



Land Use Bylaw Engagement: Phase One

April 22, 2026 Builder & Developer Session

Comments are provided verbatim/exactly as respondents wrote them. We have not corrected for spelling, grammar or accuracy. Comments were edited only if they included inappropriate language, were discriminatory in nature or identified specific individuals or groups.

Numbers in brackets indicate the number of dots placed beside a comment, indicating agreement.

Density

- Medium density is appropriate for our community.
- Adding density depends on the areas, as different areas have different characteristics, and some could accommodate higher density without any issues.
- The pushback against increasing density in the SW is because people of influence live in the area.
- Do not disagree with multifamily development, but how tall it should be, that is the question.
- Increasing density must come with a parking requirement.
- People move from big cities to small towns because they want to have more space.
- We are not Calgary, and no need for tall buildings.
- Must promote the small-town atmosphere
- More density means change is coming to our community. People don't like change and change is the law of nature
- Proposed density must be practical
- Change brings noise, but if it can be managed, then it is ok.
- Planned practical change that is realistic is good.
- Be creative on parking, and so it doesn't take a lot of space.
- Flexibility in the design is important to allow more density
- Have an open conversation about the size of expected population growth and their needs
- Be clearer on how to make decisions on density.
- Town Plan speaks about small-town feel. What does it mean?
- What does 8 units per acre mean on the ground? Does it mean building duplexes? Is that what our community expects?
- Town put a lot of thought into density. 20 units per acre is unreasonable and is disconnected from reality.
- Development setback brings different issues.
- Engineered communities would not give you the small-town feel.
- Flexibility on offering more housing options is great, especially secondary suites in new homes.
- Appropriate transitioning of development of a variety of houses is important to our community.
- Put density in masterplan communities by design.
- Three-fourths of people want front garage lots.
- Private space should not be compromised.
- Be thoughtful about how we use land.
- Don't put more infrastructure on the ground and allow market driven housing options.
- Reality makes it doable
- Use different rules and regulations for existing communities and new communities.

Landscaping

- MR – the Town does a great job with some areas, but can it handle further parks – maintenance standards
- MR – usability, practicality, aesthetics, what will be an attraction for people to want to use it, maintenance
- 40% - seems like a lot – are they using it? It practical? Long winter – can't be enjoyed that much.
- Amenity spaces – doesn't just have to be outside – doing things

- Utility companies are demanding very wide URW – makes design very challenging
- All rules are interconnected, we need to understand how requiring something under the LUB might reduce opportunities, i.e. requirement for lanes and short blocks contribute to over-dedication of roads and utilities
- Lanes – customers aren't seeing the value; lanes pull away from what could be MR
- MGA – primary guide for park or green space dedication
- MR – concerns that they are not well maintained by Town (e.g. weed control, mowing, pruning)
- Not enough for kids to do, need spaces to promote kids activities
- No concerns on tree/shrub requirements. Current rule feels adequate.
- For less than 8 units min. landscape area should equal max parcel coverage minus land required for parking
- Need clarification on amenity space for freehold townhouse units – they have backyards
- 40% for a typical apartment/condo feels too much – affordability implications should align with single detached etc. 10+ coverage standards
- Idea for amenity space – resort style area – BBQ + entertainment – promote community – games area

Parking & Access

- For example on 3rd Ave in High River parking needs some improvement
- For next planning around media building there should be adequate parking
- For housing there should be 6.1 m requirement minimum
- More diagonal parking is preferred than straight parking. It provides more parking places.
- More adequate downtown parking/street parking, diagonal was more effective as older people are not good at parallel parking – they hit things. Most people are not good at it.
- Adequate parking around doctor's offices
- Other commercial parking often feels tight, wider and better in and out access
- Get rid of bump outs. While they look nice – they are totally impractical and take up potential parking spaces.
- Blanket variance allows for 6.1 m at the property line, but that doesn't quite reflect the garages in all cases. Altering to allow the approach to match the garages may better reflect the realities on site. (3)
- We like the flexibility regarding parking requirements currently built into the LUB.
- Bylaw does not allow for two access as we read it. This doesn't really reflect what people want, which is more private access.
- Driveway length should be more flexible and conflict with the setback rule of max 6 m. 6 m does not allow for trucks etc. causing overhanging on sidewalk.
- Town should be more flexible with lane requirements.
- 75% of sales in Montrose in the last 3 years are front drive product (1)
- MR – the Town does a great job with some areas, but can it handle further parks – maintenance standards
- MR – usability, practicality, aesthetics. What will be an attraction for people to want to use it, maintenance
- 40% - seems like a lot – are they using it? Is it practical? Long winter – can't be enjoyed that much.
- Amenity spaces – doesn't just have to be outside – doing things
- Utility companies are demanding. URW – makes very wide design very challenging.
- All rules are interconnected, we need to understand how requiring something under the LUB might reduce opportunities, i.e. requirement for lanes and short blocks contribute to over-dedication of roads and utilities
- Lanes – customers aren't seeing the value
- Lanes pull away from what could be MR
- MGA – primary guide for park or green space dedication
- MR – concerns that they are not well maintained by Town (e.g. weed control, mowing, pruning)
- Not enough for kids to do, need spaces to promote kids activities

- No concerns on tree/shrub requirements, current rules feels adequate
- For less than 8 units min. landscape area should equal max parcel coverage minus land required for parking
- Need clarification on amenity space for freehold townhouse units – they have backyards.
- 40% for a typical apartment/condo feels too much
- Affordability implications should align with single detached etc. lot coverage standards
- Idea for amenity space – resort style area – BBQ and entertainment – promote community
- Games area

Building Design, Height and Placement

- Height, flexibility needs
- Rules of max height now preferred
- Break façade
- Design
- More design details
- 1.5 m side setback
- In NW, close to golf course (i.e. space in on street parking)
- 2 m side setback is required
- 1.2 2,4 foot sideyard
- Not more than 1.22 m
- More than 6 m front setback to have enough space for tracks
- No issues with height
- Front setbacks at a maximum of 6 m doesn't reflect the realities of the standard truck which is 22' 0" on average meaning over 6 m. What happens now is people park in their driveways and overhang onto walkways. I'd proposing increasing it to at least 7.5 m with leeway for pie or odd shaped lot
- Building materials are measured in imperial units. 2.5 m is an awkward number that requires additional cutting on site
- Limiting design effort by codifying setbacks creates a race to meet the noted requirement, instead of allowing the design to take context into account first
- Flexibility, efficiency, predictability
- Base bylaw requires/allows for a garage projection of no more than 1 m with a blanket variance allowing for 7.32 m. This has an adverse affect where often the entry is being extended which is not positive space for the actual home owner/buyer. It would seem the goal of pedestrian connection, re-wording the bylaw to away from garage projection which measures the foundation, and instead saying "front entry massing no further than 7.32 m" would allow design alternatives that can bring the entry forward like extending the porch.
- Preferred setback is to go up to 1.22 m for side yards. Match to building code and removes the issue of buyers/home owners getting mixed up.
- Match side yard setbacks to build code (4') no more! Additional setbacks only add cost.
- In greenfield where Developer Architectural Controls are in place, the LUB does not need to be over-prescriptive. Acs better control community feel.