



Land Use Bylaw Engagement: Phase One

April 28, 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 units in single family is good
- Some flexibility good
- 605 bad, save that for new areas (1)
- Most infill is good, some issues with height, address height specific with area
- Current traditional neighbourhood district needs to be tightened up and developers have (3)
- Variances and permits must be checked personally and permits must be checked onsite before being approved (2)
- Not affordable! People are NOT paid enough for builder's idea of affordable (2)
- Parking??? (3)
- Density cannot violate current ASP (2)
- Taxes
- Is there a density restriction in the west end? What limits density proposed for redevelopment of 605 Macleod Trail? (3)
- Be respectful of your neighbours (3)
- Schools – expansions (1)
- Fire??? – hydrants (1)
- Medical – doctors etc. – to accommodate 900+ low cost housing units (2)
- Density is tied to parking (2)
- Add a low density zone (more density than TND and TND becomes RI with basement suites)
- Permits should not be approved by Google Earth – a human being must inspect the site
- Use density targets – different targets for different neighborhoods (1)
- Make requirements black and white (1)
- TND too broad – different neighborhoods have different character (3)
- Use different zones or overlay districts (2)
- Density doesn't matter, parking does (2)
- Height of infill can be an issue
- Affordable housing requires density

Landscaping

- Need public transportation (so can be less emphasis on parking)
- Town needs to be able to say this density, or this lot coverage, does not fit into the neighborhood (2)
- 40% makes sense (4)
- Need clear definition of accessory building, shed is dramatically different from 2.5 storey garage (3)
- High River needs a better plan to deal with beavers
- But also need to address parking matters
- Landscaped area affects affordability

- Need to be able to accommodate farm equipment/pick ups (2)
- Concern about so many units on one lot (4)
- Important to strike a balance in terms of parks and green spaces
- 70% lot coverage is too much (4)
- Including accessory buildings (20% is too much) (4)
- Landscaping comes at a cost
- Should have requirements for parking island landscaping (2)
- MR – prioritize new community gardens (2)
- MR – prioritize saving mature trees (4)
- Noticing greenspace is disappearing (2)
- The design is critical – the multi-unit development needs to be integrated for community interaction (6)
- Trees and shrubs – looks very nice if kept up (1)
- Green spaces are so important (6)
- Noticing a lot of increased lot coverage properties – concern (2)
- Need green space for a community feel (e.g. not even room for a little library). So much of Montrose, for example, is paved (2)
- Common amenity space goes along with small town feel – developers won't do it otherwise (1)
- Could look into tree/shrub enforcement options – to keep up maintenance/ensuring they aren't just removing (1)
- Landscaped area helps with water management (4)
- Nobody needs 90% lot coverage in the TND (7)
- Private tree protection bylaw? (3)
- 40% is a good idea – from a water permeability perspective (5)
- Sidewalks! (3)
- The more green space the better
- Landscaping can promote walkability (4)
- The type of trees needs to be thought out – drought resistant (2)
- What can we do re: private maintenance. What if it's not being kept up? Do they need to be replaced?
- Do a review of best practices – other municipalities (2)
- Indoor amenities can be helpful for winter – lots of times can't go outside to enjoy
- MR – should be accessible to the maximum # of people
- MR – needs to be designed by a truly qualified professional (1)

Parking & Access

- Underground parking – 1 story or 2 story
- Parking spot for granny suite – one parking spot (1)
- On-site parking must be included for residential areas (5)
- Residential should have parking requirements
- Commercial – Town should buy up lots and build parkade – work with Town businesses to get involved. Need business, won't come to Town as they see parking problem (1)
- Residential should have parking requirements (1)
- With low cost housing and every other decision, the town and the people living in it – who are represented by the town – must have the final say over developers. (3)
- \$2500/month rent is not low cost!

- In favour of parking minimum requirements (4)
- Visitor parking requirement for medium/high density residential (3)
- DA has discretion on parking requirements based on location and adjacent uses (4)
- Parking access – allow front drive garages, sidewalk on one side only, 1.5 parking spots per unit.
- Density – parking too tight – garbage can issue, can't follow rules, safety issue children playing (5)
- Residential, two parking off street per unit (3)
- Unit = a mailing address
- All alleys behind
- A home business that attracts visitors who need parking needs to provide a spot.

Building Design, Height, Placement

- Need greater side setback
- Need to specify max allowed height in feet/metres and not in number of storeys (1)
- Ratio – height (4)
Lot width
- Need restrictions on relative size of secondary building (3)
- Need height restrictions on every building (5)
- Need wider side setback, and measure it from eaves (2)
- Need greater setback on back edge of property. Half a metre means it looms over alley and neighbours (2)
- Property coverage max should be 60%, not 70% (3)
- Limit height to two stories. Include any basement that is 25% above grade as a storey (5)
- Any new home builds should be a maximum of 60% of the lot size. Including out buildings (5)
- Primary building (residence) should – must be main building. Secondary buildings should be just that – smaller and fit in (2)
- Importance of emphasizing and respecting “thoughtful” development (1)
- 1.5 m side setback minimum (4)
- There should be more height restrictions in traditional neighbourhoods (4)
- Likes R1, R2...
- An area for medium to high density buildings
- More setbacks for infill area (1)
- New and more design elements
- Front setback – 3 m (min) (1)
- 1.22 m side setback
- Height – 25% of basement should be considered as one floor (4)
- Setback – depends on new build or infill, if infill needs to be in line with existing street scape! (3)
- 3 story structures should not be built in areas that were previously R-1 now TRN. Setback should reflect the adjacent properties (1)
- Restrict height by number of stories and height (1)
- Regulations based on context, adjacent lots (4)
- 3 metres instead 2.5 metres setback
- Guidelines on design, to be consistent with look of neighbourhood (2)
- Contextual bylaw requirements (4)