated then the buildings will go up higher - such as the 12 foot ceilings or three stories being allowed in current inner city areas. Now you want to increase the coverage of the land as well. I agree with densification but how it is done is the question.
Would limit to maximum 10% only over the base lot
%15 over the base lot coverage
45% coverage for R-C1/C2 leaves minimal room for landscaping/trees. 54% obviously leaves less room. The increase will be an incentive but at the expense of reduced landscaping which also forms heritage character areas . The trees make the area a heritage area as much as do the character houses.
Allowable lot coverage should be more generous. Has the proposed increase been tested?
Depends where the development occurs physically in each lot/character of the immediate area, urban guidelines are required to assess this contextually
determined by placement of existing buildings
I am not knowledgeable about this topic and cant make recommendations.

I think there could be an allowance for a slightly larger amount of development use, so long as it was held up to certain rules: the retention of at least 75% of the front viewing of the heritage home, and a keeping of certain aesthetics in the heritage design of the new development.
I would be less concerned with lot coverage and more concerned with maintaining/not damaging old trees or landscaping features like original rock fences, etc.
I'm cool with more development but stipulating that some green space should be maintained. I'm pretty sick of all the concrete here.
Maintain the same lot coverage for Heritage and character homes as other properties under R-C1, R-C2 and R-CG zoning.
30%
50 max
50%
50%
50% for R-C1 & R-C2. Calgary has only 33.7% of our city classified as green, a big drop from 56.4% in the year 2000. The City's intention is to increase our mature tree canopy: heritage areas have a highly effective canopy cover, and that should be retained.
55%. It appears that many of this type of home are on 25 foot lots and 65% coverage appears to be leaving little room for green coverage.
60 and 70 respectively
60% for rc-1 or Rc-2 and 70% for r-cg
65%
65% for all zones
65% for RC-1/RC-2 and 75% for R-CG
75 percent- in my case, I would like to build a garage studio which may push the proposed limits
80% coverage would be acceptable.
Any and all heritage trees and their rootbase must be preserved. NO cutting down or harming current trees for development.
Cancel this complete waste of resources
Conservation of character is the prime design consideration. Proposals need to be considered individually rather than by formula
Decisions can be made on an individual basis in some cases
Depends on how much green is going to stay. We need mature trees and shrubs on each lot.
Don't increase
Don't increase the coverage. Heritage landscapes are as important as heritage buildings. So by increasing the coverage you disturb the historical urban pattern of the neighbourhood. Look up UNESCO.
For a property zoned R-C1 or R-C2, the permitted lot coverage can be increased from 45% to 50%. For a property zoned R-CG, the permitted lot coverage should remain the same at 60%.
Hypothetically, I'm thinking about my house. There is no back lane, because years ago the city allowed a duplex to be built behind it. In addition, a tall, 12 story + office tower is planned for a block away that is going to completely block any sun my back yard gets. I should be allowed to develop the entire lot, no? 80% increase?
I am very concerned with what developers will do with additional lot coverage and a change to RC2 or RCG. Without concrete information (which has yet to be provided by the city) I remain opposed to any change.
I do not support increasing lot coverage.

I don't know if there's a mathematical formula that can be applied - all of my old trees are very close to the property line. Any adjacent development regardless of lot coverage would likely kill them. Coverage needs to be reviewed in context of height, side setbacks are small and something greater than single story impacts daylight.
I don't know.
I don't think the development should be more than 10%, unless there is a very robust reason given for doing so. Heritage properties are some of the most established properties in terms of trees, shrubs, and landscaping and should only be lost in extreme circumstances.
I said "maybe" because I don't know.
I think it depends on the overall lot size and be scaled appropriately to that. For example, smaller lot sizes will look too crowded even with a larger (60-65%) coverage, while larger lots can accommodate this.
I would like to see C1 and C2 with up to 60% lot coverage, many heritage properties have boulevards which are not part of the lot but add to effective green space
I'd go higher for all three categories.
Increase allowed lot coverage by more. These percentages are pathetically small.
It also depends on the size of the lot. 65% of an infill lot size 25' leaves very little.
keep as is
Keep as is
Keep lot coverage as it is
Leave as is - we don't need increased density in an already very busy neighborhood
Leave lot coverage as per current bylaw
Lot coverage should remain as is
Max 50. Trees are just as important to a heritage area as the building itself.
Must protect the old trees
No increase the current allowable lot coverages. Maintain existing landscaping.
No more than 45% lot coverage should be permitted.
no need to change this, seems inconsistent with a character home as some of the character is landscaping
Not so much the coverage but people/companies being held to the limit. Too many new dwellings appear to exceed the current limits.
Not sure
Not sure, examples/graphics needed here.
Our neighborhood has large lot and the current 45% is appropriate.
Perhaps closer to a 5% increase rather than 10% for R-C1/R-C2
Question 1 is not really what I wanted to answer but I had to enter something. I want to see ZERO % more lot coverage
RC-1 or RC-2 max of 50%
R-CG max of 60%
R-C1 or R-C2 should not be more than 50% and R-CG should stay at 60%
RC1 or RC2 should remain as is. Increasing the lot coverage eliminates at least 20% more of historical landscape hampering the conservational aspects of designation in the first place.
Rc1 Rc2 70%
Rc2 should be closer to 65%
Remain at the present size. 45%
Significantly less. For C-1 and C-2, decrease to 40%. For CG, decrease to 55%. Trees are critical.

Sixty per cent. Lot coverage needs to be compatible with dwelling sizes in the outer areas of the City.
Stay at the same lot coverage.
The appropriate lot coverage should not be increased. That will result in the loss of green space that makes these neighbourhoods so desirable.
The same existing square footage so that existing (in many cases original) landscaping is maintained
This doesn't increase density by any means. It just means bigger houses for rich folks. Keep it the way it is, and focus on apartment complexes and bigger developments. Infills are not a way to densify, they only gentrify.
to us, not about the %lot coverage but about the effort that is made to retain trees and greenery in any development site. currently, development is allowed to happen by flattening lots and surrounding area and this should not be allowed. developers should be forced to go around existing greenery despite this causing increased effort/work/\$\$\$
Uncertain.
Unsure; the more lot coverage the better. It is difficult to opine on appropriate size as I personally have not explored opportunities for additions and what the lot coverage implications are.
Up to 65% for RC1 and 2 to allow people with small lots to retain a family home.
Up to 75%
We need retaining existing tree canopy to be included. It's not the lot coverage but greenery. Under current bylaws you can rip out all the old growth trees and replace with water sucking lawn as long as you don't go over 45% lot coverage. It makes no sense and we need to take climate change SERIOUSLY.
Why not make all lots move up to a max 65%
You have not explained the rationale for the increased lot coverage. How do heritage home lots differ from non-heritage home lots? It appears that, because of participant comments in Phase 1 you are suggesting these changes. Leave the current percentages at 45% and 60%.

Does this proposed increase provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space?

Importantly, some character homes had very small kitchens rendering the main floor undesirable by today's standards. It is important to provide an incentive that makes it reasonable to keep the home and add to the rear, often the kitchen, instead of the easier demolition solution.
May need to build up. Small character houses being dwarfed by 3 story multi family dwellings.
Explain why the additional space is needed for heritage home lots.
I don't believe that height necessarily matters, if it's further back it could be taller but not within sight lines. Views and sight lines are more important.
retain the single family development character of the neighbourhood for all lots or allow all lots to redevelop without interference from city hall based on character or heritage home designation- the historical character homes belong to the owners not the public
Size matters less than design
Tear them down and build new affordable housing on the lot.
This is sort of a strange way to incentivize heritage preservation. Not sure it really does much in the grand scheme of things - if the approvals process is a barrier generally, remove it for everyone, or leave it as is.
Tired of the exemptions and where does it end. Every increase means someone wants more and this will continue. Take a stance and keep it.
Yes, however houses are limited where they can expand, mostly they can only develop into the backyard. Lot usage is severely limited but setback requirements that create front yards that are never used. Houses should be able to encroach on front setback requirements more easily.

Judging from the wording of the question? The city has already made up their minds to go ahead. All too familiar.
No. There should be exemptions for increased height ... such as secondary units on top of garages
No. This option potentially increases impacts. Would prefer to see additions over the existing historic footprint. The historical character of two or three stories can be maintained by adding architectural details that are period appropriate.
Seems like addition of very small room.
Too much development harms character
Why encourage more development space? It seems inconsistent with preserving the historical significance, scale, aesthetics and community fit of Heritage and character homes.
Why would you ask the public a technical question? Talk to your Engage team.
Yes but I would like them to still get a DP.
You reference you heard from communities, which communities did you consult.? I will ask our community board if you reach out to them.
Again, arbitrary and restrictive. What's the issue with a two storey addition to a single storey home. As long it meets the overall parcel coverage allowance why bother limiting the size of additional floor area. Seems complicated and unnecessary
Don't make special circumstances for heritage homes. The same rules as non-heritage homes should apply.
I disagree with character homes entirely. Let people build on their property
In the end will depend on what the addition's purpose(s) is(are) - so difficult to say at this point
It depends on the project. The city must be more flexible on the individual needs on the development and property size.
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis. The exemption is not generous enough.
No. I think it is critical on heritage home developments to give Community Associations a chance to comment on what is being proposed on bigger developments. DPs are the only way to keep them in the loop.
not always
see above response please.
see below
Some Character homes are sited and do adhere to current bylaw. Do they need to meet current bylaw? Can they expand to meet side setbacks?
The neighbourhood has restrictions
This does seem more appropriate however it still seems very restrictive for some development space.
I think it should be increased.
No comment
Rules are there for reason; these days, everything is exempt. The neighborhoods are already crowded. I do not with this
Seems like a large increase.
this allows for an INappropriate amount of additional development space. exempt additions should be smaller than the existing character home
?
Absolutely yes. Such constructions have Diminished tge green space & trees from this area & almost all areas where construction zones were allowed

Addition(s) should not be larger than current building, if it is it will diminish the heritage home focus and character.
Again, visual aids would be appreciated, but we don't have plans to build an addition so we don't have an opinion.
Any additions allowed must be in keeping with the original architectural style of the heritage property.
As long as old trees are protected
Could use more - I make over 100K and I still can't afford a house, how are people supposed to afford a 700-800K mortgage without two suites?
Depends on the site. One size fits all likely won't work in these old neighborhoods.
Do not increase the exemption. Again, it's the height that is going to ruin character communities like my own
Don't know
Fine, but it's critically important that the criterion about being below the existing building's eaveline stays in place. As soon as a rear addition is taller than the existing building, you've completely changed the building's form, character and legibility as a pre-war house.
Has to allow for trees. Our urban canopy needs help; trees are good for mitigating climate change (heat), not to mention mental health and a home for birds and insects.
I am opposed to this proposal for the reasons noted above
I believe so
I believe so
I do not have enough information to answer.
I do not support this increase. 60 sqm is 25 - 50% of many typical existing character home footprints and, therefore, represents a substantial addition. Permits should be continued to be required over 40 sqm
I guess, it's hard to say without a good example case study
I think it should remain at 40sqm. If we are aiming to maintain the characteristics of these older homes and their neighborhoods, its beneficial to have oversight on the developments planned for these lots.
I think so.
I think so. This allows for a larger rear entrance / vestibule / waiting area / display area
I think this makes sense. Incent owners to keep the front exterior of the structure a heritage sight and let them do more with inside and rear of structure.
I wouldn't think so. I would suggest that you provide a better unit at the rear of some of these homes.
idk
I'm not sure
I'm not sure. It may still be tight. R-c1 lots moved up closer to 60% would be preferred.
in most cases where the existing lot size is 6,000 sq.ft. this is not a concern, At lots of 3,000 sq.ft. it may exceed the lot coverage and reduce the landscape space.
It depends on the home to which addition being added ... 60 sqm is quite sizable
It depends on the original home size and lot size. Small bungalows on large lots can have larger extensions so long as they don't change the nature of the dwelling...from the street.
It does. I appreciate that is it in the rear of the building.
It does. I've seen some horrible additions in the neighbourhood, if the additions won't need dev permits there should be some oversight that ensures the addition will fit in with the existing house rather than looking like a cut and paste from something inappropriate and out of character.
It is overly generous. No additional space should be granted.
It provides for too much: the increase should not be beyond the 40sqm

It seems appropriate. In my case, with a smaller lot, I don't think I even have that much space behind my house for an addition — ours would likely need to be to the side, which sounds like we'd need to go through the permit process even if it's under 60 sq m.
Its better but its still not enough
Keep it at 40sqm.
Larger would be more useful
Mature trees should be included in the assessment
Maybe
Maybe. Again as with my previous answer, there will be reduced landscaping which will reduce the look and feel of the heritage area too.
My recommendation would be from 40 sqm to 50 sqm.
No
No
No
No
No - see above
no increase
no increase in lot coverage should be allowed as it will have a negative impact on neighboring properties.
No, as above.
No, because we need the original lot size maintained. If the majority can still be kept this would be fine.
No, it is required for the mother-in-law-suites that are allowed for densification.
No, there should be no exemptions.
no.
No.
No.
Not in favour of this proposal.
not sure
Not sure
Not sure
Not sure.
Not with small, single story bungalows like ours. A secondary suite over a modest garage would not be exempt. I believe there should be a minimum height in the exemption.
Over 40 sqm of developed space should have a development permit so planning can approve that the proposed site development is in keeping with the character of the existing home and fit in with the surrounding neighbours.
Past a point big additions on the property where a character home is located will diminish the character and neighbourhood value of the home itself... A 50% increase seems reasonably generous on the face of it. I don't think 60 should go any higher.
possibly, seems insufficient though
Possibly. Is it a sufficiently large increase?
Probably
Probably
Probably not, no, especially if you're wanting to incentivize heritage homes. The planning department is an actual nightmare to deal with, regularly losing submissions, following bylaws and policies when they are convenient, etc.



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

Probably.
Provides plenty if not too much.
Seems reasonable
Sure - again, I'd go higher.
Sure, but could be more.
There should be no increase. For these character homes, every addition should be reviewed by the city and the neighborhood association.
too much or require a permit
Too much!
Uncertain at this time.
Uncertain.
unfortunately rear additions often result in mangled roof profiles so I would no allow the increase
Unsure at this time.
Way to much
Why not push this to 100sqm, as long as it fits with the height and width dimensions of the heritage building.
yes
yes
yes
yes
Yes
YES
Yes
Yes
Yes
yes
Yes
yes
Yes
Yes
yes
yes
Yes
Yes
yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
yes
Yes
yes
yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

Yes, for not requiring a development permit this is a good exemption. But, some heritage homes cannot be expanded to the rear (due to weird lots or weird placements on the lot) so I hope this doesn't take away from a development permit application option for oddly shaped/placed homes.
Yes, I am in favor of reducing red tape. However the lot coverages should not be increased as much as has been proposed. Any addition must be within allowable lot coverages.
Yes, so long as strict guidelines are put in place for these new buildings to follow heritage typologies, again not these horrendous modern boxes that do not fit in the neighbourhood and ruin the areas where heritage homes exist
Yes, that will work fine for us.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes.
Yes. Keeping this to the rear of the lot helps preserve the nature of the home.
yes. need to maintain low profile on additions so as not to interfere with streetscape view or back alley neighbours being overwhelmed.
Yes. Construction can be done to better utilize the space with out taking up more land space. Build up not out
Yes. Maybe e en greater would be better.
Yez

Do the requirements for the exempt addition (no taller or wider than the retained character home) appropriately mitigate concerns? If not, why?

If addition on top of existing garage the height and floor area should be maximized to allow the development of an attractive and practical space - 900 to 1200 ft sq
Might reduce the value once Rc-1 is rezoned, what benefit does height and width requirements propose.
No restriction to stay within the percentage of lot coverage
still increases lot coverage
The reasons are exactly the same as those that support the 40 sqm addition on non-heritage homes. No special cases!
This would not be an incentive to maintain or modernize our character home.
when the lots were purchased people knew the rules- if they are changed for one lot they should be changed for all lots- and by a vote of the residents of the neighbourhood who are the only parties to the caveats not the planning department
prefer incentives in other means - densification/additional uses may be okay, but bypassing oversight might not be the best idea when we are looking to improve the public realm.
They should not be heritage buildings in the first place

It does not speak to the character of the house/lot.
These increases ALWAYS get out of hand in my opinion.
New builds in my neighbourhood don't seem to adhere to development permits and there seems to be no consequence when they don't.
The city should not be encouraging the retention of character homes, especially to the detriment of their neighbors and community.
There are many examples of such additions in UK and Irish conservation residential areas that are extremely sympathetic, especially toward the rear of properties
This seems far too lax.
Height and width are necessary restrictions
Oversite by City Planning is crucial to the development of heritage home sites. Your proposal appears to allow an increase of exempted area by 50% of the existing area allowed. Leave the exemption at 40 square meters and retain control over larger buildings. Again, what is the likely overall effect of this increase on an entire community?
Why encourage more development space? It seems inconsistent with preserving the historical significance, scale, aesthetics and community fit of Heritage and character homes.
Affordable housing with minimum 3 stories like has been mandated in other communities.
Heritage homes create affordable housing. Not everyone needs an ensuite to live a comfortable life. The objective should be how to preserve and restore these homes while updating them to a more modern flow. Only modest additions should be allowed after a strict historical review. Purchase of these homes should not be for demo or business
Just boxes , occupying maximum amount of allotted or allowed space is usually used up . No beautification area or no TREES ARE REPLACED . KINDLY REPLACE A TREE that is cut on property by a FRUIT TREE & not just small minor thinner versions of trees
larger development would be beneficial, so long it does not impede on the community.
Minor increases in height could be a valuable incentive and have minimal impact on others
The critical point is to retain the character of the buildings and the % amount of landscaped area.
They do from a front of street perspective — as someone who rented the main level of a house in this neighbourhood area that had an incredibly sketchy back addition, I'm curious as to what levels of inspection are still present if the permit is exempt.
This feels a lot like what a property developer would want and not what would be best for neighborhood residents or protects the character of the property. Maintaining the character of a neighborhood requires restrictions and oversight; a conflict of interest for property owners/developers whose primary incentive is profit.
two structures of the same size on one lot is the last thing a character home or neighborhood needs. What the heck is going on here. This is as bad as the developers.
We already have large houses being built in old neighborhoods impacting their character and affecting light etc in existing houses
see above response please. developers should be forced to retain greenery despite increase in effort and \$\$ required. this is not about the size/height but about consideration of a beautiful neighbourhood
The City supports densification at any cost.
Will depend on the composition of the landscape and potential visual and light (sun/shade) impact to neighbors
Yes, without increase. No taller or wider means the addition doesn't stick out past the to draw attention from the current character home.

concerns over significantly increased density without development permits and impact on congestion and parking.
DP needed to ensure proposed built form is appropriate for the site.
If homes surrounding the heritage home are taller, addition should be allowed to be taller if appropriate
In many cases, the residents of the area chose their homes for the express reason that they would have lower density. Also, parking becomes a big issue.
Need an exemption to the exemption that protects old trees. You don't get the extra development space if you have to take down an old tree to use it
We need to maintain the original look as much as possible.
Lane way homes are a blight in the community.
The neighbourhood has restrictions
ok but certainly no taller or wider should be acceptable
Honestly, sometimes heritage homes are narrow or very short. Perhaps someone wants to encase the heritage home in a greenhouse or something really creative. This requirement fails to allow for any creativity whatsoever.
precludes / prevents tasteful creativity in design
Our character house is very tall. We could build a three story building on our property. Need to limit height
See above
Sure - let people build what they want.
Terminate this initiative
Tricky to answer. I could envision a taller & wider addition being done well whether it blends in or is a juxtaposition in design. Keeping the addition to no taller or wider is safe to ensure there is not a complete mess created but a good designer could make anything work and be quite acceptable in my opinion.
Often heritage homes are quite small, and sometimes they have more width to prop. line. I have seen larger developments behind a character home look good (eg, 936 5 St NE). often neighbors have already redev'd it's not like a larger laneway. Walking in front, often u can't see the original home
60 sqm is too large of an exemption. 50 sqm is better.
A modern 2 storey laneway building would easily be taller than my 1.5 storey century home. I don't think I should be limited to a shorter laneway building while my neighbour with a big box duplex can have the same dimensions for a laneway.
For same reasons above, it's too sterile. Often development in back is only about alleyway views. Because a back development is further away from visual perspective it could be taller than the front facade of a historic / heritage home but not be visible at all. Accurate Renderings and perspectives are important to assess instead.
I feel the addition is too much.
If you are going to do this only design review would be acceptable. These blunt regulations never work in practice.
it helps
Not sure
Not sure. Main thing is to leave front-exterior intact, but extra width and size is okay I think.
You still have the same problems I have previously mentioned.
As above.
city planners overrule community input and favor developers
I'm not sure it is clear.
Leave property as is

A similar sized building could still dwarf the character home. It shouldn't be allowed to be equivalent but slightly smaller
As long the design features of the character home is maintained.
It's far too conservative. Let people build
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis. Limiting development even further will cause less redevelopment to take place.
A backyard addition takes up valuable yard space. If I were to require more square footage in my old home, I would prefer to go up so I can maintain a decent sized backyard
A laneway home wider than the Heritage home might be beneficial
A second story should be allowed as long as the street-facing part of the second story retains the original character. Most of the older buildings are bungalows and going vertical is better for retention of greenery and landscaping.
Additional width at the rear of the property may be acceptable
aesthetic value will be diminished with intensive development
An disrupt view / sun of neighbours
Any additions need to retain the style of the original property.
Any homes developed near the character home should have the same or similar design aesthetic. The issue with cities in North America there is no planning, look at the new 'strip mall' on 17th ave 4th st sw, the single level mall was built on our main thorough fair and has the design aesthetic of dispensary in Reno.
Architectural rules should be enforced to ensure the addition preserves the character of the asset
Certain character homes are quite tiny and would benefit from the space afforded by height or width.
Could still be an eyesore.
Many years ago I produced a planning guide to do's and don'ts for a British town planning department. In places with aesthetics top of the agenda, historic buildings are modified very carefully.
Depends on intent of the development.
Design of increased development should be in keeping with style of home. Concerned that privacy to neighbouring properties might be impacted (for example, poorly located windows).
Given how development tends to be done, the letter of this will be followed but the spirit won't be unless there is some oversight
Goes to total lot coverage. Possibly this is excessive.
Height may be an issue with garage additions.
Height restriction is limiting, should allow additional storey. considering there may be small bungalow character homes that benefit from the square footage of an extra floor. There is a successful example on 8th street inglewood
Houses should be allowed to expand taller to add a second storey or half storey - as long as designs are determined to confirm with the original style of the house.
I don't think the exemption is necessarily broad enough. For example, where the character home is a bungalow, and a secondary suite was added above a garage as a laneway house this would not be permitted, but the laneway house could still be a nice addition to the property.
I would like to build a double garage on a 25ft lot
Those extra feet can mean the difference of a functional 2 car garage or not. Allowing something wider would be important. No taller is a reasonable limitation to maintain the character of the streets.
I think the requirements need to include no overlooking of neighbours.
I'd have no issue with the building at the rear of a property being the width of a lot as long it was the same height.

In some cases, a slightly wider addition than the existing home may be appropriate. If the addition doesn't project into a side yard setback it should be allowed. Keep the height limitation to the existing home though
It a two story house...yes it's fine. But small bungalows have had a taller extension on the back of the house that has well maintained the character of the original home and replicate that character in the addition.
It depends on the placement of the new dwelling on the property as to whether it fits with the character home and existing landscape. The look of the new dwelling would need appropriate approvals on the heritage piece - not just development and building permits.
it depends on what the addition is used for. if it is for the family living there, no problem. If it is for another reason, it could be extremely problematic.
It is easy to build a 60sqm eyesore. There is one on 7th St. NE just south of 1st Ave. Horrible laneway piece of junk that should not have been built and which runs counter to the planning aims of almost anybody - even a greedy developer.
It should not be the same height has it affects the neighbours (for example if they have solar panels or pool)
Light and space, trees and community are all essential to our neighborhood. Each of your proposals undermine the very essence of our unique neighborhood.
May need to build up to add square footage
No, some of the character homes are single story with none or minimal basements not capable of having a rental suite. If you don't allow a secondary suite (above detached garage for example) there would be no incentive since it wouldn't be allowed to be 2-stories. This would then incentivize the tear down and re-build of old homes.
over-crowded lots in residential areas, whether their use is commercial or residential, diminish the curb-appeal of the area. exempt additions should be smaller than the character home, to ensure that green space is maintained, natural light isn't blocked, and artificial light isn't introduced
Perhaps in combination with lot coverage restrictions.
Please above. It will result in loss of green space and change in the neighborhood.
Removes a loved and lived In historic feel to the neighborhood
Same as comment above, we are all really close together and an accessory building permitted to be the same height as the main house with an increased footprint has a greater impact of sunlight/shade. Maybe a shadow study demonstrating impact on adjacent lot could be required with specific metrics of how much new shade is permissible?
Taller - height needs to be restricted especially where it would interfere with neighbours sunlighting the addition may overhang a neighbours back yard or result in a mangled roof line.
The additions should not be limited by the existing home
The design must align with the character home.
These proposed additions can still be invasive to neighboring properties.
This is a massive addition and should not be allowed without permitting.
Too big. Retain 40 sqm, please
Ugly is still unglued, no matter what the size.
Waste of land. Greater impacts on neighbours' privacy and green space.
We do not need more additions to homes.
we don't need increased density in an already very busy neighborhood

Yes and no, again it's a matter of having the addition fit in stylistically with the existing home. The home across the street, for example, had an addition done some years ago that is not even close to the same as the rest of the house in colour, siding material, window style, roof, etc, and just looks bad.
Yes, but need to take into consideration many forms of buildings, for example a 60sqm addition on a bungalow on a 25ft wide lot would be quite deep, leaving little backyard space
You start to change the nature of the neighborhood when every available area of the property is covered. The loss of green space detracts from the heritage nature of the neighborhood.

Are there other procedural incentives that should be included?

City of Calgary should put in a minimum time to approve, and default to approve if the city does not formally approve it in that time
No separate council hearing or review on change of land use related to secondary suites.
Retrofitting of energy saving measures that are visually unobtrusive such as solar panels or ground loops should be expedited or encouraged - in many cases, this is one of the only ways to save on energy costs unless siding is removed and house reinsulated from the outside
The lots on each side of a heritage home cannot be RCG or HGO or MCG.
Length of ownership based on funding - i.e. avoiding 'flipping'
Like you did with Suites? That was a joke. We need to discuss grandfathering and what that looks like. We need realistic understanding of what is allowed and what isn't. Everyone needs to be on the same page. Discretion needs to be given to these homes, and suites. What kills a reno is the code requirements.
Parking requirements for a suite is ridiculous when you are allowing 8 units with only 4 spots elsewhere. Make it easier to include a suite in a character home not harder. They are often on small lots. Why is it ok not to have parking or outdoor space in an apt building but you insist on those in a home suite. Help the process don't hinder it
If anything, there should be stricter guidelines which encourage people to keep existing character homes, and renovate the existing, rather than tear down and redevelop on the land
If the character elements are clearly defined for additions, the changes to these more intensive uses would not be required.
If you have a character home I am not sure ease of application is applicable without some form of auditing that new dwellings "fit" the original historic application and design.
Incentivize retaining any renters that already inhabit the property.
It would be helpful if the City prioritized upgrades to services. I.e: the original copper pipe to our house is so narrow, it freezes every year. We need to update our water access tap, but would cost us to have the City come and make this change. Without updated water and sewer, I wouldn't consider additions or changes to increase property density.
I would suggest putting retail and multi residential dwellings against the highway. The highway impacts home value, but doesn't impact residential value as much. Keep homes rc-1 or purchase the detached garages to build attached garages for homes rezoned
Preservation will take effort. People should have to demonstrate how changes will align with period of home
Should be an additional fees and substantiation to have homes identified as heritage.
every owner on a street should be notified when an application has been made not just the closest neighbours

I believe there needs to be an approval process in place for proposed exempt additions, just to make sure that homeowners are abiding by the rules of having the addition at the rear of the home and no wider or taller than the existing character home. There will always be those who will try to cheat!
Only if character homes are formally designated.
The only permit that should be require is a building permit. If I can't remove my home in the first place, there is only so much I can do on the rest of my lot. Again, if the purpose of this is to make it easier and offer incentives to keep some of these old homes, then make it so.
The proposed incentives are not broad enough. They only apply to owners planning to preserve a character home. They do nothing for owners that have ALREADY done much of the heavy lifting of preservation. Once an initial renovation is done, the work of preserving a character home continues FOREVER. Why no property tax reduction for preserved homes?
There are a lot of barriers to building anything in Calgary. I don't know if this will have much effect as repairing heritage homes is very expensive and often less costly to knock them down. The size of heritage homes also doesn't match modern homes and the little changes suggested make little difference.
Why should they be able to avoid densification?
properties must be developed by community residents only and inhabited by owners
Retention of current tenants and artists in areas to maintain culture in downtown Calgary (a struggle for Vancouver and Toronto at the moment)
Anything that enables homeowners who have access to personal finance lending, rather than developers who have access to commercial balance sheet / cash flow based lending, to develop their own property is preferable.
If you own/buy a character home you should follow the same rules and oversight as other homeowners
No! City of Calgary does nothing to incentivize me as a tax payer when I want to do a renovation so why should I pay for some one else to do one? I do not want my tax payer dollars spent this way.
Nowhere else to put this comment: the Incentives Area Map excludes many character homes. There should be an opportunity for participation for land/property owners outside of the defined areas.
We would all want the same waiver. They'll get the money back in the increase in property value. They should pay for any city costs. .
Why should they be exempt? Fair is fair all property owners should have to pay
This depends of course on how much of the property is being developed in the spirit of heritage conservation. Fees s/b collected if this turns out not to be so.
All permits and particularly change of use permits must be reviewed by the community through a rigorous transparent process.
Development permits should be stricter in historical communities
Yes as long as the amendment to allow businesses in character homes does not pass. I am not at all in favor of heritage homes used for commercial purposes other than artist studios.
Requiring fewer permits or a reduced application fee would not be an incentive to maintain or modernize our character home.
Homeowners should be encouraged to garden and landscape there lots for food and for aesthetics. Heritage homes utilizing unzoned slivers of unusable /unused city property should be granted title of that land and encouraged to grow there.
I lived in a certified heritage building (Hecla Lofts) downtown Edmonton; having additional barriers removed was critical in maintaining and repairing the building.
I pay enough taxes for others - I would only support for homes with suites.

If a character home is adding square footage, it would be nice if the new floor space did not have to conform to the NECB. Typically the old house only has 2x4 walls with batt insulation. To have to build the new addition with 2x6 walls to the new energy code is silly since the existing house does not comply.
No, but will provide the feedback that I was pleasantly surprised to not need a DP to add a compliant front deck to my house last year. Our community association creates all sorts of problems for applications that follow all of the rules and was prepared for a fight, so thank you for making that a non-issue.
Waive fees to upgrade the homes themselves but not for additions.
Accessibility requirements for businesses difficult to meet in an older home.
Assistance for basement suite egress.
Development of the Heritage Property must not change the street view and must include protection of all public owned trees on the boulevard in front of and adjacent to the development property.
Encouraged green spaces and Community gardens
Let heritage home owners do whatever they please with their assets. There is a housing shortage and by preserving these "character homes" it perpetuates the crisis. Waiving a fee would encourage heritage home owners to preserve their property when really it does not deserve preservation in the face of a housing crisis.
This survey is not clear
Where do I get to disagree with the whole idea? This questionnaire is biased. Hello Engage?
Consulting on adding value or making it easier for people to access heritage consultants / resources to properly preserve character in homes
I would suggest that additions to legal non conforming properties be simplified. I added a rear second floor bathroom to such a house and I needed a full development permit even though it only added a rear dormer. no change to footprint. It took months and was ridiculous.
Change of use permits should require a fee.
Support and backing to defend and protect un necessary tear downs and gentrification
The effort should be made by the city to maintain the old neighbourhoods of Calgary as they are. We have very few old neighbourhoods in this city. Instead of cherishing them, waiving development permit and making it easier to expand would affect the quality of life in these neighbourhoods. Vancouver, Toronto, Boston, protect these homes.
Consider expanding the eligibility date. My home was built in 1952 and is a textbook example of mid-century modern and we are working very hard to keep it that way, at no small expense. She is a treasure, on a corner lot in a neighbourhood of tear-downs and is representative of an important time in architectural history.
cannot think of any
Counter point: heritage homes are expensive to maintain. If the individual/business cannot afford the permit, there is likely risk the property will not be sufficiently maintained to sustain it long term.
If the goal is to retain heritage homes then why not give incentive to homeowners to retain these homes by helping with renovation/modernizing costs where the character of the home is maintained but the changes supports more comfortable living. Examples -new windows, increased insulation, property tax breaks,
Fewer permits should be necessary, but no need to lower fees.
Lower fees, less unnecessary red tape is usually a good thing
No. Just because the fees are waived doesn't mean the permits should be easier to obtain.
Waiving inspection fees
Yes waiving fees would be great since I spend \$11000 rezoning our character home for health care use.. everyone else just rips them down and builds new.

Are there any financial grants to maintain Character homes?
As in many other municipalities, once a home is declared a Heritage Home, Character Home or Home of Interest, it is protected for all time from destruction or major changes not in keeping with the designation.
But these will probably be too minimal to change behavior - it would be better to provide direct tax relief and/or financial incentives to protect these homes.
Character homes are often in high property tax zones forcing people to sell to developers or tear down and build. A discount on property tax would be an incentive to keep your heritage home.
Cost incentives to upgrade energy efficiencies; ie. Upgrade heating systems, replace windows etc. anything that will make the homes more energy efficient and sustainable
Efficiency rebates/grants - insulation, windows, plumbing, electricity etc, the city is in a " climate emergency"
Fast track applications
Fast tracking with any development committee with the city.
Faster process for applications, less waiting also results in less money
Fast-track of applications?
Grants should be made available to assist home owners
I wonder if there could be incentives to fixing up character homes in ways that are essential to maintaining the structure itself, so that future buyers don't just tear it down. I don't have an answer, but if there were some sort of incentives that could be beneficial...
I would be more interested in incentives to improve the energy efficiency of heritage properties, since I do not have space for a B&B or other options for professional use of my home
I'm not super familiar with all the costs or permits that are part of additional development so can't think of anything else. Anything that makes the process easier, cheaper and provides incentive to maintain character homes and heritage sites would be great!
improvements to the property, upgrading energy saving projects (heating, insulation ect) should be encouraged with grants to property owner
Incentives for keeping and protecting mature trees, incentives for bringing house up to date which prevents heritage houses from falling to disrepair (pipes, asbestos, roof, etc)
It would be wise for the City of Calgary to design a fast track information, help and approval process for character home applications making this an easier solution than demolition. Such a process would send a strong message that the City of Calgary and its residents highly value our heritage and greatly appreciate heritage custodians.
Maybe incentives to bring back features (may include materials) that have been eliminated (generally covered) over the years
Not procedural necessarily, but property tax incentives for people who are choosing to renovate or add to character properties rather than tear down.
One time Tax reduction/deduction for properties where reinstatement/restoration occurs
Only incentives should not be direct cash contributions but tax incentives. If the person can not maintain the home then a seperate arrangement should be explored on a case by case basis. Fiscal responsibility should always been the main priority.
property tax incentive. small break each year? if someone make update/maintain their character homes but property value goes up - it might further encourage people to just sell the parcel.
Property tax incentives for work to the exterior.
Reduced property tax
Reduced property taxes. These homes can be expensive to maintain.
Reduced taxes for character homes. They require more upkeep so this could offset that.

Reductions in property tax should be given to those owning character homes.
Renovating a character home in a way that maintains its character is very expensive. Other financial incentives should be considered.
Shouldn't there be a requirement that once a home is deemed heritage, it can't be bulldozed by a future buyer?
I lived in Belfast for a time, and Heritage Homes were decided on by an outside body. It meant homeowners couldn't change the facade.
Be nice if we had something like that in place in Calgary.
There should be grant program that character home owners can apply to in order to get upgrades and fixes to the property that will help maintain the character property. This is done in BC.
Trying to provide an incentive for the preservation of Character Homes is laudable. Our city must not neglect the historic nature of many of its homes and making it more attractive to preserve these buildings rather than tear down should be encouraged and fostered.
Yes, homeowners should be incentivized to plant native plants or pollinator friendly gardens when redeveloping part of their home.
Monetary help with maintaining and upgrading home
No
no
No.
No.
not sure
again - if this is a change of use application, this fee waiver is problematic as it will result in even less scrutiny around changes from strict residential use
All fees for building upkeep (i.e foundation repairs) should be waived I'm an effort to preserve these homes
If development is within character home's footprint. If it is an addition, then there should be inspection fees to make sure the addition falls within guidelines.
Offering quicker approval for DP/BP applications with less to no application fees for character home development could make them a more a attractive option.
Reducing permits seems like a bad idea. Removing fees as a barrier seems like a good idea
Rezoning how-to support? Fee waived if there is such a thing?
A certified library of contractors and designers who can advise on heritage home repairs and renovations.
A planning department needs to guide the process to prevent unsightly carbunkles
Access to historical resources and professionals that can aid in maintaining historical reference.
Additional support from city staff to guide homeowners through the process
an inspection before and after the changes are made. Home owner needs to make informed decision about how the changes will impact the character nature of the heritage home. They should receive professional advice on how to protect the character nature of their home
Architectural incentives for having the addition match the home's style?
Flexible approval criteria, site and design specific considerations need to be flexible to make maintaining heritage sites worth while and attainable (within reason and considering site contexts)
Have you analyzed building code requirements? Sometimes these approvals can create unreasonable burdens or restrictions. While public safety is paramount, Safety Code Officers should be trained to deal with equivalences for heritage homes.

I do not support fast tracking or reducing barriers to this. It is important that these go through the permitting process and neighbours have a chance to weigh in on plans that could have substantial impact to them
I would have liked to see the City develop a similar package to the Clean Energy Improvement Plan for maintaining and repairing heritage resources. Many heritage homes have insufficient foundations that are material to repair / replace. For many, it makes more financial sense to tear down and rebuild than to repair the foundation of a heritage home
Include buildings built during 1945 - essentially the end of the 2nd World War.
Keep the development permit process, it prevents the systems from being taken advantage of
No. I do have concern about remove permits though. Oversight is good to avoid shoddy work. Helps keep contractors honest too.
Perhaps the City could provide incentives to construction, renovation and trades companies who would like to work on heritage homes in a historically sensitive manner. Having a list of these vendors would be appreciated also. Having a Heritage Counsellor available with the City could be a nice possibility, as well.
Retroactive rebate if they actually maintained the character
Shorter review times. Assistance applying for permits. Fewer application requirements
Some lump sum money to encourage heritage home owners to keep the structures and not tear them down. PS it it a mistake that Rideau is not included in the map area??
There needs to be a means to approve elements in a heritage renovation that do not comply with regulations. Small suppliers (the company that made windows for our addition) may sell items that lack appropriate stickers for meeting environmental testing even though the product conforms. Reasonable judgement needs to be applied.
There should be no incentives
This project appears to be trying to help old people financially and is completely misplaced. This is not an appropriate use of city funds.
Waive some Development Permit requirements such as street scape plans .
Yes. I really do believe inspections of new builds are important.

Online Workshop Notes – February 1, 2023

General questions:

- What about signage regulations for the commercial uses. There are good examples of historic signs.
- When an existing building has a free-standing garage is this part of what is considered as lot coverage?
- How would heritage grants work to support these new policies?
- Is there any conflict between Character home guidelines and Designated property guidelines? I.e. if all cladding is replaced with modern materials?
- How can you find out if your home qualifies as a character home?
- With the new uses listed, would the CA planning committee still be allowed to comment, or would there be no DP required?

- As long as developers continue to outbid any potential homeowner who might be interested in buying an older home (due to zoning incentives to raze and build condos), heritage homes will continue to be destroyed at an alarming rate.
- Proposal makes sense, when trying to level the playing field.
- You mentioned tax breaks for designated properties. If the city gives a property owner a tax break, rather than having to designate it is there a way to put that money on your title so that if a developer buys the home and wants to knock it down, they have to pay it back, but for someone who wants to keep it can use the money in the future towards keeping the home.
- We should have a private tree bylaw! Climate emergency?
- Any studies re quality of life in communities that have more of these smaller commercial ventures as opposed to ones that are strictly residential? eg. safety, community etc.
- Have a private home from the early 1900's that we've spent a significant amount of money to renovate. Haven't legally designated the site. Do we have access to any of the grant monies to assist with structure work that is required to maintain the home? Without financial assistance for this work may need to consider other options than keeping the home.
- Based on what I've heard here, it sounds like we need more incentives to encourage/justify designation.
- is there a formal process for heritage designation? I had a cursory comment that since we had replaced windows and cedar shakes, we weren't eligible for our 1914 home (windows and shakes were what were there originally).

Are there any other housing and home-work compatible uses that would be appropriate for this incentive? Are there any proposed uses that should be removed? If so, why?

- Can they rent out the 60% and do whatever they like in the other 40% of the home?
- How many of these types of the proposed uses already exist in homes throughout the city, not just character homes? If you're going to make it an incentive, it would be helpful to know how widely it's currently used. If it's not really used, is it worth making it an incentive?
- How will the proposed uses incentivize the retention of character homes? Is the idea that it will be more beneficial to keep the home, maybe make the space bigger so there's more uses allowed in the building?
- Think a lot of the older homes in the area are being sold because of downsizing. Developers are buying the homes and replacing them with infills. If the goal is to retain heritage homes in Calgary, I hope that there are other ways that the broader goal is achieved. Hope is that the incentives will make it more viable to keep character homes.
- How many pre-war homes do we lose to people who own the home for ~5 years that decide to then redevelop vs developers buying the home and replacing it with an infill?

Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of the proposed uses?

- Concerned that there aren't any parking considerations currently. Lots of areas have limited parking, so bringing more people to the site is a concern. Needs to be balanced.
- Parking is mainly in laneway or on-street. Some folks have started to accommodate parking on their lot. Perhaps if incentives are implemented can require them to provide parking on-site.

- Rules around hours of operation, should be compatible with a residential area. 24/7 operation isn't compatible with a residential area.
- If you require people to provide extra parking in the back it reduces landscaping and potentially results in removal of trees.

Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for Character Homes with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping?

- Lot coverage increase – CA is constantly battling for the conservation of the tree canopy because of the benefits it provides the community. Anything that increases lot coverage is a concern, but if a character home is conserved may be worth it. Because of the increase of the lot coverage and size of character homes it's likely that mature trees will remain. Can we protect heritage trees?

Does the proposed extra 20 sqm of exempt addition provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space? Do the requirements appropriately mitigate concerns?

- In hilly areas the height and width restrictions being proposed might be difficult to achieve.

Is waiving fees for applications an impactful incentive?

- How much would one save if fees were waived?
- I don't think saving a couple of thousand will make a difference on someone planning an extension.

Questions for follow-up:

- Could you let people have backyard chickens without the lottery for a permit in a heritage house?

Online Workshop Notes – February 2, 2023 Afternoon Session

Questions of clarification:

- What about signage regulations for commercial uses? Theresa are good examples of historic signs
- Could you let people have backyard chickens without the lottery for a permit in heritage house?
- When an existing building has a free-standing garage is this part of what is considered lot coverage?
- How would heritage grants work to support these new policies?
- Is there any conflict between character home guidelines and designated property guidelines? I.e., if all cladding is replaced with modern materials, how can you find out if your home qualifies as a character home?
- With the new uses listed, would the CA planning committee still be allowed to comment, or would there be no DP required?
- Passionate about maintaining their 1945 house, never registered, for clarity they are not entitled to these incentives if they are not registered? Do they have access to the monetary incentives to maintain the home? From a structural perspective do they have access to that? Not well educated but glad to have some insight from this session!

Are there any other housing and home-work compatible uses that would be appropriate for this incentive? Are there any proposed uses that should be removed? If so, why?

- I would like to see if anybody is doing something out of the home, i.e., resident of the home uses a portion of the building as an Air B&B.
- They could rent the 60% but do stuff in the other parts?
- Do you have an idea if in the city in general what kind of uses these facilities have how many are there and what the uses are? Even if they are not character homes? More for general interest, if it's going to be made an incentive, how much is it used already?
- Another question: tell me broadly/ philosophically how these incentives will provide protection for heritage homes?
- Two comments: I am concerned with no consideration of parking because in the areas guest lives in there is limited parking, so more people is a concern, needs to be balanced with motions going forward.
- With existing owners, for value in the current home – a lot of the older homes in their area are being sold due to downsizing – developers knocking down and in-filling – if the goal is to maintain heritage homes and their value – they hope it's for adapting their current homes and make it viable for staying in it.
- As long as developers continue to outbid any potential homeowner who might be interested in buying an older home (due to zoning incentives to raze and build condos), heritage homes will continue to be destroyed at an alarming rate.
- Parking in our area is lane way or street, some have adapted to parking on their lot – maybe should be forced to put parking on there lot as a possibility?
- The hours of operation as more conducive? Didn't hear any restrictions in regard to that. Are we moving into rules?
- Back to parking, if you have people encouraged to put their lot in their backyards – we are chopping down more landscaping (not good).

Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of the proposed uses?

- Talking about height cannot be higher or wider, if they propose to build something as high as three stories – the footprint is minimal, but height impacts residential areas – how are those two measures balanced? If your home was built before 1945 you can do whatever you want?
- For clarity, if someone is infringing on the property line, they can do so without meeting other restrictions?
- The fact that they are over the set back does not extend to their new dwelling they have to revert due to guidelines.
- Does your new guideline that applies to the new property have to go through a development process?
- I live in Killarney. There are condos everywhere.
- What you are proposing makes sense.
- A question mentioned tax breaks if property gets designated is there a thought that rather than designating the property can you put that money on your title so if a developer wants to knock it down that must buy back from the City, but a new home buyer gets to keep it for the property, and it

becomes a collector fee? Haven't designated their place yet due to wondering if there are any (financial) advantages.

- A follow-up asks how many heritage or pre-war homes have been lost to homeowners who rebuild from scratch vs. developers.

Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for *Character Homes* with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping?

- Tough one where to draw the line, in Crescent Heights in our planning group for the preservation of our tree canopy, anything that increases lot coverage is a concern for our trees, but if it ensures our character homes are retained then we would like to see rules or guidelines around tree preservation, i.e., the 100-year-old tree must be protected from demolition/renovation/expansion.
- How much would one save if fees were waived?
- We should have a private tree bylaw! Climate emergency?
- I don't think saving a couple of thousand will make a difference on someone planning an extension

Does the proposed extra 20 sqm of exempt addition provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space? Do the requirements appropriately mitigate concerns?

- What was the plan on parking?
- Are there any studies on quality of life in communities that have more of these smaller commercial ventures as opposed to ones that are strictly residential? e.g., safety, community etc.

Is waiving fees for applications an impactful incentive?

- Based on what I've heard here, it sounds like we need more incentives to encourage/justify designation.
- Is there a formal process for heritage designation? I had a cursory comment that since we had replaced windows and cedar shakes, we weren't eligible for our 1914 home (windows and shakes were what were there originally).
- If you're on collector road, the business requirements can be restrictive for the utilized areas, for smaller buildings in between, how do those compare?

Online Workshop Notes – February 2, 2023 Evening Session

Questions of clarification:

- When you are exploring new options, we should get people to preserve 'one zoning', the planning department should consider this for preserving heritage/character homes.
- Participants live in a (brick) heritage home, maintained everything they could of original architecture/structure, their lot is not covered in the heritage incentive zone – question: how were the heritage incentive areas determined, is there an understanding that they excluded a few properties that deserve attention?
 - Bothered by that because the house is one of six named homes in the city and they do not fall into a heritage area (missed by a block, across the street from Bankview). Due to this,

they feel since they don't qualify for incentives, they are better off selling to developers who will bulldoze property and put in a brand-new asset. Not R1 but pretty close.

- Has The City thought of a buffer zone? Many historic areas use this tool for areas just outside the core historic area.
- Am I to understand that if I wanted to turn this (heritage home) into a doctor's office that could be done to the property? Let the record would show I would not want this! That would be the end of Mount Royal! I don't want this because it is a commercial business and I want to live in a community strictly with residents.
- A participant had renovated several heritage homes in the community and made them 'lovely' assets, they are in favor of the general thrust of the program but not a fan of the potential commercialization.
- There are current programs that exists where a homeowner can have their house designated as a historical asset, but they can't change anything without going through a committee, this is going to be the same thing right?
 - Can get a \$75,000 grant for the house but it is still very restrictive, concern is how do these two programs link together.
- I have been unable to find a link to the application to apply for the funding that you just referred to. I wish to do work to improve insulation on my 1912 house which is very cold. Would you be able to provide a link to apply for a grant?
- Heritage resources, I know they were doing some stuff in Ramsey, maybe one building in Ramsey is a heritage home, is there any discussion to make these grants available to old homes to keep the original architecture? Is there any ability to use this for preservation for houses that don't qualify for heritage status?
- If we are going to designate heritage homes as specific communities, can we control what will be developed? Making sure that it fits into the community?
 - Example: Scarboro every house in a box, ugly because we need to control what is built.
- You need to talk to builders that are doing the work on heritage homes.
- I am very keen to see more effort on heritage in the city so you are moving in the right direction.
- I think the incentives don't do enough for homeowners. They do more for developers and landlords.
- Just wondering for health care service, can you give us some examples of what could be included in that?
 - Interested in the full scope, seem to remember something about halfway which is care service, in same use category as daycares and home care.

Are there any other housing and home-work compatible uses that would be appropriate for this incentive? Are there any proposed uses that should be removed? If so, why?

- There is concern over retail activity in predominantly residential communities and whether retail belongs in residential communities – how did we arrive that it was acceptable to have retail activities in residential communities.
- Historically, Ramsay has been 'mixed use', and was something that was encouraged to be maintained when we worked through our ARP. These uses would not bother me in my neighbourhood.
- Limiting to 8 visits a day and 2 non-resident workers would be acceptable.

- What may add value to one home or business may take away from another home.
- Would parking requirements be waived for secondary suites and additional uses as there would be no space on small character home lots to provide the bylaw required parking for most of these uses?
- I also value mixed use in the community. I would suggest music studios for lessons for families in the community.
- With the parking, it should also be noted about the small size laneways we have in terms of back access.
- I would like to talk about the Bed and breakfast versus Air B&B, would be fine for old style where owner is resident of neighbourhood, but there have been a lot of issues with Air B&B's, here should be a distinction, not a fan of Air B&B.
- I think the term is "hosted guest", and whether its advertised is irrelevant, what is relevant that the owner is present and maintains the property.

Are there any additional rules that are critical to the addition of the proposed uses?

- Goals are lofty, not so sure that allowing a building that was designed by importance that was intended for family dwelling, that if you introduce retail, it will not be a favour to the heritage project – it's not the same thing.
- It's a place for people to live, not for people to run a business, make the incentives go deeper
- What favour are you doing for the heritage building when you have three dentists working out of a heritage home? They don't make very good clinics and offices, what favour are you doing when you gut the inside? Changes the 'spirit' of the home.
- What would preserve heritage in Ramsey vs. Mount Royal? Maybe there needs to be two distinctions, might help to specialize neighbourhoods. Are we trying to be too broad – what works for one wont work for others.

Do the proposed increases to lot coverage balance the need for additional development space for *Character Homes* with opportunity for the retention of existing landscaping?

- FYI: 20 sqm = 215 sq ft
- 60 sqm addition wondering how that would work if you did a review?
- Is that the 60 as a footprint or total square footage of the addition, is it including all the levels?
- I think that's fantastic on lot coverage, with the parking changes and in place the properties and the green space become a significant part of the conversation, so thinking it through, we want to put parking on our property. There are two separate conversations that are happening especially since they may lose their free street parking. As the city is bringing in these costs, I want a driveway but defeats purpose of maintaining street scape/green space.
- I would like to talk about the impact of legal nonperforming which is common in old areas.
- As a homeowner, not even looking at the additional incentives, it depends on the homeowner, and we are looking at significantly reducing the green space
- This also saves trees...that is a huge impact when saving homes.
- Based on what I've seen, lot coverage is a significant issue that comes up, especially because this wasn't an issue back in the day, and the lots are quite distinct, clearing this up for people would be a benefit.



Heritage Incentives Area

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase 2 What we Heard

April 2023

Does the proposed extra 20 sqm of exempt addition provide for an appropriate amount of additional development space? Do the requirements appropriately mitigate concerns?

- Is it our understanding the program is to help save heritage homes from being demolished and give an incentive to keep the building?
- Completely agree Ramsey should have separate rules, waiving the PD's is one thing, but is the city going to make us black out the windows or put more parameters on our home? (When it comes to renovations)
- It becomes daunting to homeowners when you hit the building code phase, when you find there is not enough leeway when trying to meet codes and do renovations, it can stop people.
- Part of the problem is the city wants us to meet code but no leeway in the understanding that it wasn't built to code.

Is waiving fees for applications an impactful incentive?

- In last session we were encouraged to leave properties as is for tax incentives, where is that going?