

Land Use Bylaw Engagement: Phase One

April 22, 2026 Public 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

- Secondary suites are already existing in Neighbourhood East
- If secondary dwellings are to be built, they should fit into the neighbourhood not overpower existing homes (3)
- Architectural controls/creative in-fill to preserve neighbourhoods and small town feel
- Parking is an issue, with lots of options to resolve this
- Start today
- No HOA style design needs but still keeping in *u.hes* of area
- Subjective but not prescriptive (1)
- Please reconsider the 70% max lot coverage and the 20% secondary building – need green space in High River, not all buildings and concrete (2)
- The small town feel is compromised when adding density to existing neighborhoods
- Density can be added to new areas of development (3)
- Care to old infrastructure (1)
- Can systems handle it?
- What will have extra strain?
- As a single family home owner, putting a multiple family dwelling decreases my property value – show me a study where it would actually increase my investment value (3)
- Is there a way to apply density for a block/neighbourhood etc. to limit complexes and duplexes (1)
- Caution about sunlight with development (1)
- Maximal stories or height
- Architectural control for aesthetics (5)
- Sunlight study, bring it back (1)
- Make a limit on density before allowing building, 2.4 is the average
- Location of density is important, e.g. near schools, key corners, hospitals etc. (1)
- Increasing density has public risk (holistic approach to building)
- Number of stories of height, e.g. no basement joist 5” below to classify as a basement, would be height (2)
- I moved from Calgary to avoid over-densification (1)
- Design controls
- Max 2.5 story height in outer neighbourhoods
- Density by duplex, townhomes not 25 units with no parking
- Save the tree canopy (3)
- Average TND density of 8 dwelling units per acres and 32 people would be a permitted use. Beyond that would be a discretionary use.
- No surprises with new types of properties in established single family homes. Your home is your investment. (6)

- You'd be hard pressed to find a home increase in value when a surprise multi-story unit is newly developed next to you. Your property value will decrease. Strategic placement in newer developments works.
- If second suite most have more % green space than 2%
- Urban tree canopy protected (1)
- History and culture of older neighborhoods should be maintained (1)
- Southwest side = retain the character of the neighborhood (1)
- Max height of two stories
- Fun fact education micro-info through all communication channels (Okotoks & Calgary do this well) (1)
- High density needs impact studies – traffic, infrastructure, parking, amenity. Triggered at certain density (3)
- More community engagement
- Use the Highwood Centre/Memorial Centre
- Electronic Board use for Town meetings, advertising of community events
- Mostly seniors here and they want to know about events
- Feasibility studies – neighbourhood impact (1)
- SW – honouring small town feel, pedestrian friendly, passage to river/forest/sun exposure for neighbour
- High density comes with social implications.
- Higher density should not create ghettos or slums.
- Put duplexes side by side and do not put them in the middle.
- Density brings property value down.
- Lack of architectural control impacts our properties negatively.
- We need design guidelines to integrate additional homes within the existing communities.
- Building a three-and-a-half-storey building is not good for our community.
- There must be a trade-off instead of building more infrastructure.
- A comprehensive infill plan is needed.
- We should have more development within our existing communities, but it should not be tall buildings.
- Do not disrupt older areas
- More density and more multifamily development will bring more people who require more services.
- New communities should not be restricted to have more density.

Landscaping

- Private property – cannot remove large trees without town approval. Otherwise trees come down and none are replaced. (2)
- Need for more schools
- MR – should be easily accessible
- One tree and two shrubs not necessarily enough – should be based on lot size
- Developers should be responsible for playground installation (2)
- Need to think ecological – things that don't need a lot of fertilizer (1)
- Bird friendly
- Need to reduce lot coverage maximum – to allow more green space (1)
- Shrubs and trees need maintenance – some issues (3)
- Perhaps indoor spaces should be mandated – usable throughout year
- We need more mingling – food, games, entertainment
- Community gardens – appealing, like in Victoria, B.C.

- Variation in lawns/green spaces
- Landscaping is visual interest and supports heat reduction etc.
- Allow/support lawn, colours, drought tolerant space etc. (1)
- Amenity space is very important
- More density should have proportional community spaces: 10% - 8 units, 15% - 10 units etc. (1)
- Really need to look at best practices
- Local and regional vegetation and drought resistant (2)
- Tough darts – 10% green per lot? Nonsense
- Make tree planting a major initiative of the town of High River
- Bylaw for big fines for clear cutting lots
- History of historical homes and historic tree canopy. High River is known for this. (1)
- Town might compile a list of trees that support the continuation of the tree canopy. (1)
- Not i.e. columnar aspen.
- Need approved trees that are shade trees to further the canopy.
- Need bylaw to protect private trees (unless sick) (1)
- High River is known for urban tree canopy – essential for character (2)
- Green spaces surrounding every building
- Generous set-backs from streets and other buildings
- Amenities on every second floor
- Stop listening so closely to greedy developers
- Developers and planners assemble groups of potential buyers and listen to what is important to them.
- 40% is not too much (4)
- 70% lot coverage – too much (2)
- Sidewalks with blvds, so important - both sides! (2)
- Where you have front garages – make sure there are blvds
- Montrose is a good template (the original Montrose...the present newest build, not so much) (2)
- Should not be front drive garages – walkability
- Drought resistance lawn species
- MR – needs to be usable by the Town
- How can private landscaping support the senior amenity zone projects?
- 40% of site landscaped – multiunit development: in the case of a variance, by how much can the 40% be reduced?
- Clear definition of livable/usable. 10%?
- MR – needs to be in the middle for mingling
- New dog park – need one per quadrant (1)
- Who decides the tree and shrub requirements? And SBE matters for other street housing and views.
- MR – needs to be designed – playground, kids
- Town needs private tree removal/bylaw (to save trees) (1)
- MR – in accessible locations for residents

Parking & Access

- More well maintained rear lanes in new development areas (1)
- In the case of multi-unit residential, assign the number of parking stalls required according to the number of each size unit in the dwelling (e.g. 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom suites) (2)

- Based on an average of two vehicles per dwelling unit. Any multi-unit development shall provide parking on site for 70% of the estimated vehicle count (2)
- Protect lane access – width, visibility (trees, parking access etc.) (2)
- Global best practices to consider. Understanding and documenting use cases based on lived experiences (1)
- Speed control bumps, i.e. Macleod Trail after school zone most traffic speeds up to get to speed resulting in excess noise and speed (2)
- Multi-units need to adapt to Stats Can data e.g. 4 years as updates (2)
- Current each resident has 0.7 cars related to average bedrooms onto dwelling. Ex: 5 bedroom = 3 persons = 2.1 car needs minimum
- Planning needs to consider in all new types of residential development the impacts to parking.
- Multi-family should allow two stalls per unit (4)
- Many single family homes can have 3-4 vehicles, 2 adults, 2 teens. Having no parking controls in residential areas is creating conflict (3)
- Resident sticker permit for congested high demand areas
- Driveway rules should not be changed in the middle of a development being built
- Driveways should be the width of the garage.
- Number of residences should relate to number of parking spaces. (1)
- Building permits should accommodate all parking on the building site, no on-street parking (1)
- Mandatory disability spaces for multi-units and businesses – based on determined units or expected visitation to business. We have an older population and we need to support access. (1)
- Keep restriction of no front driveway if you have a lane (1)
- Definitely need parking for all residential/commercial buildings (2)
- Do not change bylaws until area is developed
- Do not implement no parking on the street
- Limit the curve of streets due to cars parking on the street causing blind spots (1)
- Encourage driveway parking (2)
- Agree to have garages in front if needed. Regardless if they have a laneway double-width. (1)
- Drivers need to back up into garages for safety. Make it a bylaw. (1)
- We are not a walk oriented community. Few walk in the winter (2)
- Multi-unit residential: some areas (i.e. new west side of Montrose) have two storey extremely narrow homes. Majority do not have back lanes and are on a busy street. Front road is lined with vehicles. A lot of young couples with children live here. A clear safety issue. Request the units have a separate area for parking. (2)
- Reinstate parking amount per residences. Perhaps at least one parking spot per residence – to avoid already crowded areas (i.e. cul-de-sacs) from more congestion especially if they are to become multi-family dwellings/properties.
- No one wants a detached garage (1)
- Most houses will need room for two vehicles (1)
- Multi-family units must have two parking stalls or areas (2)
- Who wants to prioritize walking over driving. Very hard on seniors.
- Multi-units – 2nd suites etc. - anywhere with more than 1 home needs stricter regulations of spaces, garage can't count! Garages aren't for cars, they tend to be storage.
- Closer downtown parking lots to support business growth, ex. Lot space by library etc. (1)
- Multi-unit residential – require at least 1.7 parking stalls for each unit – no variances (1)

- Driveway widths – prefer double driveways/the width of the garage (1)
- More bicycle parking! (bike locks/racks/covers)
- More bike lock-up racks (2)
- More bicycle parking
- Reduced speed in downtown central area maybe to 20 kph.
- I'd settle for 30 maybe.

Building Height, Design and Placement

- We don't need to be squeezed into IAS like Calgary subdivisions
- Need to go back to R-1, R-2, R-3
- Need parking limits or more parking per new units being built (1)
- Downtown businesses keep the old town and vibes – stone, bricks, colours, general design
- If future centres try to duplicate the vibe
- Site visits for future development not just Google Earth imagery (1)
- We need microbus town service
- Neighbour impact has to be considered, overlook, massing, privacy.
- Discretionary use – so neighbours are informed.
- Development permits cannot be approved without a compliant life saving access/stairs. Not saved for the inspection of the building. (1)
- Designs under current LUB may not meet safety code requirements.
- When permits are approved URW and fire safety/separation need to be considered at the approval stage.
- Current bylaw framework allows approvals that meet technical requirements but lack real world feasibility
- Bigger the building the more space around is needed, also – party, green space etc.
- A math formula for correlation of massing and density – keep things open and small town feels while still increasing density.
- Ensure placement doesn't impact sight lines and safety.
- Corner visibility on busy roads/areas
- Larger when largest building
- Vegetation included to be considered.
- Massing and height with a 1 m setback is intrusive and obstructive.
- Real world impacts need to be considered.
- Interpretation of the bylaws do not ensure consistency and due regard.
- Keep logs of documented community use lived cases of what has not worked as its the use cases that bylaws can be stress tested against to see if they indeed work in real world scenarios.
- In the case of multi-unit residential, it would be more complex, but please consider site-specific requirements. (1)
- Developers are fleeting, residents are often there for their lifetime (1)
- Units per acre for residential
- Require 2 m per side setback (fire safety, privacy, aesthetics, runoff) (2)
- Validation (on-site visits) of what was built matches what was approved. Impact on Neighbour Assessment (2)
- Need to have more than 1 meter set back – 2-3 metre set back is what it should be. One metre is not enough. Some homes are too close to each other. (2)
- Business frontage – more than present 1 m set back. We are people that stop and chat with each other, soon another friend joins our group. Here comes a dog walker etc. We

- need to ensure it is safe to still gather – even on our sidewalk, without it being dangerous and someone trips off the curb.
- Spell out to developers very clearly what is required at the granular level. No grey area
- What is the context for allowing higher density? Where?
- In traditional neighbourhoods – max two storey or building height whichever is shorter. (1)
- Suitable to height of existing homes.
- Review privacy concerns – build decks below fence line, mandate landscaping requirements (1)
- Review development bylaws from other communities and adopt world class bylaws to develop this town.
- Neighbour engagement prior to permit approval (4)
- Need to specify max building height, not the number of stories (3)
- Stepbacks are important, should be applied to all new (1)
- Setbacks – side should consider overhang
- Height – should be firm height, not stories, applied to all structures (3)
- 1.5 side setback including overhang (2)
- Height restriction suitable to neighbourhood (1)
- Is all development at the discretion of the development officer?
- Minimum setback for areas with and without sidewalks and backyards
- Retain the third storey setback requirement (2)
- Development in established areas require neighbour/block lane engagement for a specific number of dwellings, ex: 1 lot infill with proper 3 dwellings new engagement
- Stepback proportional to height and mass, ex. 1 story = 1 m, 2 story = 2 m etc.
- Restrict the height of a building so the next door owners do not lose the sunlight (3)
- A multi-family dwelling next to a typical house would cause the typical house to lose their privacy (3)
- Ensure that the 3 storey maximum for TND is measured from grade.
- Any basement development over 25% above grade would count as one of the storeys
- More setback both side and front and back (1)
- Side setback is fire hazard
- Also 70% of land occupancy is too much
- Story or building height is cap, ex: 2 story or 100 m, which is lower (1)
- Increase side set backs?
- Increasing density to existing older neighbourhoods.
- Architecture is important. Massing.
- Parking is important. (1)
- Duplexes, townhomes are acceptable to me if above 5 items are addressed.
- Multi-family, multi-floor buildings can only be situated on larger lots – 2 storeys max.
- Keep 40% landscape

Other

- Secondary suite allowances help densify while building the choice in for the buyer instead of codefying it.
- We need to understand how densities relate to a small-town fee. 8 UPA is 20' wide duplexes, suggest too intense for TND.
- It would be concerning to introduce zero lot line to increase density. Instead, continue to allow secondary suites.
- Allowing secondary suites (2 dwellings) per site in traditional communities is appropriate. The town does this already.

- Be efficient with how land is used.
- Reduce road dedication in favour of private lots
- Increase tax generation opportunities while reduce operation, life-cycle and maintenance burden
- Be more judicious on planning new developments in particular with roads, sidewalks, lanes. These do not generate taxes and reduce affordability, be decreasing the amount of lots available. Development/lot costs increase and taxes go down
- LUB should better support market-aligned housing.
- Majority of buyers want front drive homes
- Flexibility, efficiency, predictability
- It would be good to have some DP-exempt uses in the TND. Single family/semi-detached/at grade fee simple housing.
- Consider DP exemptions for green field (new) community developments and how to streamline - 'cut the red tape' - to speed up approvals and building permit releases. In particular on single family detached homes.
- 2 m 'blank wall' rule becomes difficult with residential design, should be controlled by developer