

3.32

Bylaw 21202 - Text Amendments to Zoning
Bylaw 20001 - Mid-block Row Housing in
the RS Zone and minor changes to the RSM
and RM Zones

Sam Mothana

June 30, 2025

Changes to building length

- Would have huge impact on development across the board due to reduce site coverage allowed for use in multi family development

Calculated maximum site coverage achievable under proposed changes for a single stucture multi family residential use								
Site Data	Width m	Length m	Max building Current	Max building proposed 50% of site length	Max site coverage under current zoning bylaw	site coverage under proposed by law 1.5 m side setback	site coverage under proposed by law 1.9 m side setback	site coverage under proposed by law 1.2 m side setback
site 50' x150'	15.24	45.72	30.00	22.86	45%	40%	38%	42%
site 42' x 150'	12.80	45.72	30.00	22.86	45%	38%	35%	41%
site 33' x 150'	10.06	45.72	30.00	22.86	45%	35%	31%	38%
site 50' x 130'	15.24	39.62	30.00	19.81	45%	40%	38%	42%
site 42' x 130'	12.80	39.62	30.00	19.81	45%	38%	35%	41%
site 33' x 130'	10.06	39.62	30.00	19.81	45%	35%	31%	38%
site 50' x 110'	15.24	33.53	30.00	16.76	45%	40%	38%	42%
site 42' x 110"	12.80	33.53	30.00	16.76	45%	38%	35%	41%
site 33' x 110'	10.06	33.53	30.00	16.76	45%	35%	31%	38%

UNDER PROPOSED changes, this would limit site coverage for single family homes with attached garages to 38% for 33 wide lots

Changes to building length

- **HUGE IMPACT ON SINGLE Family developments as well**

Site Data	Max site coverage under proposed by law 1.2 m side setback
site 50' x 150'	42%
site 42' x 150'	41%
site 33' x 150'	38%
site 50' x 130'	42%
site 42' x 130'	41%
site 33' x 130'	38%
site 50' x 110'	42%
site 42' x 110"	41%
site 33' x 110'	38%

UNDER PROPOSED

Achievable site coverage for single family homes with attached garages

- 38% for 33 wide lots,
- 41 % for 42 wide lots
- 42 % for 50 wide lots

Interior Side Setbacks

- Changing interior side setback from 1.5 m to 1.9 m is designed to restrict multi family development across all lots
 - Makes it very difficult to design multi family functional floor plans by making building "skinnier"
 - Could lead to taller buildings (third level) to address loss of valuable floor space (leads to more massing) or
 - would make building longer in order make up for lost width
 - Would make multi family developments very difficult in smaller lots

Timeline of proposed change

- Not enough notice is given to developers
- what happens to current permits under review
- Current development permit timelines are very long
- Would have huge financial impact on current developments
- Wrong message to send to developers and builders
- Erodes public confidence in investing in infills

The truth of the matter

- Proposed changes are
- Discriminatory in nature
 - The average infill land cost between 300k to 500k\$
 - New infill single family home cost more than 650k\$
 - The average price of a house sold in Edmonton is 464K
 - Under these new proposed changes, the message is loud and clear.
- Designed strongly discourage multi family developments infill
- Have huge implication across all developments across the city, not just in infill. And forget affordability

Front and Side Facades for Mid-block Row Housing & Multi-unit Housing

- I support Improving curb appeal of the building
- Increasing windows to 15% is not a good idea
 - Increased energy waste
 - Most windows sold in Canadian market have an insulation rating of $\sim R\ 4$ while most walls are around $\sim R\ 17$
 - Can lead to structural issues
 - Most small scale residential building are built under part 9 of the building code
 - Entire building is not structurally engineered
 - Can lead to reduced shear load “rack” tolerance and unsafe building

Benefits of higher housing density

- **Improved Housing Affordability**
- **Efficient Use of Infrastructure**
- **Supports Public Transit and Active Transportation**
- **Environmental Benefits**
 - Denser living often means lower energy use per household through shared walls
- **Economic Vitality, More residents support local Businesses and increase vibrancy in commercial areas**
- **Stronger Communities**
 - Promotes **mixed-income, mixed-use neighborhoods** that are socially dynamic.
 - Can increase neighborhood vitality and safety through **more “eyes on the street.”**
 - **Inclusive and less discriminatory in nature**