



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

## Project overview

Since November 2021, we have been working with area stakeholders to create Heritage Guidelines for areas in the North Hill Communities (NHC) that have concentrated groupings of heritage assets, sometimes known as character homes. Heritage assets are privately owned structures, typically constructed prior to 1945, that significantly retain their original form, scale, massing, window/door pattern and architectural details or materials.

The Heritage Guidelines will contribute to the historic character of these specific areas by ensuring that new development respects existing heritage assets. The Heritage Guidelines will be included in the North Hill Communities Local Area Plan (LAP), a long-range planning policy document that guides growth and change within these communities.

These will be the first areas in Calgary to benefit from Heritage Guidelines. The Heritage Guidelines created as part of this work will inform subsequent Heritage Guideline Areas for other local area plans.

## Engagement overview

To complement the ongoing work of the stakeholder working group, we launched [a public Engage Portal page](#) for the project. The purpose of this page was to provide NHC stakeholders and other members of the public with a summary of the proposed Heritage Guidelines, gather their feedback what they felt was positive about the proposed Heritage Guidelines, and what issues or concerns remained. The page provided specific descriptions of the key guideline building elements, including:

- Front façades;
- Windows, materials and details;
- Roofs and massing; and
- Site and landscape design.

Online feedback was open from April 4 through 22, 2022.

## What we asked

We asked the following questions on the project Engage Portal page:

- What do you see as the benefits of these Guidelines?
- What issues or concerns do you have with these Guidelines?
- Are there communities where you feel these Guidelines should be modified, and if so, how?



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

## What we heard

We received 134 responses from 128 participants on our Engage Portal page between April 4 and 22, 2022. In general, participants were supportive of the proposed Heritage Guidelines, and felt that they would help to support the heritage feel and character of the areas in which they will be applied. Critical comments centered around the ability of The City to enforce the Heritage Guidelines and a concern that they may prove to be an impediment to development and redevelopment in the NHC.

- 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 as well as the project working group will be used to further refine the proposed Heritage Guidelines. The revised Heritage Guidelines will be shared in a closed session of the Calgary Planning Commission in July of 2022. Following additional work and edits, the final Heritage Guidelines will be shared with the public in September of 2022, The City's Infrastructure and Planning Committee in October of 2022, and will be taken to Council for their consideration in December of 2022.

## Summary of Input

The following tables provide an overview of the top themes from responses to the three questions included in this phase of public engagement.

What do you see as the benefits of these Guidelines?

Theme	Description
Maintains heritage feel	Participants felt the Heritage Guidelines will help maintain the heritage feel of the NHC, both for communities broadly and individual streets. Participants also felt that the Heritage Guidelines will allow for new development, but will also possibly lead to fewer existing character homes being demolished.
Discourage inconsistent development	Some respondents felt that the Heritage Guidelines will limit the number of tall, boxy, flat-roofed infills and other development forms that are inconsistent with the existing character feel of the NHC.
Allows for new development	Some participants were encouraged by the fact that the Heritage Guidelines will allow for new development in the NHC.
Unconditional support or disapproval	Some respondents provided unconditional support for the guidelines while others don't want the guidelines implemented in any form.

What issues or concerns do you have with these Guidelines?

Theme	Description
Impediment to development	Some participants felt the Heritage Guidelines will negatively impact development in the NHC in ways such as increasing development application review times, creating too homogenous a feel in the NHC, resulting in developments that are out of touch with other modern homes, and will make renovations to or selling of heritage homes more difficult for existing owners. Some participants indicated homeowners should have full ability to do what they wish with their property. Some participants felt the Heritage Guidelines may add costs to new homes in a way that will negatively impact housing affordability.
Issues with specific requirements	Some issues with specific guidelines included not going far enough to limit the height of three storey buildings, guidelines being too restrictive for height and massing, not wanting limits on modern building materials and windows, and not wanting restrictions on requirements for landscaping.
Enforcement	Some respondents felt that the Heritage Guidelines will be difficult to enforce, especially since there is a feeling that other similar guidelines within existing area redevelopment plans are not enforced.



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

Theme	Description
Multi-residential development	Some participants were concerned that the Heritage Guidelines will still allow for new multi-unit builds, including row housing, and don't do enough to protect existing heritage assets.

Are there communities where you feel these Guidelines should be modified, and if so, how?

Theme	Description
No modifications necessary	Many respondents felt that no community specific modifications were necessary.
More area generally	Some participants provided comments that more areas, including entire communities, of the NHC and communities outside of the NHC, should be included.
Level of enforcement	Some participants felt that the Heritage Guidelines should be optional, while others indicated they needed to be strengthened for better enforcement.



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

## 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.

What do you see as the benefits of these Guidelines?

Absolutely none.
I support the guidelines and don't have any issues.
The benefit of strong guidelines is that new development will actually make a positive contribution to the heritage feel of our inner city communities. Too often new development is either out of context (like ultra modern) or poorly built (cheap construction) without regard to the character of the neighbourhood.
I see these guidelines as a means to help preserve the heritage, history and identity of our community in Crescent Heights while helping us change to support the needs of new residents.
Preserving some of Calgary's heritage for all to enjoy is something that the city hasn't bothered to do until now. Just because people move into an area who have money doesn't mean they should be allowed to change the vibe for the rest of the neighborhood. People specifically seek out character houses and the right to live in an area without having a cruise ship house built next door. This would ensure that those who have gone out of their way to be part of that community can continue to enjoy
As stated above " The Guidelines will contribute to the historic character of these specific areas by ensuring that new development respects existing heritage assets". We need to preserve the character of our historic streets.
I'm so pleased with the mindfulness that went into creating these guidelines! It's precisely the advocate that our historical areas need and obliges developers to truly consider the aesthetic and emotional impact of their projects. Living in a historical community, I'm often faced with the worrisome incongruence of flat, boxy, cumbrous new developments. These guidelines would make all the difference in encouraging new buildings to complement rather than overpower their neighbouring structures.
The major benefit is preserving what heritage we have by blending in the new to respect what is there. Once its is gone it is gone forever.
They encourage architectural conformance to neighborhood streetscape and sense of community. However: The Heritage Guideline Areas in the Renfrew community as posted on the April 5 2022, North Hill Communities Guidelines Areas Map omits several important blocks of Heritage Asset Homes. These private Heritage Homes are built PRE 1945 and retain original style, details, materials and make up

greater than 25% of a block face. Also, several POST 1945 and new homes conform to the original Heritage.
Maintaining height restrictions is important. However - don't consider just the adjacent heritage homes -- the city should be considering the the whole neighbourhood to avoid changing the heritage character. Need to maintain better set-backs from street.
If they're actually implemented, might look nice.
They will help maintain a more uniform streetscape.
This should harmonize the feel of heritage neighborhoods while allowing owners to build new houses.
These guidelines more sensitively integrate new infills into the existing streetscape maintaining the character of the neighbourhood
I do not see any benefits to these guidelines.
I don't see a benefit to this.
Having a regard for context is useful, but must be tempered by upcoming National Building Code changes that do not reflect heritage assets (windows, wall thicknesses, etc). Could be useful in flagging areas that development of affordable housing units likely isn't viable, likely high end market units as an outcome needed to support the requirements and cover land costs.
This portal does not provide enough space for meaningful input. To give direction to both the development authority and builders/developers that helps retain the massing, scale, patterns and rhythms of heritage rich streetscapes.
I really don't see a benefit to the street scape, which is likely what you are after.
Like that flat roofs look like they might be appropriate for this area anymore. They are unsightly most times and an excuse to build as tall as an apartment. Would use way more heating and electricity for the tall style.Does not fit in these areas at all.I like the front yard setbacks. It has way more curb appeal, not one on top of another.
Promoting significant architectural details is worth it. These guidelines don't highlight what features should be preserved or replicated.
Support modern reuse or replication of architectural when significant. Height is not an architectural feature. Restricting height does not align with inner city growth Vs. suburban. Need height to achieve larger floor areas and continued growth in inner city neighbourhoods. Also need to balance with sustainable architectural materials so there is no conflict between the guidelines and and sometimes less green "natural" building materials. Small is not architecturally significant.
Keep history and culture
Front facades with porches do make a difference, and add to community interaction. I've seen evidence of that. Pitched roofs are also good, but see below. The emphasis vertically oriented windows with casings and frames contributes to character.
These will provide a more uniform appearance to houses that results in a more welcoming and attractive feel - out of scale / oversized homes will be prevented. Uniform front setbacks promote walkability and sense of neighbourhood. The old, smaller homes in the neighbourhood will continue to fit in / look in place. Including a mandatory front projection also addresses sense of neighbourhood and walkability.
We need to retain homes that were the root of Calgary's heritage and diversity rather than a bunch of boxes that have zero character.
I absolutely see the benefits of these guidelines and I am so excited to see that our city is working to preserve the heritage nature of these communities. I moved into Capitol Hill 2.5 years ago and absolutely love the character of the community. I am happy to see that our city counsel values this character, as well, and are seeking to preserve the heritage of our great city.



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

Some architectural elements may prove beneficial - image wise only. Maintaining heritage City owned sidewalks from pre1945, preserving City Trees are more beneficial to adding character to a neighborhood.
Consideration to upper story massing and street setbacks will greatly contribute to preservation and equality of light access and help preserve some continuity in street and neighborhood feel.
I own a heritage home in the area. We have future plans of a renovation or rebuild, but, I am in favor of these guidelines. It's a shame they weren't in place earlier as the infills coming in are swarming the neighborhood. Calgary is not known for any care towards preserving heritage and watching home after home get hauled to the dump and replaced with very little thought other than profit, you feel crushed about what's happening to the neighborhood. Its time to hold developers accountable.
They will help preserve the "character" of an established community. It is hard to articulate, but there is a satisfied feeling I get when I am on a street where the new/renovated/original houses have these consistent elements. In contrast, I feel an uncomfortable feeling - akin almost to anxiety - when there is a mix of these elements. Living in an established community, I would welcome not only the visceral and aesthetic benefits but would anticipate a positive effect on my property value.
Love the idea
Keeps the original character of the homes and area.
Increases home values for existing residents.
Gives the community a sense of place.
None
Preservation of the historic charm that older neighborhood's had
Preservation of character, appearance and history of neighbourhoods, making them desirable places to live.
There is a certain charm to character houses and in areas which have been a part of Calgary for a long time and have a long, storied history in the city, I think it's important to see that maintained rather than being swallowed up by cookie cutter modern architecture.
I am so pleased to see these proposed guidelines! I find it very irritating when new buildings are allowed to overtake the character and scale of other buildings in a neighbourhood. It is really insulting to the existing residents, and everyone loses out when the "feel" of a neighbourhood disappears. I think preserving the vertical rhythm of a block is particularly important, so that heritage buildings are not overshadowed by new ones.
Strive to maintain the character of the street. We built in 2004 in Renfrew and modified our design to fit in with the street scape. Since then, ridiculous homes have been built with zero acknowledgment of our heritage neighbourhood.
They will help to ensure a better integration of new buildings into a street of heritage homes. Reduce the massive appearance of some newer homes.
This would be beneficial to retain the character of the neighbourhood.
New homes will "fit in" better to the look of heritage homes.
None
care and consideration for established dwellings will ensure that they remain desirable. Could allow for better preservation of heritage buildings and spaces in the area by not allowing a new building to dominate a space. Overshadowing a smaller, older building. Also puts in the public's mind that there is value to preserving heritage.



Set backs from road (makes for nice walking in the neighbourhood and maintaining green space), maintenance of character of neighbourhood, does allow for density increases but in keeping with neighbourhood charm
Nice guidelines to keep consistency with design styles pre-1945. It is possible to modernize these existing homes to update the unseen mechanicals (plumbing, heating, electrical), make them energy efficient as well as either reconfigure existing space or add space to accommodate changing lifestyles: work from home. I'd encourage the City to make these existing homes energy efficient (heat, water, electrical consumption). Guidelines would reduce existing houses going to landfill, good objective
Will retain the character of the neighbourhood but still allow new development. Keeps development from neighbourhood busting.
Not much considering the NHLAP now allows RCG boxes throughout Mount Pleasant. It is hypocritical to add some of these guidelines to protect the character of our community because RCG with its nearly 100% coverage within the setback destroys the very feel community members want to maintain.
I don't see the benefit or need for this type of initiative.
Ensuring that heritage assets are not overwhelmed or diminished by new developments; celebrating the distinct character of these streets or areas and celebrating the social benefits they bring to a neighbourhood, such as how front porches and gardens encourage interaction between neighbours.
They are a thoughtful application of the design thinking and principles that inform the plan. I appreciate the consistent approach to setbacks.
Love that we will see new developments be required to suit the neighbourhood. I live on a cute street but worry when senior residents leave their heritage homes it will just be ploughed down and a square box will replace it. Gives me hope!
Retaining heritage buildings and not dwarfing them by new, incongruent builds.
Preserving heritage homes not just larger structures. Maintains character of neighborhoods and heritage in Calgary a city that has not done a great job of this to date.
None.
None, this is a massive overreach by Council and should be abandoned in its entirety.
Over harmony to the remaining heritage areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain a heritage streetscape</li> <li>- Provide clear direction to homeowners and developers</li> <li>- Provide home buyers with sufficient information to aid in purchasing decisions</li> </ul>
This seems like a bit of an over reach, too many houses will be similar—overly planned community
They maintain the character of the neighborhood; they make the heritage assets seem like they belong, like they set the tone and set the trends of these old neighborhoods. The heritage assets stand out as elder statesmen of the neighborhood. It also forces home builders to get creative with their designs and gives the new houses character that a lot of suburbs don't always have.
Unified look, preserve the historical look of the neighbourhoods.
Keeps some of the heritage feel of the neighborhood.
Dwellings in the areas would have uniformity and the area's neighbourhood density and visual aesthetics would be preserved. Also current homeowners in the area would not have their property values impacted by irregular buildings or condos close to them because there is an appeal of a neighbourhood with exclusively houses close to downtown.
These guidelines require that thoughtful consideration and respect be shown when building in heritage areas. Currently anything goes and developers keep pushing the limits on bigger, wider, taller, boxier.
Finally!! It is so depressing to see heritage homes destroyed. What is one thing people love to see when they are travelling. History. We need to do something NOW. It is sad seeing new homes go up



that do not fit in with the heritage architecture. New communities, have architectural controls, which helps the neighbourhood blend. What is being built in heritage areas does not “blend”. It is time to make these heritage communities a place where we can enjoy the history of our city.
The elimination of hideous 2 & 3 storey cubes, like the ones currently defacing Bridgeland [personally identifying information removed], that reduce the aesthetic ethos that draws people to the areas in the first place [personally identifying information removed] which is currently under restoration/ redevelopment to include a laneway suite. [personally identifying information removed] is amix of existing heritage assets and grim cubic infills that would have greatly benefited from these guidelines.
Soft change. The retention tributes to the historic architectural language.
It will help conserve some character in older communities. We live in Rosedale and in my opinion the recent developments approved by the City are appalling. Even with the Infill Guidelines, the City pays them no heed and a few developers are drastically changing the landscape of Crescent Road.
I think these are great guidelines! I work in new home construction. New neighbourhoods have architectural controls, and i think these older neighbourhoods need to as well. I think this is a great start, but I also think new homes/developments should be built to have the same design to fit in with the area. I don't think it's a good idea to have super modern design on a street with mostly heritage homes.
As someone who lives in a 'heritage' home (built in 1914) I would like to see the charm of our older neighborhood maintained. Unfortunately I have seen the systematic demolishing of older homes that are replaced by infills that in no way look like they belong. There have been some new builds that have tried to maintain the charm, but they are few and far between. It would be nice to see that our inner city communities are given some respect.
I think these will be useful to support shared understandings and consistent interpretations about what current residents and developers mean when they talk about the character of a community.
Helps preserve the character of older communities by keeping the look of some of the older buildings.
Stop rich developers from gentrifying neighborhoods like bridgeland and putting their god awful post modernist designs into lots and charging \$750,000 for their tin container. These guidelines are good and will help maintain the charm of neighborhoods that have existed in Calgary for over 100 years.
Maintains some association with the architectural history and beauty of the neighborhood. Hopefully stops developers from building huge ugly monstrosities that don't fit in. Hopefully stops the addition of multi-story (3 story and up) buildings to mar the neighborhood skyline. Hopefully stops four-plex and up being built on which was once a single heritage family home lot. This only adds pressure to the neighborhood with parking and wheelie bin issues.
The feel of a neighbourhood when it's somewhat consistent with similar features is better. Incongruous build shapes stand out dramatically from their neighbours and disrupt (yea change, but more so disrupt) the feel of a block.
Preserve the look and feel of a neighborhood. I appreciate my community and love the older houses.
The guidelines do a great job of recognizing the location of character areas.
They will help prevent the historic scale of these neighbourhoods being dwarfed by over-sized new development
Keeping the same “look” for the community.
Maintains the look of the community and would encourage those to maintain it and some to locate to the area that appreciate it.
Maintain heritage homes and character of historic neighbourhoods.
Less ugly box designed houses in heritage neighborhoods.

I live in Crescent Heights and I'm tired of seeing the streetscape destroyed by modernist infills, so I think these guidelines have nothing BUT benefits. It's sad to see the beautiful, historic Craftsman style of the neighbourhood be systematically and thoughtlessly destroyed.
Protects existing heritage homes and maintains the integrity and appeal of the neighborhood. The very reason ppl want to live there.
If they can keep some of the heritage look for Crescent Heights, they will tie residents into the history of the community and of the city.
Maintains the character of many important neighbourhoods in Calgary
NO!
The guidelines strengthen the appreciation of Calgary's cultural history.
Keep the character of these houses and the community. If the city had provided incentives to restore or renovate these houses within the guidelines provided by the city this would not be an issue. Every major city has done this but Calgary. You could have maintained the historic charm and modernized them for less than building these row house monstrosities and keep real estate prices down. They could have been renovated for families with help. Instead we have been turned into a suburb.
Help make communities look better
These guidelines will create a more harmonious look for these older neighbourhoods.
The guidelines are great for a few streets, what about the rest of the neighborhood?
Finally an acknowledgment of the value of historical assets. The City under-appreciates the character these homes and areas bring.
Incorporates landscaping, although it doesn't go far enough. These historic communities are home to our mature urban forest. Guideline should convey context of the green infrastructure
There should be more language around the responsibility of living/developing in these areas
I especially like the height issue- I currently see heritage houses dwarfed by new builds. As an owner of a heritage home (albeit heavily renovated before owning) I appreciate these guidelines. I am not at all opposed to multi units when they are built in the character of the area (some are much better than giant mcmansions)
Good.
Yes
Having a shared aesthetic could make the the neighborhoods more appealing.
Keeping some interesting aspects of the community!
Keeps the look of the neighbourhood somewhat consistent, both with house facades and especially setbacks and some green landscaping in the front and back. It contributes to character continuity, and in our area of Crescent Heights new houses have been successfully integrated, yet are modern. This is important also for greenery in Calgary, and especially for water absorption as opposed to concrete where the water runs off into the sewer system and can overwhelm it.
Houses fitting in to the neighborhood. New houses not encroaching on privacy and sunlight for existing houses.
Preserving the historic nature of communities and houses.
I live in the North Hill area and all around us old homes are being torn down to make way for these boxy monstrosities. I think this will help preserve the character of the neighbourhood but still too many houses are being torn down.
It will keep the charm and history of the area. It will ensure a sense of community.
Keeping some originality to an area
Yes

They respect the people, families and their stories that have made Calgary the city it is today. Architecturally, these houses tell a story. The guidelines will maintain a community feeling that cannot be rebuilt if destroyed.
Clear guidance for home owners and developers in the designated areas is provided. If the intention of the Guidelines is followed, development which destroys or substantially degrades the character of an area should be minimized. The Guidelines are not overly restrictive thus, hopefully, making them more likely to be followed.
some direction to builders and architects when they set out to make drawings
These guidelines gave me hope about Calgary's esth��tique, caract��ristique and historique speciality and future!
I think that the rules about front projections and roof pitches are good ways to help keep the community's distinctive look. It's always cool to see houses that are 'variations on a theme,' where you can see architecture change over time while still paying homage to the past.
Retention of the beauty of these neighbourhoods; stop further destruction of the lovely appearance of streets. Improved happiness of existing residents. May slow-down the destruction of beautiful heritage homes. People may more strongly consider renovating rather than bulldozing.
That Calgary has some heritage buildings left. But this has come after the fact of developers knocking down heritage homes in favour of multi units. A little late!
Coherent neighbourhoods, increased property values due to cohesive streets and architecture, protect the value of heritage assets by not having them overshadowed by behemoths, encourages heritage assets to be kept, helps keep rampant and abusive developers at bay.
To encourage character development
Warmest thanks to all the folks that have pulled this together on our behalf! We feel so blessed to live in a century home, on an inner city street that (hasn't yet) lost all its character and history; Grateful these guidelines will help foster respect, maintain and highlight character through harmonious architectural features, deter further development of modern buildings that are unimaginative, 'disconnected,' right-angled, office-like, nonnatural, aesthetically unappealing and soul-crushing.
Prevent further tragedies from occurring such as the one on the corner of [personally identifying information removed]
Historic home and streets should be preserved as much as possible. I have seen too many infills and boxy homes pop up and the streets lose their charm.
Some of these guidelines hopefully can, to a certain degree, preserve the nature of the original communities which I feel is important. Many of these communities have already started to look like a hodgepodge of humungous nondescript boxes with little space for sun and vegetation and consequently little habitat left for birds and other non-human life-forms. The character of the communities have already been changed.
Prevent new developments from upsetting street landscape and ensuring aesthetic neighborhood cohesion.
The guidelines will help to eliminate oversized homes that don't fit into the neighborhood
As a 30+ year resident of Rosedale I see no real benefits here.
These guidelines provide substance that developers can use to design new buildings. These are excellent is giving direction on how to comply with a heritage character housing district.
Preserve the historical nature of the neighbourhoods, prevent the destruction of single family homes in favour of higher density dwellings in the same footprint
Retain the heritage that Calgary has! Calgary is a "young" city and needs to retain as much history as possible. By implementing these Guidelines, it becomes the homeowners' responsibility to maintain these

heritage assets and builders' responsibility to create something beautiful that fits with the community. Imagine the heritage tours that could happen after these guidelines are in place for 50 years. This is a necessary step to preserve these homes.

I guess if it keeps people from blocking any and all development, these will be helpful.

Preserves pockets of cultural and architectural history within a growing metropolis. Allows existing heritage assets to appear well-placed and preserves their historical context. Creates and maintains visually appealing streets to enjoy on foot or small wheels. Increase enjoyment of the community.

What issues or concerns do you have with these Guidelines?

When one buys a lot in the neighbourhood with the intention of building a new house, that individual should be able to design and build what he or she wants on the lot. The guidelines are going to make the process of building the individual's dream home much more restrictive, and thus expensive. The guidelines are written with words such as "should" but these will be interpreted by community associations or other active individuals as "must", impeding the development of new homes.

I live on 3rd st NW and the city has omitted at least seven houses from the north end of the street near 16th from the requirements. The majority of which are heritage assets and none are overtly modern style. I'd like to see it from 13th Ave to just south of alley of 16th Ave

There are too many instances that say "encouraged" when it should say "must". These guidelines will just be ignored if everything is optional. Front facade projection should be at least 50% to better align with existing heritage design. Window image doesn't represent heritage design or show "vertical oriented windows" like the guideline states. 4:12 is not a heritage roof pitch. The minimum should be 8:12, with 12:12 encouraged. Material should be stucco or wood siding.

Rather than encouraged - to read should/must. #2 Front facades are greater than 1/3 on heritage homes #3 Illustrate better: new build (2-3 storeys) vs existing homes #5 Side lites should be vertical in illustration #7 Natural materials: define better ie. use of wood & colours choices etc #8 Define heavier materials #15 Define larger building - how large? #17 Setbacks should be defined by existing heritage housing #18 Should require tree planting minimums as once enforced for new developments.

I am worried that developers will not be held to keep up the guidelines instead opt to build big anyways and just pay the fines associated

One hopes that we can trust the City to enforce these guidelines and not have too many 'exceptions'. We have rules for the size of developments in residential areas yet time and time again see way too many huge residences being built that surely push the allowed guidelines.

Since these guidelines are yet to be implemented, I wonder if there's a way we might encourage developers or renovators to still take them into consideration? Might we educate them on the value of preserving and honouring the historical character of an area in the meantime? - perhaps also to protect areas not recognized in the guidelines, or areas that could lose their status if development plans move ahead too soon. I also feel that natural-looking materials are imperative to the goal.

I believe there should be more emphasis placed on landscaping. Currently in my experience when a new development comes in, they wipe out all the landscaping aka our urban forest and do not replace or if they do add anything it is a single tree which usually a columnar popular which does nothing to support the animal habitat nor contribute to a tree canopy. Also the public realm landscaping needs to be monitored as there is not any rehab of these areas done after construction.

Consideration was not made to include these Heritage Home Asset blocks as Heritage Guideline Areas in Renfrew. I recommend the blocks of Renfrew Heritage homes addresses to consider include:

[personally identifying information removed]

There should be an onus on developers to be familiar with the Guidelines, to incorporate the Guidelines into their plans, and to provide the Development Authority with a clear description of how they have responded to the Guidelines. Therefore, there should be two new questions on the development permit application: 1) Is your proposed development within a Heritage Guidelines Area? 2) If yes, describe the elements of your proposed development that specifically respond to the Guidelines.

Given character limitations, comments are in bullet form: We shouldn't be discouraging single-detached (current character of neighbourhood); multi-units increase stock but fail in affordability and create garbage bin lanes; 3-storey contemporary styles discouraged (creates a wall/barrier streetscape and impedes large boulevard trees); set-backs from street are dwindling (2nd St NE developments) and need to be restricted; lot coverage needs to be restricted to maintain neighbourhood character.

Once the developer run planning department gets feedback, there'll be exemptions to everything so their buddies don't have to follow any guidelines.

Heritage' celebrates a particular culture, which itself did not respect what was here before. The guidelines may discourage the densification that we need to address climate change. We need to focus on things such as walkability, access to transit, resilience to severe weather events, and the energy transition with access to solar rather than a celebration of colonialism. What are culturally-appropriate built forms for the current face of Calgary? Multi-generational families, co-housing, etc.

Still a bit frustrating that heritage homes that are not dilapidated are allowed to be demolished. While these guidelines maintain the feel of the neighborhood, it is the true heritage homes that give the authenticity.

Faux heritage can be bad or ugly - can you show examples of modern homes that still fit these guidelines - i.e. it is possible to build a modern style home that has a sloped roof

1-that new builds should match the old homes facade. This limits diversity, and architecture. All these new guidelines limit homeowners in these neighborhoods to have an older home with new renovations. This decreases the value of our houses, and decreases prospect buyers. The new guidelines that all new builds have to match the front yard setbacks. A lot of these older homes are set very far back from the street, and not everyone really wants a front yard, and prefers more backyard.

It is imposing specific design ideas for new homes that limit the look for heritage communities. Most of the new home designs are so modern that they take away from the heritage look. Design modifications should be the decision of the home owners, not the city's. There should also be a total stop to side-by-side homes, unless that is what the home owner wants to build. Single family homes can be designed the same as the old homes, just newer and not so tall, putting extra shade on the street.

Semi-protection of heritage without proper designation under Historic Resources Act is a slippery slope, leading to higher costs & uncertainty. Appears city is looking to do heritage protection for all the perceived benefits, but none of the actual costs of designation. Meeting guidelines will absolutely add costs to redevelopment unit, increasing costs of housing for all via another constraint on infill supply. Suburban growth already far easier, this is another obstacle to "growing up"

My main issue with these guidelines is that they don't cover enough areas of the city. What determines which neighbourhood or area they apply to? On my street, beautiful post-war bungalows are being torn down and replaced by large, concrete, prison block mansions. I'm incredibly concerned that the character and heritage of these homes is going to disappear. [personally identifying information removed]



Everything is "encouraged". Could the introduction to the guidelines not state that new development must adhere to multiple elements of the guidelines to be approved? What is the point if they can be ignored? All images show 1 and 2 story building forms, but neglect to show how to insert 3 story buildings which seem to be the most common infill. Massing is really not addressed. Materials and window treatment need more thought.
Heritage is restrictive, borne out of small wartime housing. The characteristics of that era have passed and on my block none exist in the original form. Emulation of this will make the existing homes look out of touch. The existing bylaw for height should be retained. Window size should not be restricted. Exterior materials have greatly improved building technology and should be embraced, not restricted by guidelines stuck in the past-look to the future!
Will be then stopping at two dwelling instead of some of the more multi that seem to be shoved down our throats? That would be much more desirable for Renfrew. The heritage style is why I bought here in the first place.
Small depression architecture is not worthy of preservation in Crescent Heights. Loss of development potential without compensation. Guidelines should not limit redevelopment potential. Height limits are unreasonable.
Southside of 12Av NW has more than 50% of dwellings in block modified. Only [personally identifying information removed] have somewhat unmodified exteriors. Please revisit the vinal siding heritage dwellings. Object to lowering the value of existing dwellings by not allowing heights to current 3rd storey rules. Small is not an architectural feature that should be promoted. Three stories can be sensitive until these lower quality depression area dwellings redevelop.
Density and cost
Building height should be restricted to 2 stories only, not just discouraged. Too many new builds are creeping up to 3 stories, creating a significant shading and tunneling effect regardless of peaked roofs. Would like to see more emphasis on landscaping at front and back of developed lots. When a lane loses mature trees to accommodate a garage, it impacts overall tree canopy, shading, drainage, walkability, bird habitat. Back yards should also be soft permeable landscaping if possible.
[Personally identifying information removed] is my concern. It is not financially feasible to maintain this house as a Heritage site as described. It would need extensive interior repairs, basically the structure needs levelling and rebuilding. I would have to sell soon. Declaring it a Heritage site would make this difficult. Could this site not be declared a Heritage site? Sincerely, [Personally identifying information removed]
The mandatory front projection needs to include additional architectural styles - something that provides cover over top of the main entry, but is not necessarily as big as a porch or verandah. How do these guidelines fit with/apply to high density housing such as the townhomes that are being built on corner lots? Too many specifics in the Guidelines are 'encouraged' instead of 'should'. Given that landscaping is included in the guidelines, how does it become part of the approval process?
I would like to see the guidelines expanded to include more streets within these heritage communities. We have plenty of subdivisions in Calgary where more modern home designs could be used. I would love to see these heritage designs preserved in these older communities for future generations to enjoy and be reminded of the character of the homes that were original to these communities.
Reduction in redevelopment height should not be reduced from current bylaw. Preserving low height and small should not be an influencer on heritage guidelines.

Preserving small windows from historic homes should not be encourage, allowing natural into the home is critical. Heritage materials are high maintenance and not in line with current building technology and though create a warm image are not practical in todays environment.
The requirement that multiunit dwellings be visually differentiated via use of different material or color selections feels out of place with how multi unit dwellings have historically been built and older multi residential units often visually benefit and better integrate with other homes through use of symmetry and cohesive visual expression. The attempts to manage front fascia designs feels to land in an awkward middle ground that may result in odd design forms in practice.
Concern is the process for permits - I worry that the city will turn this into a challenge. Worried that developers wont comply and will get away with it (we see plan after plan to keep the trees on the lot for ex. once approved they all go in the wood chipper). I hope modern materials like metal roofing/siding will be allowed as it lasts longer and can still fit a historic feel. Accountability for road repair on mainline work - streets and sidewalks are a mess. Hope rebates could be available
Developers may find these guidelines increase the cost of building. Some will feel their "freedoms" are infringed. For fairness, there may need to be differences in application regarding current property owners as opposed to owners who purchase a property under the new guidelines.
Will increase the cost of building (and therefore buying) a home due to the requirements.
Potential to slow down the development review process (decreasing supply in a tight real estate market).
Assumes higher community value for existing or historical architectural styles and limits innovation or more modern home designs.
New built now a days are more modernized with theirs design, so why are we stuck in the past and putting restrictions to have old looking houses. I'm also not sure if this is really a heritage issue. Just because this is an older neighborhood and not all owners can afford to renovate or to expand their footprint, new built should not be punished for it.
Too little too late for certain neighborhood's that have lost almost all charm.
That they will be met with uninformed opposition, or even informed opposition from developers, who have more to gain from replacement than renovation.
Eliminating modern architecture which would show the evolution of design. If roof shapes and frontages are sensitive to the adjacent heritage assets, glass and larger Windows (for example) could be allowed.
I think that as long as people are free to make their own choices regarding things like colours and choice of materials, I see no issues, so long as it doesn't turn into a situation like you see in the USA on home buying shows where there's a home owner's association which strictly enforces things like the 4-5 paint colours you're allowed to use and other nit-picky restrictions that end up turning it into a cookie cutter suburb with no life or character.
None.
We've already built so we will be fine, but new builds may be quite restricted. Modern monstrosities don't fit.
I would like to see a greater emphasis on ensuring more soft landscaping on the entire site and protection of trees, boulevard and on the site.
The issues that I have is not with the guidelines the issues that I have is that the city allows too many duplexes and row houses. I am also concerned with the amount of mature trees that get removed to build these monstrosities. The whole lot gets filled up with the house, there's no yard, there's no trees and its just a big black box of a house sitting on a lot where there once stood a cute quaint heritage home. Developers have destroyed our community and the city allowed it.





# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

None
Let people build what they want as long as it does not mess with the neighbours rights and make sure their is enough parking
Need to also address key viewlines to historical buildings and historical sense of place way finding. For example views to church spires and clock towers. For example the view down 1a street perfectly frames the Balmoral School clock tower. This view should be protected and is supported by MDP urban design policy. It is the local Calgary Tower and should be treated the same.
I could see the public pushing back because they have fewer options for new builds in the sense that they have to follow the guidelines, but that's not a bad thing. We need to show that heritage is valuable and worth preserving. Change is uncomfortable, especially for those who aren't used to being mindful of others, but we can't delay any further.
None.
There are existing homes built in the 1950's & 1960's that have flat roofs, and these homes should be considered as part of your "current state" analysis. I agree that there have been new homes built that have flat roofs and these newer homes are so large that they don't fit the "look" of a neighbourhood. A balance between what was a 50-60's design and the new monster super structures is required. It's unfortunate that these super structures have already taken over some communities.
They won't be upheld, there is always an exception to a guideline!
They are missing the point. Who cares about roof pitches? But I care that the NHLAP has removed R2 and made everything at least RCG (I am aware it didn't change zoning but the rezoning is just a rubber stamp now - all RCG easily approved). If the guidelines would talk about all doors of all units needing to face the street or Avenue , maintaining max 45% coverage, keeping trees, then we would keep the character of our community. No double row townhouses and 4-plexes in mid blocks! Please!
The highlighted areas are arbitrary. Creating more, unnecessary red tape.
Only a small regret that they are being created after so many wonderful old historic assets have already been lost to unsympathetic infills.
I am fundamentally opposed to the city being so prescriptive as to what someone can do with their property. I also believe such prescription has the effect of museum-ification, disney-fication of communities that are forced to one design standard. Could you imagine how dull and homogenous Calgary would look if such standards existed 70 years ago! We live in vibrant communities, in houses that reflect our personality - not in perfect postcards or showpieces for our neighbours.
Just want to understand that if current homes want to repaint or reface their home with a different material will we be required to reference the guidelines? And are the guidelines to be referenced or is a permit required to make the changes?
None, i think this is a great idea
Hope there will be limitations on height being in a heritage home this is a concern is loosing privacy to a three story town home. No issues
These are tools for busybodies to prevent infill housing and increased density housing.
This is ridiculous. The scope of the communities included in the guidelines, and the significant restrictions on development/redevelopment for homeowners are way too onerous. The benefits do not outweigh the significant impact on current homeowners in the area. It will also drastically reduce property values and attractiveness of the communities, leading to lower desirability of the areas. It will stifle the vibrancy of the areas and cause them to basically be relegated to cheap rentals forever.

What if we want to build an alley house with a flat roof?
While I appreciate the desire to maintain the heritage community names, the map is confusing as is. I would suggest using the current community name with the heritage community name in brackets afterwards. This would be the same as street names are shown on street signs (ie 17 Ave SW formerly known as ...)
All streets/houses would now look too similar. Fake facades poorly done, not maintained.
I don't have any concerns. People who want to copy and paste homes probably do.
A unified look is not necessarily a good thing. I live in a 1912 home, down the street is a super modern house that was built very recently. I love that my street has such a variety of houses.
Also concerned that this could lead to a lack of affordable housing because builders can't use their standard templates and have to customize for our neighbourhoods. I'm sure a lot of people would say that's a plus, but I can't get onboard with that kind of gatekeeping in our neighbourhoods.
We already have similar guidelines in our communities ARP. City planners do not make developers follow the ARP and we end up with modern flat roofed houses. Why bother having guidelines if they aren't enforced.
This may cause development to not proceed but these projects can be built in other areas. This may cause a long delay in developments being built because of the administrative review and approval required.
Proper training of file managers is paramount otherwise the guidelines will mean nothing. It is important to be rather more stringent in the application of these. I say this because the tree planting bylaw for new builds is pretty much ignored by both developers and City alike.
I have no issues or concerns with the guidelines. I still think there are modern designs that fit in these areas. They are one of a kind. On 10th Avenue NE there is a good example of modern amongst heritage.
That they are not implemented quickly, and across a broader area (Inglewood, Bridgeland, Renfrew, etc.). Re-development approval appears to be on a single lot basis, strictly by adherence to rules and without concern for cumulative impact. The same could be said for relaxations: one at a time and soon enough the relaxed version becomes policy. Rapid application of the guidelines may slow down the developer driven destruction of neighborhoods - cynically done one lot at a time.
none
The name 'guidelines'. We appealed the development next to us and their lawyer stated repeatedly that because they were 'guidelines' they did not need to be adhered to (the Infill Guidelines). Every section of the Infill Guidelines was ignored by the builder, the owner and the City. Even the City file manager told me, "We don't like to tell people what to build on a lot they paid for", that house is adjacent to a Heritage House in the inventory. The lawyer poked fun at the IG at the appeal board.
none
I think that builders and developers will find the loopholes and continue to demolish homes to be replaced by ugly, boxy pieces of crap. My fear is that these guidelines are not going to change anything, since the city is very good at giving builders and developers free reign. Concerned neighbors are politely told to f off when they speak up. I wish I could say that I am hopeful that things will improve, but I am doubtful since builders seem to have so much clout.
Narrative about the purpose and intent of the guidelines would be a useful addition. Some communities in the area already have developments that don't align with these - there needs to be some acknowledgement that those developments (and others that might not perfectly meet these

guidelines) are not bad/evil and are also a reflection of a community's history and heritage as well as the evolving needs and interests of the community.
The City will not listen to citizens concerns (this is what they did with NHCLAP). Anything that automates density is a concern. Across the board guidelines reduces the individuality of communities and kills their character. It may also be too costly for a private heritage building to be maintained by the owner.
I have concerns that money talks and developers and rich people will still find a way to get around them, or that there won't be any consequences to not following guidelines.
We are not against a one of one modern design building that does not resemble the heritage design however it does add to the beauty of the neighborhood and can fit into the neighborhood vibrancy.
Commonly lots are narrow at 25ft with heritage homes built relatively close to the property line and sharing a path between them. Existing home have consistent fronts, and backs of the structures. This makes for lovely sightlines both along the street and in the backyards. Backs and fronts of properties shouldn't vary much from the existing assets as otherwise these properties loom over their neighbours as the lots are so narrow.
None.
The biggest concern is that these are being implemented as a planning overlay when it would be fairer to introduced them as caveats on title so the property owners would be made aware of how the guidelines will restrict the improvement of their property in the future.
They seem to have ignored the heritage value of classic 'fifties bungalows, now 70 years old in favour of the early 1900's homes.
They are limited to what is current and desired in new homes. The community has more younger families who want to stay current with home trends and styles.
I prefer diversity in new construction & homes to look different in inner city communities. I love to see a combination of restored character homes & new builds with differing styles. I think these guidelines impede the creative abilities of architects & developers.
Developers not having value towards heritage properties and just want to knockdown properties to put up newer buildings to make profit. Guidelines need to be enforced.
I'm not sure they address the potential compatibility of set back dormers, or boxy rear additions. For instance, maintain gable ended front for compatibility with streetscape for the first 6-10 feet, and transition to dormer sides/boxy second story addition. Issues with constraint on constraining housing, gentrification, and rising house prices.
That they only include limited areas. This should also include Capitol Hill heritage homes too. Our neighborhood is going to be just a bunch of ugly boxes soon. Thank you for allowing 8 x 3 story townhomes to be built in place of two heritage homes when there is already no parking. Will look real great beside my 1931 character home.... Not!!! :/
None, except that it can't be applied retroactively. I'd love to see every modernist infill torn down.
None.
On our block of 7 Avenue NE, they will come too late to keep a sense of continuity. Already approved are plans that are technically acceptable but aesthetically hostile to the heritage houses.
Could lead to decreased development and home values in these areas due to restrictions on building. Also does not seem to consider that many of the heritage buildings in these areas are in poor condition and despite the desire to keep historical buildings around allowing them to become further run down will not serve these communities well in the long run. Another strategy seems to be needed to allow for significant repair to historic properties.
It should not matter what type, size, style, color, windows, orientation the new construction will have. The city already has the ability to control construction within the Contextual development guidelines!



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

Sometimes developers find ways around the guidelines: they have in the past. Developers tend to have more influence on the City than residents.
My main issue is with the 1945 year designation. The majority of buildings that fit these descriptions were built between 1940 - 1950 because Mount Pleasant was developed later than some other areas. This means that these guidelines are useless because many houses will not qualify. My house fits into these guidelines and was a farm house in inner city Calgary, built in 1947 when Confederation park was a slough, so I do not qualify. The farm was originally the whole block but family sold off.
More red tape that restricts development
None, very happy with the guidelines.
I feel the whole neighborhood should have the same guidelines.
There should be a requirement to recycle all historic assets if they're torn down such as wood flooring, heat grates, etc. Reuse is a responsibility. Plus this will create an inventory for others trying to restore There should be a penalty fee charged to knock down rather than rennovate. We make it too easy to not try and work with these homes More emphasis on preserving urban forest and permeable land. Larger side yards. This is also what brings character to the historic community
none
Who will enforce the guidelines. Can you make them retroactive?
Too late for Crescent Road!!!! 😞
No
Calgary, like cities across the country, is facing a significant housing crisis. We need to be doing everything we can to incentivize new developments, construction of additional units, and increasing density. Any new guidelines that add to the cost and/or time required to expand existing units or build new ones is antithetical to increasing density in these inner city neighborhoods. We need to be doing everything we can to simplify the development process. These guidelines complicate it.
The city is headed for a New York style when we have our own style - the little boxes squished into neighborhoods are frightening and short sided
I'm concerned that people building will be able to challenge any new building guidelines as there are already houses that have been built taking up double lots in it's entirety, and have flat roofed box designs that are taller than any existing structures. I hope new guidelines will address this specifically as people at present can circumvent most building guidelines already,
None other than they might be hard to enforce.
Still allows for houses to be torn down.
That builders will find ways around? Lack of flexibilty? Affordability.
Why is 1 st NW north of 12 ave not included ? At century homes here.
None
None
While it mentions landscaping, I couldn't find anything that stressed the importance of protecting and maintaining the mature trees on the boulevards. They are aesthetically appreciated as well as important for the environment.
* Before the Guidelines document is approved by Council, can developers demolish heritage assets? * When the Guidelines are approved, what prevents a builder/home owner demolishing a heritage asset? * In Calgary there seem to be many rules/regulations/ by-laws/ guidelines that exist on paper but that are not enforced, are unenforceable, or are enforced inconsistently. How is this set of guidelines any different?

that they will never be passed or implemented before older neighbourhoods are irrevocably changed. Older neighbourhoods are being changed by the tearing down and replacing with big box houses at an alarming rate. This may be too little too late!
I still remember a scandalous proposal about the four lions of First Street Bridge, they need yearly checking, cleaning like ever art work, monument of cities. Five or six years ago there was a news on news papers, some city authorities were proposing to chance marble lions to fibre, plastic lions! I hope you can protect Calgary's buildings, lions, characteristics.
Don't include a setback requirement! I'm afraid it will prevent people from being able to build homes such as duplexes that are affordable and bring younger people and families back to our inner city.
My biggest concern regards the use of "encouraged/discouraged" versus "should" in some parts of the guidelines: points 4, 7, 11 and 20. From my experience working with a provincial regulator, providing guidance without requirement influences the behaviour of some, but not most. I would expect low compliance with statements that include encourage/discourage rather than "should." Would also like to see building height (no more than 2 stories, or 1.5 next to bungalows) and density restrictions.
I don't understand?? Already three storey homes have been built next to heritage homes. Block type homes that do not fit in with the existing neighbourhood character. Multi units instead of single family homes.
The current building code may run into some pretty substantial conflicts with these guidelines. The building code has become so ridiculous that it is pretty much impossible to build a new house at the same height as an old house. Small allowances on height may need to be made. Also some old houses have non-standard setbacks and applying modern setbacks will create unfeasibly small houses. A couple houses should be protected from teardown, but allotments must be made for unsalvageable houses.
How the 'guidelines are interpreted and by who? Setbacks should align with city setbacks not old properties built 75 or 100 years ago.
Even as these guidelines are not yet official, might the city now educate, encourage developers/renovators to be mindful of these considerations? (We're concerned that entire blocks could lose heritage status if developers continue to have free rein before this is finalized!) Secondly, do you have guidelines relating to property lines (distance between homes) for new builds? Finally, although we support an approval process for simple reno's, we hope it won't be too involved or costly.
They should be applied in other areas of the city.
Nothing has been said about preserving mature trees (which other cities do). Mature trees IMPROVE AIR QUALITY, reduce flooding, temper climates, create inviting communities, etc. These heritage communities were once green spaces until developers have been allowed to destroy everything on the lot when they build. Also, nothing has been said about the total footprint of the building. Areas are beginning to look like apartment blocks, leaving no habitat for trees, bushes, birds, bees...living things.
Existing new infills losing value as a result
The city won't follow them
The vast majority of homes within the "Heritage" guideline area of Rosedale were built in the 1930's. Art Deco and modernist architecture emerged during the Great Depression and are certainly worthy of preserving. Rosedale? Not so much..... I do not see an overall heritage theme that is consistent throughout the area, let alone one which is significant, endearing and justifies this bureaucratic exercise.
No issues. Overtime I expect there will be some refinements based on the data that experience that will be provided from using the guidelines.
That developers will rush to tear down as many historical homes before the guidelines pass, so they are not impacted





# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

I don't know what the plan is for new multi-residential units within these areas. I think having a mix of single use family dwellings and smaller apartment buildings is necessary in every neighbourhood. How would that work?
It seems onerous and imposing on what people can do with their own property for their own needs and tastes. It's kind of gross to assume you should control the aesthetic of the street.
N/A
Need to address historical view lines that contribute to sense of place. For example, key view lines to the Balmoral School clock tower. These viewlines are as important as the Calgary Tower only at a neighborhood scale. For example, viewline down 1a ST nw frames a view of the clock tower. The urban design section recognizes views as important. These need to be re enforced in local plans.

Are there communities where you feel these Guidelines should be modified, and if so, how?

All of the listed communities.
I think guidelines should be stricter (more required than optional) in areas like Crescent Heights where there is a high concentration of heritage properties. There should be a sample of existing character homes in each neighbourhood that define the character of that neighbourhood. Let's make it easy for builders/architects to know what the expectations are (beyond your sketches) for character in a given neighbourhood.
Yes, I think for Crescent Heights it should be modified to include the suggestions that I have indicated above in the second question. We should also find a way to include the need for housing for an aging population - senior people can't age in a 3 storey building. Illustrations could include new builds that are 1 storey therefore encouraging diverse housing for the future.
I feel like more areas need heritage designation and protection.
Modified in what way? Not sure what you mean. Obviously the identified streets within our oldest communities need the most attention paid to them.
I notice that the corner of [personally identifying information removed] was not included in the Crescent Heights, 2nd St. area. There is a lovely and sizeable historical home here (with a designated heritage tree just outside), so I just wonder if that might be looked into? I also wonder whether some of the guidelines could be slightly expanded into surrounding areas to avoid abruptly segmenting the historical characteristics from the new.
These should go beyond just a few selected streets with in the communities and apply to the whole community.
Beaumont & Regal Terrace need to see greater limitations to the development and removal of heritage appearance.
Does it matter? From the top down, the planning department is run by developers. They get what they want and planning runs scared of the developers. Top down, if the developers don't get what they want, they call and all of the sudden things are watered down/taken out so as to appease the ones who own the decision makers in admin and council.
The automatic 1945 year build to become a heritage home. Every home owner should have the choice to become a heritage home, not an automatic inclusion. Dictating materials that are allowed to be used and how big windows are. The setback if the new houses from the street. Dictating landscape, this limits homeowners from have gardens etc. The city should not dictate landscaping of someone elses property.

There should be no imposing of Guidebook guidelines in these communities. There are now too many generic side-by-side homes that are far too big for a small family, cost too much for the average Calgarian to afford, and they do not have a heritage feel to them. This includes all the northern heritage communities. Let the home owner's and private sellers decide what to do with their properties.
They should not be implemented anywhere within 600 m of a BRT route or LRT route, as this works against TOD principles and MDP objectives. Supporting transit & redevelopment ("grow up not out") efforts should be prioritized over subjective attempts to preserve "character". If undertaken beyond 600 m of any BRT or LRT route, then much less concern about implementation. Note: not stop, Route - stops can change on BRT/future LRT, also need to to avoid "string of pearls" effect between LRT stops
I think the guidelines need to be modified and given more thought. We don't want fake old houses, but we want heritage communities to retain some of their appearance and "feel". What in these guidelines do you believe achieves this?
Do not modify
Be careful with the colors. Lets not be East Germany please. Brick, stone, no plastic siding as it's a fire concern and should be banned. It also doesn't stand up to our hail storms. Lets have quality products that don't look shoddy in 10 years. Make sure companies are following permits and having permits.
Remove guidelines from R-C2 areas. Poor quality architecture and form that is not worthy architecturally of preservation. Height is not adequate as proposed.
Map should correctly identify (East) Crescent Heights. Too many poor architectural examples to preserve in Crescent Heights, especially where there is R-C2 designation. So sad to take progressive planning back to the gingerbread age where the goal seems to be to stop redevelopment through height restrictions. Small is not a heritage asset. Who is going to compensate for the lost development potential (3rd storey)?
No , the guidelines look good for me
The entire area south of 7 Ave NW between 1 St NW & Centre St NW should be included in the Guidelines. This includes: The 600 block of Centre A St NW The 500 block of Centre A St NW The 100 block of 6 Ave NW The 100 block of Crescent Rd NW 1 St NW from Crescent Rd to 7 Ave NW
I feel strongly that Bridgeland should be included before it loses the character that people love about it
See my comments above. Thank you for allowing Calgary residents to participate in this process.
All
No - so far makes sense. The map does look pretty random though - but I imagine that's because so many infills have been done recently it's broken up the historic integrity of many blocks. We have an obvious stance on redevelopment and driving up home prices - it's time to take a stance of preservation and beauty and our history
I would suggest that similar measures protect the 1960s - 1970s character of a community like Lake Bonavista. Architectural consistency in every neighbourhood should be a priority.
The ones listed but additionally in Winston Heights Mountainview
Anywhere closer to commercial/retail nodes or areas where there are already a portion of non-historical inspired architectural styles/modern single family or infills.
These guidelines are a good start, but the damage is already done to communities such as Inglewood, Bridgeland, Renfrew, Crescent Heights etc etc. Hopefully this could happen expeditiously and we can preserve what little is left.





# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

No, it is up to each neighbourhood to define its character.
Unsure.
No. I hope this type of project can be extended to other communities, to make sure new builds fit within the character of the neighbourhood. Even communities that were not built before 1945 could benefit from such guidelines (ex. communities of 1950s bungalows).
I think the guidelines would benefit Renfrew overall.
No
No.
We need redevelopment and the higher tax base
Need to go further to recognize overall urban design, street pattern, park frontage, and historical view lines. See note above.
No
I've suggested the one modification that would acknowledge the existing mix of flat roof houses that were built in 1950-60's and these houses exist in the communities you reference.
Crescent Heights should have the guidelines brought into place sooner - the community is fast being modified with exceptions ... we're losing the community through neglectful development
No. Would like to learn more as to why resources are being put into this initiative.
Just want to continue to be sure heritage trees will also be required to be kept and maintained.
N/a
I live in Bridgeland and am curious why this community was not included as it has a lot of heritage homes and also has lost this ornate at risk with new builds and no interest in preserving heritage riverside bungalow school
They should be scrapped. We are in a housing crisis in Canada! It's morally wrong to implement further barriers to housing in Calgary.
I feel these should be abandoned in their entirety.
No
I feel like they're adequately broad guidelines, unless there are instances with multiple lots or large areas in severe disrepair. If the residents sufficiently cared about the condition of those properties than someone would have cared for them. In that case it seems okay to do more drastic change within a neighborhood.
I would be happy to see these guidelines implemented in the entire communities of Beaumont and Regal Terrace in Renfrew
Keeping heritage look and feel and adding density is difficult. I am a fan of the Bridgeland Character Home Preservation incentive (With my spouse I own and live in what I think is the first home under that program).
can't think of any
The City should do an inventory (maybe it's done already) of heritage buildings. The focus should be on saving and maintaining key assets, not creating a city wide generic guideline.
These guidelines should be required for approval of projects. Don't let people ignore these and continue to inflate prices and change the curb look of character neighborhoods.
Not at this time
No.
Character areas aren't necessarily better served by having new buildings be of the same scale or have the same architectural details as the old ones. Perhaps they should be consideration to requiring that architects design new buildings in heritage areas rather than draftspeople.



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

Capitol Hill is a healthy mixture of 20th Century home styles that should be recognized in these guidelines.
The guidelines would be better suited if you requested the same type of materials to be used with new developments (like cedar, bricks, etc), however requiring roofs and heights to be similar to character homes is limiting to evolving with the current world.
Many of these streets already have more new development than older homes, will the guidelines be Street specific? For instance, why stop a home from having a flat roof when precedent has already been set?
All communities visual guidelines should be modified to maintain the look of how the community was originally designed and developed.
I believe they should be extended to Bridgeland-Riverside which is under great development pressure.
Yes, all north hill communities should be included. Capitol Hill specifically! Any place there are heritage homes, there should be design outlines for new developments. Not just the areas you designated.
--
None
I feel that the communities should not be directed to always remain the same design.
Communities should have the ability to decide their future as residential &/or commercial spaces: not only must the City listen to residents, but really take into account resident's wishes and concerns.
You are way too late with this in my community. We have many streets that these type of houses have been torn down and replaced with street upon street of row houses. The suburbs have more character now than this community. All the houses are attached and look identical. They have no back yards, no curb appeal, they are so tall the block the sun, some are so close to the sidewalk you can touch their stairs, there is very little set back you can see in the house from sidewalk no charm left here.
They shouldn't be blanket applied but rather only next to heritage homes
Guidelines should be in line with the neighbourhood. Calgary has lost alot of its beauty to housing that has not been in line with the other dwellings in the neighborhood. In Rosedale you have designated only a portion of the community as heritage, what happens to my street. When it changes within a neighborhood it becomes clutter and undesirable.
no
Make them optional, do not require an approval process, and remove any barriers or delays that the guidelines may impose on new developments/upgrades. Or better yet, offer a expedited permitting process for anybody willing to implement these aesthetic choices.
The consultation has been a farce to date - planners are just picking comments that they agree with!
No, I believe in character continuity.
No
No. I think it is important that these guidelines apply across the city.
No. All the communities listed have older housing / heritage assets that should be preserved to maintain the character of the area.
no
There are a lot of communities like our Banff Trail NW, need these Guidelines, modifications, with terrible new houses, specially Cambridge models! They should prevent. They should control. Also all new models are bigger then old ones and they effect, most of situation stop daily sun of our front and backyards. They should control and prevent.
Please allow mixed-use redevelopment in Rosedale! Not part of the heritage guidelines, I know. But it would make 16th Avenue so much nicer and would help tie all of the North Hill communities together instead of a horrible blank wall for blocks and blocks.



# North Hill Communities Heritage Guidelines

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

July 2022

No
No. Every community that has heritage older homes should have rules. This endeavour is surely a little late and rules should have been in place before any community development especially multi units or three storey new dwellings.
These guidelines probably shouldn't apply to the south side of 17 ave or north side of 15 ave to permit better redevelopment of 16 ave. There are also sections of 20 ave, centre street, 4th street, and edmonton trail that should be exempt due to their own redevelopment plans. I would suggest keeping the roof pitch requirements to keep the vibe of the area.
The guidelines should be applied uniformly across a community.. not by localized blocks of houses. This will create value disparity within the community.
Where possible, we'd love to see these guidelines expand out - to more adjacent streets, to enhance character overall; through builder incentives, perhaps? And a question please, about our street specifically: On the map (Yellow/Crescent Heights) the designated area (east side of 2 St., north of 13th ave) does not appear to extend north to include a gorgeous, obvious heritage home on the N.W. corner of 2 St. and 15th ave. N.W. Might you look into including this please? Thank you again!
Not sure.
No
Mount Royal, Elbow Park, Britannia, et al
I don't know but I feel that these guidelines simplify what is needed to fit new developments into a heritage area.
I'm not sure if I understand the question as the Guidelines aren't in effect. I feel like Sunnyside and Hillhurst should have these guidelines implemented.
I think people need to focus on their own properties and not get in the way of new housing that better fills the needs of property owners.
N/A
Absolutely not. Need to be contextual to the specific environment and neighborhood that the historical buildings are located in order to create unique sense of place for each neighborhood. Read Jane Jacob's!