



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Project overview

The CalgaryEATS! Food System Assessment and Action Plan is Calgary's Council-endorsed food strategy. Its vision is to create a sustainable and resilient Calgary food system so that every citizen has access to local, healthy and environmentally-friendly food. Over the past year, City teams have been working with interested stakeholders to identify various food-related areas of our bylaws. We are currently in the process of reviewing these identified areas to create as many opportunities as possible to increase accessibility to locally-grown food in our city. By updating some of our bylaws, we hope to:

- Create more opportunities to build a sustainable and resilient food system through land use and development;
- Support and promote the growing of local food through community gardens and urban agriculture initiatives;
- Expand opportunities for commercial growers; and
- Support increased access to healthy food for Calgarians

Engagement overview

The City of Calgary wanted to gain feedback from stakeholders on the following input points: growing food; opportunities for small-scale farming; community gardens; indoor commercial agriculture; food processing; extensive agriculture; intensive agriculture; urban grazing; growing food on boulevards; 'pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land; an 'agricultural land use district'; breweries, wineries and distilleries; and rooftop greenhouses.

Stakeholders were presented the current rules for each of the above noted input points, the opportunity that was available and possible ideas for bylaw amendments. They were then asked to provide feedback on the opportunity and the possible ideas for amendments. This report reflects feedback received through this engagement process.

The engagement program was undertaken through two public open houses held at the City of Calgary's Municipal Building on November 15 and November 24, 2016. Forty-three people attended the first open house and 64 attended the second.

What we asked

To capture a balanced understanding of what stakeholders' opinions about each individual input point, the project team presented the following information at the two open house sessions on individual poster boards. Each board asked the question "What do you think of this idea?" and stakeholders were encouraged to provide input using sticky notes. Several subsequent emails were received from stakeholders and have been included in the verbatim section of this report.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Board 1: Growing food

There are many expectations about the types of gardens and locations of gardens allowed for food production.

Opportunity: Should our bylaws explicitly state that growing food, including raised beds and hot boxes, be allowed anywhere on parcels of land where people live as long as the land is maintained and safe?

Current rules: There are no definitive rules written, but The City allows what it refers to as 'customary and acceptable' uses of growing food outside.

Possible idea: Make it clear in our bylaws that as long as a resident follows all of the other food regulations of our city, growing food outside is acceptable on parcels of land that are safe and being maintained.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 2: Opportunities for small-scale urban farming

Opportunity: Can small-scale urban farming be allowed outdoors on vacant land or on some of the open landscaped areas around residential, commercial or industrial buildings?

Current rules: There are no rules for small-scale urban farming in Calgary.

Possible idea: Allow small-scale urban farming on vacant land and on landscaped areas of developed land and allow limited 'farm gate' sales with a permit (subject to existing bylaws, regulations and guidelines).

What do you think of this idea?

Board 3: Community Gardens

Opportunity: It's not clear where community gardens can be built and which developments they can be combined with; should we allow them everywhere?

Current rules: Although not explicitly written, community gardens are included in our city's definition of 'a park', so they can be established almost anywhere in Calgary.

Possible idea: Define 'community garden' in writing and list it in the land use bylaw; this would make people more aware of the community garden option and residents/developers might build more of them as part of new developments.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 4: Indoor commercial agriculture

Opportunity: Should commercial indoor food production be allowed in more places?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Current rules: Businesses can grow food indoors in industrial districts.

Possible idea: Should we define growing food indoors separately from other manufacturing uses and allow it in commercial districts as well?

What do you think of this idea?

Board 5: Food Processing

Opportunity: Food manufacturing is unique compared to other types of manufacturing because a provincial regulation requires it to be located away from landfills and sewage treatment plants.

Current rules: Food manufacturing is included in the same definition as other manufacturing businesses which means that there are no explicit land use bylaw rules that require it to be set back from landfills and sewage treatment plants.

Possible idea: Define food manufacturing separately in the land use bylaw with a rule that separates it from landfills and sewage treatment plants.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 6: Extensive Agriculture

Opportunity: Livestock can graze and food can be grown outside on land in the city that is yet to be developed for urban purposes, but should small greenhouses and buildings also be allowed pending urban development?

Current rules: Most extensive agricultural activities are expected to take place outdoors and not inside of buildings.

Possible idea: Refine the rules to allow small greenhouses, agricultural buildings and animal shelters as part of extensive agriculture on undeveloped land.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 7: Intensive Agriculture

Opportunity: Although it is a listed development, there is currently no definition of what intensive agriculture is – should we define it?

Current rules: Intensive agriculture is undefined but can only be approved by Council via a public hearing.

Possible idea: Define intensive agriculture and include in its definition feedlots, animal barns, etc., but let it remain as a development that can only be approved by Council.

What do you think of this idea?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Board 8: Urban Grazing

Opportunity: There is a lot of city-owned land where weeds and grass can be managed by livestock grazing.

Current rules: Livestock grazing in the city is regulated by the 'Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw' and is generally not allowed.

Possible idea: Allow The City to use livestock to manage weeds and grass on city-owned land.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 9: Growing food on boulevards

Opportunity: Can I grow food on a boulevard (the city-owned land between the sidewalk/curb and a residential property line)?

Current rules: The 'Streets Bylaw' requires permission from The City.

Possible idea: Put in place rules that allow residents to garden on boulevards without the need of official permission.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 10: 'Pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land

Opportunity: Can The City help promote local healthy food by allowing 'pop-up' food sales on city-owned land?

Current rules: There are currently no rules that allow 'pop-up' sales.

Possible idea: Allow temporary 'pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land when permission is given by The City.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 11: An 'Agriculture Land Use District'

Opportunity: Should The City have a land use district or zone to accommodate permanent agricultural uses within city boundaries?

Current rules: Low impact or 'extensive agricultural uses' are allowed, such as crops and animal grazing, but new permanent agricultural developments such as large barns or greenhouses are not permitted.

Possible idea: Create a new 'Agriculture Land Use District' so that land can be used for permanent agricultural activities.

What do you think of this idea?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Board 12: Breweries, wineries and distilleries

Opportunity: Now that The City has had some experience approving permits for breweries, wineries and distilleries, should they be allowed as a 'permitted use' (uses that are automatically approved if they meet city rules) in some industrial districts?

Current rules: They are currently considered 'discretionary use' in existing buildings (which means they can be approved or refused based on The City's discretion).

Possible idea: Move breweries, wineries and distilleries under permitted use bylaws in the I-G districts when in existing buildings.

What do you think of this idea?

Board 13: Rooftop Greenhouses

Opportunity: Some developments provide few, if any, opportunities to grow food on the ground; should The City encourage rooftop greenhouses?

Current rules: Rooftop greenhouses are allowed but are included in a building's maximum height.

Possible idea: Exempt rooftop greenhouses from maximum building height.

What do you think of this idea?

What we heard/summary of input

All of the feedback collected for each input point was organized into the following themes list below. Support for recommended amendments was universally high, featured on the majority of responses on each board.

Growing food

- Support these changes
- Not limited homeowners
- Safe & maintained needs to be defined
- No permits should be required
- Expand to unutilized spaces
- Limit regulation
- Not needed; unnecessary regulation
- Land available for lease
- Personal or commercial?
- Responsibility for maintenance should be clear
- Regulations/bylaws need to be clear and easy to understand



- Commercial use in residential needs to be limited
- Clarify what accessory building is and allowable size
- Strata councils may not support
- Affordable permits
- Greenhouses on public and private land
- City soil testing program required Reduce barriers to growing food
- Front yards need to be included
- Do existing bylaws conflict with this?
- What are water rules/restrictions?
- Include greenhouses

Opportunities for small-scale urban farming

- Support the changes
- Consider previous contamination
- Dairy only to consumers
- Already defined by province
- Remove barriers for farmers
- Make permit process easy/or no permit required
- Allow fruit orchards
- Allow on school grounds
- No restrictions
- Don't include animals
- Better definition of urban farming needed
- Less limitations on farm gate sales
- Residential needs to be better defined
- Encourage in commercial areas
- Mandated minimum land dedicated to urban farming
- Allow backyard chickens
- Soil quality testing/info is required
- Only allow on private land
- Allow garage and basement farming
- Allow on boulevards
- Support food security
- Define vacant land and available uses
- Define small scale
- Commercial sales should be allowed
- Tax breaks for developers who include farming land Water usage should be regulated
- Restrict chemicals and pesticides



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Community Gardens

- Support the changes
- Allow sales
- Remove barriers
- Allocate City support/resources
- Place in diversity of areas
- Place in industrial areas
- Too many land use regulations could lead to confusion
- Give developers tax credits to include them
- Allow them everywhere
- Where they are allowed and what they are should be clearly defined
- Should be included in Municipal Development Plan
- Mandated minimum land dedicated to gardens
- Allow in schoolyards
- Minority opinion should not block gardens
- City should subsidize gardens
- No need for regulations
- Does this include communal gardens
- Maintenance should be regulated
- Wildlife protection should be regulated
- Allow beehives
- No sales should be allowed

Indoor commercial agriculture

- Support the changes
- Distinguish between growing and processing
- Add aquaculture
- Allow in commercial districts
- Tax incentives should be considered
- Allow in industrial areas
- Allow in residential area
- Needs to include health and safety standards
- Allow anywhere
- Venting and equipment should be a concern
- This type of agriculture and scale need to be defined
- Should be required in denser residential areas
- Energy and infrastructure requirements are a concern
- Remove barriers



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Allow on schoolyards
- Provide incentives for indoor agriculture

Food Processing

- Support the changes
- Limit the scale of processing
- Limit the type of processing
- This is already governed by the Province
- City should rent facilities
- Identify sewage and landfill locations
- Define setbacks
- Needs to be better defined
- Not required
- Consider water regulations
- Could create barriers
- Make small scale processing possible
- Needs to differentiate between meat and vegetable processing

Extensive Agriculture

- Support the changes
- Need to determine contamination
- Avoid feedlots
- Eco-standards need to be included
- Allow greenhouses
- Allow commercial aquaculture
- Research other cities' best practices
- Limit to temporary use
- Must meet health requirements
- No regulation required
- Encourage organic and sustainable practices
- Need to consult with public on uses
- Allow backyard chickens
- Need to define safe operations
- Should be allowed in all residential spaces
- How can undeveloped space permission be obtained?

Intensive Agriculture

- Support the changes



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Not necessary to define
- Need further definition around intensity
- Do not include animal barns
- Consult with industry experts on bylaw
- Consult with provincial government
- Don't restrict permit process
- Define animals and vegetables separately
- Create a specific zone for this
- Animal agriculture is undesirable
- Consider aquaculture
- Confusion of what is intensive and what is extensive
- Consider limiting chemicals and pesticides
- Do not allow this

Urban Grazing

- Support the changes
- Oppose the changes
- Need to clarify the cost savings
- Need to clarify who manages livestock
- Allow backyard chickens
- Use goats
- Allow private involvement
- Need to clarify what type of City land would be used
- Need safety guidelines
- Use cows
- Consider low maintenance plants

Growing food on boulevards

- Support the changes
- Oppose the changes
- Streamlined process needed for application
- Limit risks to drivers and pedestrians
- Reduces infrastructure and upkeep costs
- Contaminated land is a risk
- Use curb cuts for water runoff and use
- Is food grown safe from contamination?
- Issues with snowplowing and maintenance
- Limit pesticide and chemical use



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Hire urban farmers for this
- Limit to non-commercial
- Remove all barriers
- Maintenance of boulevards is important
- Soil testing is required
- Water requirements need to be considered
- Needs more rules and guidelines
- Another bylaw is not required
- Define areas that can't be used

'Pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land

- Support the changes
- Oppose the changes
- Regulated by provincial government
- Concerns about water and electricity use
- Allow backyard chickens
- This isn't in alignment with other City departments
- Would require education and promotion
- Pop-up needs to be defined
- Mandate fees for participation
- Regulations would need to be defined
- City should provide incentives
- Allow on private land
- Make permitting easy and inexpensive
- Develop at city spaces (train stations, parks, libraries)
- Only local produce
- Designate sites that don't require permits
- Safety of food should be regulated

An 'Agriculture Land Use District'

- Support the changes
- Consider school partnerships
- Allow areas to be multi-zoned
- How would space be managed?
- More discussion is required
- Require many zones and districts
- Consider impact on parks system
- Oppose the changes



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Should be percentage of total land
- Allow backyard chickens
- Could use golf courses and green belts
- Use regenerative agriculture
- Entire city should be an agriculture district
- Consider noise and odour
- Consider the cost
- Allow in industrial areas
- Would need neighbourhood consultation

Breweries, wineries and distilleries

- Support the changes
- Encourage small scale production and sales
- Oppose the changes
- Don't limit to industrial areas
- Need to consider whether this benefits community
- Consider noise and odours

Rooftop Greenhouses

- Support these changes
- Must balance building design
- Should consider impact of greenhouse
- Existing building should be exempt
- Should be encouraged in all zones
- Should only be allowed in commercial and industrial zones
- Consider structural components of building
- City should provide incentives
- Any new City building should be required to have green roof
- Height limits should be required
- Oppose these changes
- Will impact neighbours
- More information and detail is required

▶ For a verbatim listing of all the input that was provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Next steps

- ▶ The feedback collected through the engagement process will be provided to the project managers for consideration as they develop a recommendation report for Council.
- ▶ The report will be presented to Council for review and decision in Q1 2017 (TBD).



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Verbatim Comments

Verbatim comments include all written input that was received at the two public open houses for this project.

NB: The verbatim comments have not been edited for spelling, grammar or punctuation. Language deemed offensive or personally identifying information has been removed and replaced with either (offensive language removed) or (personal identifier removed).

Comments received at open houses

Board 1: Growing food

There are many expectations about the types of gardens and locations of gardens allowed for food production.

Opportunity: Should our bylaws explicitly state that growing food, including raised beds and hot boxes, be allowed anywhere on parcels of land where people live as long as the land is maintained and safe?

Current rules: There are no definitive rules written, but The City allows what it refers to as 'customary and acceptable' uses of growing food outside.

Possible idea: Make it clear in our bylaws that as long as a resident follows all of the other food regulations of our city, growing food outside is acceptable on parcels of land that are safe and being maintained.

What do you think of this idea?

- Yes, and I would go a step further to ensure a) it is not limited to the homeowner specifically (so long as the homeowner's permission is obtained) b) "safe & maintained" is defined within reason c) a permit is not required d) expand this to other unutilized spaces ie. boulevards, vacant lots etc.
- I favour as few regulations as possible. Safety & maintenance seem reasonable concerns.
- Great Would be important to encourage rain barrel/compost use. Would encourage organic gardening, using grey water & permaculture techniques
- Yes. Misperceptions that residents can't/shouldn't grow vegetables in front yards
- Sounds like a bureaucracy and a law for the sake of a law. Not needed!
- Yes - Current Rule seems fine why add more complications
- Yes. And land should be available for lease by the community association for food growth & resale.
- No. Bylaws may not be the most effective document to promote this. Creating a new bylaw is unnecessary.
- Yes I agree so long it is well maintain and the land is safe for everyone.
- Yes. On all property food growing should be exempt from bylaws about how front yards look. Some veg gardens aren't "pretty" but they are necessary!
- Personal Food Consumption or Commercial Food Consumption?
- Food Regulation is Provincial, Not City of Calgary.



- Too Much RED TAPE - NOT NEEDED
- GOOD IDEA, BUT IS THIS LEVEL OF DETAIL REQUIRED BY BYLAW?
- Food is needed and we need to invest in every opportunity within our city to grow it
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes - take it one step further & ENCOURAGE people to grow food on land. Not just allow.
- Explicit and Restrictive are two different things. We don't need more restrictions. Other countries and jurisdictions have created laws that enable citizens. We need to encourage and enable.
- Yes
- No restrictions apart from basic respect for neighbours and community look.
- Unnecessary regulation.
- In agreement with adding clear bylaws
- Agree - question about who is responsible for maintenance?
- THE LAND USE BYLAW SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT IT DOES NOT REGULATE LOW DENSITY LANDSCAPING & THEREFOR DOESN'T REGULATE GARDENS. CALGARIANS DO A GREAT JOB W THEIR YARDS SO WE SHOULD LEAVE IT BE.
- YES
- As long as you word this with care.
- efficient use of land
- Yes
- Yes
- YES NO RULES
- Yes to growing food everywhere. No to restricting design such as size, techniques, etc. We need to be leaders in sustainable food & break away from aesthetics & monocultures of grass (often treated with a wide array of chemicals/fertilizers & mowed with fossil fuels).
- What are all the food regulations? Is this easy to understand? Does it allow for some personal choice on food safety issues. What is maintained?
- Yes
- Yes: important to clarify into bylaws. Important to be very clear as to what SAFE & MAINTAINED means. Commercial growers should not be able to grow on residential land however, homeowners/tenants should be able to sell excess - in limited amounts. Need to limit commercial use in residential neighbourhoods.
- Good Idea! Will people growing food for themselves have to comply with rules for commercial producers? Seems to rigorous.
- Would a greenhouse be considered as accessory building? Would it count as building coverage? What would be an allowable size?
- Support possible idea as it will allow for currently used parcels of land to be maximized.
- Strata councils may not be okay with this.
- I'm against this unnecessary bylaws to regulate this does NOT need to be regulated!



- If explicitly stating is the only way to promote & ensure increasing conversion of land to growing food, then yes! What kind of work & bureaucracy will be implemented to oversee safe & maintained? Not sure that's worth it.
- What is the city's role in providing access to soil testing for homeowners? Education access? How to grow.
- Yes
- We should include being able to have greenhouses without on public and private land. Permits should be affordable.
- Yes as long as it doesn't bother others
- A city run soil test lab to make it affordable to not only test for contaminants but for nutrients too!
- Yes! Need to reduce barriers around growing food. Need to make clear & simple instructions around what can be done.
- Should be able to grow food and sell it on your front lawn.
- What is 'safe' according to who?? If eater is informed, growing should not be restrictive. Love making growing food easier.
- "Growing food outside" covers anywhere on the parcel plus building integrated solutions. Good choice!
- Great idea! What is considered maintained?
- Should include explicitly "Front yards" as well as "backyards".
- Yes! Front lawn gardens abandon lots and city property
- Are there any existing bylaws that conflict w/ raised beds, hot boxes on front lawns? Height, appearance?
- Yes. Growing food should not be associated with "ugliness". Concerns regarding quality of soil on urban parcels, heavy metal contamination?
- What about ownership of lots. Are there bylaws with respect to abandoned or city lots. What about restrictions on growing invasives?!
- Just let people know it is not against any bylaw to have raised bed or garden in front JUST DO IT
- Is a hot box a 'cold frame' What about greenhouses. Size. What about water (rain water) harvesting for gardens.
- Yes
- Yes! Include greenhouses in the definition.
- Awesome idea!
- (No front yard greenhouses) Sure, otherwise.
- Support the idea!
- Good idea. Make sure there isn't a conflict with other bylaws or neighbourhood covenants restricting how close to the street/sidewalk gardens can be.
- that is a good idea
- Fully support! What is the definition of maintained and safe? There should be a process to allow on any piece of land, not just where people live.
- Agree with the idea of front/back yard gardens being specifically included - providing people keep them tidy view fronts for sure.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- "Safe" outside of private land should include environmental assessment from city dept.
- YES
- Good idea. Possible rules for selling excess produce.
- If someone wanted to turn their front lawn into a garden, would this bylaw help or hinder this? Could this be challenged as not "customary" use. Maintained - permaculture style gardens tend to not look groomed. Is this term too limiting?
- Yes! Having more pieces of land to grow produce is vital. Who will it feed? Non-profits?
- Great idea! Is it possible to allow larger greenhouses w/o a building permit? 108ft2 isn't a lot of space to try and grow year round.
- What are your metrics to identify a 'safe' parcel of land to grow food on?
- Article 25 #mow2grow Yes to #1
- Food on any parcel including front "lawns" is an important step
- better defn of safe & maintained wrt to water
- Yes residents should have every right to grow & share home grown foods/produce.
- Yes! But what does "safe" mean?
- Great idea! Would like to see greenhouses included in this.
- Total support for idea.

Board 2: Opportunities for small-scale urban farming

Opportunity: Can small-scale urban farming be allowed outdoors on vacant land or on some of the open landscaped areas around residential, commercial or industrial buildings?

Current rules: There are no rules for small-scale urban farming in Calgary.

Possible idea: Allow small-scale urban farming on vacant land and on landscaped areas of developed land and allow limited 'farm gate' sales with a permit (subject to existing bylaws, regulations and guidelines).

What do you think of this idea?

- "Farm Gate Sale" defined by AB Ag. This is not a farm.
- Consider: Potentially contaminated sites due to previous use.
- Farm Gate Sales - from the farm itself; whole fruits & veg to anyone purchasing; products such as eggs only to final consumer not businesses.
- Yes BUT must remove barriers for farmers. For example easy & low cost permits. Partnering with community gardens could be beneficial.
- Also include Fruit orchards
- Should be allowed on school grounds also.
- Fully YES. Every lot/area has the potential to be a market garden. No restrictions other than safe food handling that already exist.



- School and institutional programs/incentive
- Yes
- Great idea for plants. Save our animals. No animals. Lets grow food not grass.
- Yes!! As an urban farmer this would generate many more opportunities to make a decent living at it. Farm gate sales are already so small, it would be inefficient/counter-active to require a permit for this.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes! Put land to use!
- totally! Allow these initiatives to happen
- Yes lets grow food not grass
- GOOD IDEA TO ALLOW URBAN FARMING!
- Define urban farming: do you mean plants & animals, or only plants? Or plants and bees? If animals are included, which?
- 100% urban farming is happening no matter what.
- Yes
- In agreement, should be allowed and should need permit for sales. Unsure how feel about animal farming.
- I do not like "limited" farm gate sales - should allow veggies/fruits/egg/even meat to be easily accessible to the Calgary market.
- Yes
- Yes!
- Yes
- If it is already happening, why not catch up with bylaw?
- define residential - condo? Apt? but like idea.
- Absolutely.
- Yes!
- YES
- for plants only. No animals.
- Yes - strongly encourage this on commercial or high-rise residential. Would like to see it mandated that a min % of land is dedicated to urban farming & commercial owners foot cost of testing/mitigating soil quality.
- better to grow food then the weeds and garbage currently on vacant lots. Permits should be minimal cost to low income.
- I want chickens in my backyard! Calgary is so progressive in other ways, why are we lagging behind on this??
- How can we publicly identify quality of soil, lots that would contribute to farming success? Is information on lot history publicly available. Is there incentives to invest in this land long term from a farmer's perspective?

- Not in favour of permit. Am wondering why you're regulating sales at its most common denominator. Make a biz classification - urban farmer. Then expect them to farm gate sell.
- Only on privately owned, non residential land. Public land - ie. public schools, city, etc., should only be open for food use as school or community gardens as these are accessible by all citizens.
- Great idea. Should be allowed to have larger greenhouses.
- Don't limit small scale farming to "outdoor". Allow small scale garage/basement farming.
- Remove all barriers to small scale urban farming.
- Would also like to see 'boulevards' adjacent to private land put into use as long as line of sight is not obstructed for traffic and people.
- I want chickens in my back yard.
- Small scale urban farming is a solid approach to food security. Our young and not so young have forgotten how to "feed themselves" That is food insecurity. We need this.
- Great idea. What 'vacant' land would be considered?
- Good - willing to have my backyard planted to vegetables in future
- Who decides if vacant land can grow food that gives profit to grower?
- What is small scale? How do you ensure that the price of goods is accessible to citizens at large?
- I see so much vacant land that could be used for growing food! Front yards, large parks, almost every space should be fair game.
- Compassionate & commercial urban ag efficient scale.
- Yes, caution about what's involved in permitting system. Could make it harder rather than easier.
- 2 points to consider. 1 - Who looks at city parcel's history. Should the city be involved. 2 - Should city create a database for info.
- 1% of parks should be allowed for urban farming. A 6 foot section around a park would allow for thousands of vegetables with little impact on park space
- Future plans for the vacant land needs to be part of overall planning - places to grow food need to be allotted ___% amount of space in city planning
- Idea - yes!! Commercial sales from urban ag where would this be allowed?
- Great idea! Temporary installations could be moved from vacant lots around the city once the lots are ready for development
- Tax break on developers who facilitate site use for 3-5-10 years! Great idea!
- Good idea. How to make sure that the person who plants gets the harvest if it is on vacant land. Garden theft is real.
- Agree. What land use designations would it be allowed for? What is the definition of "vacant land"? I would not allow sales on site, only growing. Include container farming!
- Who would be looking after water requirements and possible reclamation costs? Great idea!
- Yes. We should grow food almost everywhere the city mowing grass except well used sports fields. The city mows acres of grass. Plant fruit trees instead of elms etc.
- Why limit farm gate sales? Lose the permit.



- Access to potable water? Priority during water restrictions? Other water harvesting options? Safety?
- Yes. Urban agriculture needs to be encouraged.
- No different than a garden. No need to license something that doesn't need permits. More taxes?
- Yes. This will bring citizens closer to food and improve food habits.
- How about property tax break on speculated developer land to encourage urban farming? Yes.
- Why does the City have to make money off the poor?
- Thank you for recognizing small-scale urban farming.
- Yes! Make sure other bylaws don't conflict but, rather, align.
- Sounds great. Would be curious what is meant by "small-scale".
- Permits are barriers to marginalized groups. Consider accessibility & equity.
- Fully support this.
- Yes small urban farms should be allowed.
- Urban farms already exist. There are many. Help us. Don't regulate us out of fear- empower us to make Calgary awesome.
- Understand farming is not currently a \$\$\$ biz in #yyc. It can be but be weary not to limit farmers by having licensing cost or site use fees.
- Understand water usage. Ensure this is included in some fashion in the bylaw. Fully support!
- AGREE!! Perennial food gardens should be considered as well.
- Yes! Limited how & why? Careful about making regulations too strict, vague, confusing, expensive.
- Farm-gate permit? Why? And who is regulating? Why not allow a business class of urban farm and include the cost of a "permit" in the license?
- Love it! Any restrictions on location vs. type of ag? Heavy chemical inputs getting into stormwater? Noisy machinery at inappropriate times etc.
- What about bylaws limiting the use of chemical fertilizers & pesticides - can organic practices be a part of the 'safe' definition
- Subsidies or tax breaks would be great as we know there's not much money in vegetables

Board 3: Community Gardens

Opportunity: It's not clear where community gardens can be built and which developments they can be combined with; should we allow them everywhere?

Current rules: Although not explicitly written, community gardens are included in our city's definition of 'a park', so they can be established almost anywhere in Calgary.

Possible idea: Define 'community garden' in writing and list it in the land use bylaw; this would make people more aware of the community garden option and residents/developers might build more of them as part of new developments.

What do you think of this idea?



- I think this is fantastic! Even better to allow some nominal sales from community gardens so these groups can maintain the infrastructure needs & potentially even pay a staff person to help manage & maintain the gardens so they can operate effectively eg. many gardens don't have space for tools etc. & have poor compost because no one is incentivised to manage it properly.
- As community gardens are in definition of the park - pay for city staff/contractors to help maintain, make compost accessible, etc. to help remove barriers to people.
- Community gardens placed in diversity of areas such as schools, green spaces, mini street sides (like in Montreal), possibly industrial areas if it works for the people that work there.
- Might add to confusion with so many other details to consider in land use regulations.
- YES
- Yes, but don't want to create unnecessary red tape for potential community gardens. Make it approachable!
- Give developers credits for including them.
- "Might build" isn't good enough. These need to be strongly incentivised through tax breaks to developers and residents. Allow everywhere including condo patios and rooftops.
- Yes, but is it safe to grow food in areas with lots of pollution say by factories
- don't just include & allow - encourage & facilitate - or even require in new developments. Gardens are good.
- Where should be clearly defined
- Include in Municipal Development Plan?
- Depends on where, parkland is best
- Community gardens is great to help feed the homeless but respect the land
- mandate a certain space or % of food growing area/trees in new communities
- Yes
- Do it.
- CA process is long & arduous - difficult to gain residential consent - streamline
- Yes, everywhere allowing citizens to farm & grow increases appearances & green spaces w/o cost
- YES
- define & actively promote these
- YES!
- Love it! More of it!
- TOO MUCH REGULATION, TOO MUCH RED TAPE.
- Schoolyards too? Great educational & community potential.
- CA sites/school sites (combined efforts)
- I do encourage more community gardens. If a defined use and bylaw encourages that, then I agree, but may not be needed.
- Yes



- A CG in a loc of a community should not be allowed to be blocked by minority descent ie. Fairview, Crescent Heights
- Emphasis grassroots organization, development & operation by citizens...not allotment gardens run by individuals hired to manage them
- Need definition first, then deal with land use bylaw. Best thing about my community is the community garden. Encourage more.
- Yes to community gardens. Please move this forward. Great way to build community and tear down "walls". We - all humans - must eat
- Allotments or communal vs individual plots But yes!!! & schools/gov
- Ensure it is also allowed to sell produce from community gardens on city and public lands. That can support a local food system. Create subsidies to support creation of more.
- Yes. Communal & accessible to all socio-economic speres & regions of the city
- Yes - sharing awareness of community gardens is good for mental and physical wellness!
- Incentivize developers to plan for community gardens.
- Some funding in this area would be great!
- Would this be for all land uses? What about industrial?
- Yes
- Defintion is important first step. What is relationship b/w the City and community associations for groups that administer gardens?
- Yes as long as defining promotes instead of complicates development of more community gardens
- creates unnecessary restrictions. Don't regulate what doesn't need to be regulated. Let people grow food.
- Interesting but will this restrict residents options of sites available? Will developer collect insight about wants/needs of residents?
- Yes please be sure to consult Janet Melrose when guidelining all aspects of community gardens.
- Yes they should be allowed and mandated as a % of greenspace.
- What about communal gardens would they be covered under the same definition?
- Yes community/communal gardens should be allowed everywhere but def should include opportunities for urban farming with the community/developers
- Success can be enhanced through integrating rain water capture off roofs, having a shed/greenhouse to start seeds, etc. Implications?
- With the definition, include examples of the range/type of community/communal gardens.
- Will defining cg create more of a barrier in some communities
- Yes to more spaces for community gardens as long as there are succession/maintenance plans in place.
- Allow more latitude in community garden management &aps. ie. collab. With urban farmer(s)/commercial operations.
- Should not be allowed to intefere with wildlife transit.
- Community gardens seem to come about in an organic way, when a group identifies a space & sufficient interest. They should be allowed everywhere. Developers should be required to include them in new devts.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Allow beehives in community gardens.
- Yes. Growing food in vacant spaces.
- Community garden: Any shared garden space operated by residents. Should be allowed everywhere.
- Yes - wait list in my community is 2 years. More support for these across the board.
- Would be wonderful if new developers planned for it especially since lots in new areas often too small for garden.
- Raising money (\$2500?) to cover insurance is a serious problem for a community garden. 32 beds \$30-50 per year rent.
- Yes.
- Insurance cost? Donating food? Beehives
- Does it change regulations around placing them? City should pre-approve areas for in-ground or orchard plantings. New communities/developments (land redeveloped) should be required to provide land/soil safe/sufficient for in ground growing at least in res./park/community spaces
- No sales of produce. % donation to feed marginalized Calgarians.
- Yes. Great idea.
- Can the city provide incentives to communities to have community gardens?

Board 4: Indoor commercial agriculture

Opportunity: Should commercial indoor food production be allowed in more places?

Current rules: Businesses can grow food indoors in industrial districts.

Possible idea: Should we define growing food indoors separately from other manufacturing uses and allow it in commercial districts as well?

What do you think of this idea?

- Yes, 100%! Especially for small-scale producers, close proximity to market makes a big difference. This could generate much more opportunity for aqua-ponics, hydro-ponics etc. that can be key players in expanding year-round opportunities for local food production.
- indoor production & processing go hand in hand
- Yes. Define separately & allow in more spaces.
- Need to distinguish between "Growing" and "Processing" - this will become very grey.
- YES
- Different then processing what about aquaculture
- Fish processing aquaponics
- Yes. Too many restrictions in current land use definitions.
- YES!!! Currently in this situation.
- Yes.



- Yes. May not necessarily want to grow food in industrial areas due to dust/emissions from neighbouring facilities. Allowing in commercial districts should be considered.
- No problem. Would they be taxed at different rate?
- Commercial yes industrial yes res/comm yes. Consider that many options for doing this already exist.
- Yes. Restaurants are already doing this by growing their herbs inhouse.
- Yes the law right now limits our company.
- perfect use of industrial/vacant warehouses for diverse industry/seasonal opportunity.
- Yes. Definitely it should be controlled separately w/ standards for health & safety.
- Should allow it anywhere restaurants and retail outlets are allowed.
- mechanical equipment and venting could be a concern.
- Yes.
- growing food indoors should be treated differently than manufacturing. Should be allowed more widely.
- Yes - it should be allowed in residential as well - for small scale - at least for farmers market sales - make it clear. (You can can food at home. Why not grow it too?)
- Yes. I am in agreement to have food manft. defined separately then other manufacturing, and allow it in commercial areas.
- YES, DEFINE AND ALLOW MORE.
- YES
- Yes
- Yes. Allow & encourage (incent) growing indoor food in any zoning industrial commercial residential
- Certainly and mix residential and commercial. Why couldn't you shop from the growing site?
- More than commercial. All over Calgary!
- Could a developer develop food production building similar to multi commercial bay warehouses. In a commercial/industrial district?
- In order to facilitate more farming in urban spaces (where the people are) we need space to grow. Industrial commercial residential. See if it is required.
- Yes! We should expand the currently available space. Help with office vacancies?
- Yes different definition required & also details as to allowable scale
- Yes, definitely allow it in commercial districts! Concerned that developing food growing indoors as a separate function will interfere with innovation & flexibility - what rules would they have to follow?
- Why not. Includes: aquaponics, hydroponics, rooftop, "grow ops" with growlights
- rooftop gardens are an excellent idea as well as commercial spaces - Calgary needs to be more sustainable especially as it grows.
- It is already allowed in certain zones. Allow for commercial as well as residential under certain conditions. Eg. like home based business. Is container farming indoor farming, urban farming or both?
- Yes, focus this to recapture commercial wastes like heat & grey water
- Yes, rooftop, courtyard etc. Should be required in denser multifamily area & green roofs in commercial zones



- In any district. Matter of scale. Basement/garage.
- This should be allowed in any district! Is it possible to reduce restrictions on home operated business using a garage? Most startups can't afford the development permits to legally operate out of the garage.
- Yes. We need to utilize all our space and not continue to expand our foot print. Might need different regulations.
- Concerns of infrastructural & energy requirements of indoor farms. Sustainable, scalable complement to food production? Maybe.
- Growing food indoors should be allowed in all food-safe areas! (individually & commercially)
- Yes, indoor commercial agriculture should be allowed to reduce carbon foot print.
- Yes
- Do not place any more barriers on sustainability for food production, allow for diversification.
- In any district - not just commercial.
- Full integration of urban ag ultimate goal
- Open it up. Whatever works residential too...
- Allow in commercial districts too. Consider enabling opportunities on school grounds too.
- If it is for local consumption to bring down costs, yes.
- Liberate production! Yes. Diversify food production.
- Yes. I imagine consideration for type of production & impact on infrastructure/neighbours may be necessary. Could also be fine in res.
- Yes, should be allowed everywhere, perhaps limiting scale for residential.
- Yes! Roof top gardens, see examples from Montreal.
- Yes - it helps with expanding local food production.
- Ye! Importing food is not a long-term solution for food security or healthy citizens.
- Yes - provide incentives for indoor commercial agriculture.
- Yes! Growing food indoors should be permissible in a number of spaces. Often larger scale industrial space isn't necessary.
- Capitalize on industrial ecology! Waste heat etc. can be used for food production.
- Allow food growing in commercial districts.
- Allow for food growing redefine
- Allow anywhere per food safety regulations. Home based businesses should be encouraged.
- Yes! Have to think about power & water usage implications. Also could build in energy/organic capture and reuse to guidelines.

Board 5: Food Processing

Opportunity: Food manufacturing is unique compared to other types of manufacturing because a provincial regulation requires it to be located away from landfills and sewage treatment plants.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Current rules: Food manufacturing is included in the same definition as other manufacturing businesses which means that there are no explicit land use bylaw rules that require it to be set back from landfills and sewage treatment plants.

Possible idea: Define food manufacturing separately in the land use bylaw with a rule that separates it from landfills and sewage treatment plants.

What do you think of this idea?

- yes
- yes
- yes.
- YES
- Yes
- Depends what scale of food processing. Farmers market sale vs. Lilydale.
- But, yes to small/medium scale.
- Consider food type (crop vs. livestock). It may not be helpful to improve restrictive setbacks for certain livestock operations if waste stream must feed into sewage treatment.
- Why needed if Province already covers? MGA.
- Yes
- Yes
- yes
- Municipal, city owned facilities should be available for rent/use by communities and group
- yes
- If covered provincially the no need. What is needed is to clearly identify locations of sewage and landfill to applicants who identify as food business.
- How would set-backs be determined? What has been shown to be "safe" for growing food?
- Too generic. This should be consulted with the Provincial groups/agency to assess risk. Shouldn't be city who decides.
- Yes. Clear law and instruction to interested parties.
- Yes.
- Yes
- Keep food production away from sewage & landfills.
- Unless data shows that this is a problem, might be better is do nothing & focus efforts on other areas of the bylaw
- I guess I wonder what the point is? Who benefits?
- I have trouble imagining issues related to current landfills & sewage treatment plants & manufacturing. Current rule seems effective.
- Water is an issue! So only if it can be done responsibly.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Yes, please!
- This might create other barriers
- I agree with having a separate category for food mfg since there are different rules. Better communication of requirements would result.
- As a start. Are there ways to make small-scale 'manufacturing' easier more attainable esp. outside industrial areas? Mobile chicken slaughtering for backyard chickens comes to mind
- Only if being done "inground" and there are concerns of soil contamination. Otherwise why?
- This is probably not as restrictive as it might seem. May not be worth the effort.
- Not sure if this is an important step to ensure safe/hygenic food manufacturing. Why is this important to city?
- Food processing should not be treated as unique. Might create new barriers.
- A processing operation is not nec. 'industrial' & would be at scale accomm. In a community association hall - pending health regs.
- If there are current risks/concerns, yes, but not worth overcomplicating things w/ more regulations.
- Geography does not determine food safety.
- Please manage setback distance somehow. Enable safe food manufacturing.
- Strong regulation on waste handling.
- Yes.
- Yes. Are there reasonable & quantified reasons for concern regarding this zoning definition. IF not, why more regulation?
- Not worth the effort as this will only happen once in a blue moon. AHS regs for food processing already covers any risk.
- needs to be kept healthy and safe especially if given to low income persons or if sold.
- Can we differentiate between meat processing and vegetable processing?

Board 6: Extensive Agriculture

Opportunity: Livestock can graze and food can be grown outside on land in the city that is yet to be developed for urban purposes, but should small greenhouses and buildings also be allowed pending urban development?

Current rules: Most extensive agricultural activities are expected to take place outdoors and not inside of buildings.

Possible idea: Refine the rules to allow small greenhouses, agricultural buildings and animal shelters as part of extensive agriculture on undeveloped land.

What do you think of this idea?

- yes
- YES
- very important for green house due to short growing season



- consider: the potential of contaminated sites, previous use of the site.
- For meat: I would like local, portable, butchers to reduce stress of animal transport & avoid feedlots & industrial meat growing systems.
- Fully YES
- Great idea but our season is too short.
- Yes! With standards for new buildings for eco features such as passive solar orientation.
- Yes allow greenhouses and also consider beehives and cold frames.
- What about commercial aquaculture? It can be done indoors & recirculate the water.
- We need to research best practices. How other cities are doing this!
- GOOD IDEA.
- Put this land to work!
- Use should be limited to temporary.
- Yes
- Yes greenhouses are key in this climate.
- Absolutely! As long as it meets health standards that are reviewed and observed frequently.
- Yes
- I agree, great use of land temporarily.
- Yes, this is a great opportunity to connect more of the population to the food system & educate about how our food is/can be grown in AB.
- yes!
- Yes
- A FARM IS DIFFERENT THAN A SMALL SCALE GARDEN ON A VACANT LOT. EXTENSIVE AG. IS FARMING. WE DON'T NEED TO REGULATE GARDENS.
- YES USE ALL LAND!
- As long as people or companies making investment know its temporary.
- Yes. Timeline should be developed and adhere to, in order to eliminate dispute. I build a greenhouse and tomorrow the land has to be developed.
- Yes
- YES
- Must encourage organic practices. We should stay away from allowing unsustainable practices.
- Limit to the s-fud designation - cannot go from "urban" back to s-fud, ie. pre-urban.
- Yes! w/appropriate community consultation to avoid negative response.
- Access to irrigation water?
- Sounds good.
- Yes.
- Allow small greenhouses for close to year-round local growing.
- Yes!
- Yes! Limiting activity to outdoors is unnecessarily restrictive.



- Use "backyard hens" pilot from Edmonton as basis for further exploration.
- Yes
- Yes
- Would need to allow for a fair warning if development was going to happen so buildings could be moved.
- Yes - as long as the growing methods are safe. What urban farms will be engaged in determining what is safe?
- Yes to greenhouses, with caution & slowly with livestock to ensure a positive outcome.
- Must it be restricted to undeveloped lands? Backyards, comm. Gardens (parks), roofs, etc.
- How would people/business acquire the permission to use the undeveloped space? Great idea! Could have many mobile units that could be moved from site to site.
- Agree. How will people access the undeveloped land? Utilities. Ensure environmental impact on wildlife is clear.
- What is the city's plan to benefit/encourage homeowners to grow and get rid of worthless lawn.
- Absolutely, as most structures can be moved & re-setup elsewhere. In the meantime the land can be used productively.
- If this reduces the overall tax - residential - absolutely
- Agriculture should be allowed with certain health promoting parameters for animal husbandry
- Animals require shelter from elements
- Great idea - water, gas, electric?
- Excellent idea
- Yes.
- OMG YES!!!
- In AB climate, we should always consider our indoor options as well.
- Greenhouses should be allowed in order to extend our Calgary gardening season.
- YES need more local greenhouse production
- Yes.
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes to greenhouse.
- Yes

Board 7: Intensive Agriculture

Opportunity: Although it is a listed development, there is currently no definition of what intensive agriculture is – should we define it?

Current rules: Intensive agriculture is undefined but can only be approved by Council via a public hearing.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Possible idea: Define intensive agriculture and include in its definition feedlots, animal barns, etc., but let it remain as a development that can only be approved by Council.

What do you think of this idea?

- I'm not sure it is necessary to define, but keep it w/ council approval.
- Definition should be multiple ones.
- I'm not sure I fully understand how this functions currently. I would be careful about how to define intensive ag. Animal barns may not need to be included as it may still be very small scale ie. define in a way to benefit/reduce red tape for these small-scale/hobby farmers.
- DEFINE BUT PRESCRIBE LEVELS OF INTENSITY?
- Would need to consult industry experts if intensive ag includes livestock.
- Yes. Often they should be regulated w/ different standards & scale of rules/bylaws. Especially if used for profit.
- I agree but let the public speak on what's right. Consult Alberta Agriculture.
- Should be broadened to be part of a permit process and not restricted to Council approval. Modern small scale intensive is far more accessible than a large feed lot. Ex. Rabbits, chickens, fish.
- There needs to be a definition.
- MAKE IT EASY FOR LAND TO BE USED.
- YES
- Seems like a limited opportunity. Do current rules need to change?
- So many things count as intensive, including marijuana grow-ops (legal or otherwise). How about hydroponics? Definition would be a very good thing - consult with U of C and others.
- Should be defined to differentiate from less intensive agriculture. This would allow for council only to be involved when necessary.
- yes
- Can this change be done in a timeless manner. Intensive can change on future trends.
- yes
- Important to define volume sq ft, type of agriculture, type of practice.
- Consult with Alberta Agriculture.
- This is a hot topic. Intensive animal operations may be a problem. Intensive permaculture gardening is desirable. Define animals & gardens separately.
- If it's considered a development, maybe create specific zones for it.
- Must specify animals or plants. Intensive plant agriculture desirable. Intensive animal agriculture is completely undesirable.
- Recirculating Aquaculture Systems (R.A.S.) should be given extra consideration.
- Yes - make it easier for "non-intensive" agriculture to move forward.
- Yes
- Definition needed before deciding how to manage



- Feedlots - No! Smells - unhealthy resulting food not really fit for consumption
- Must be context sensitive - smells - noise
- Yes but no. Encourage more intensive farming like food forests with special approval. Whereas feedlots should not be encouraged & should be not included with food forests in defn.
- Yes
- Define it as low impact vs intensive. Allow low impact agriculture anywhere.
- Yes - define intensive agriculture and also define types of intensive agriculture that do not require council approval.
- Just allow agriculture in the city, Residential should be allowed small scale/urban farming (both indoor & outdoor w/o a permit). Commercial/industrial land could be permitted for larger operations.
- Remove intensive & extensive...just agriculture.
- Sure, why not?
- Be careful of feed lots within the city unless carefully regulated and monitored. Should ensure no groundwater contamination and gas should be captured.
- No disagree. Just call it agriculture.
- We just need to be careful not to restrict too much.
- Confused b/w intensive & extensive agriculture
- Yes!
- Feedlots seems like a trigger word like tractors for urban farming
- Lets use regenerative agriculture as a category. I.e. soil health no chemicals.
- Thanks for distinguishing, between intensive and extensive. Makes it easier for communities to know what they are getting.
- Yes, same for: small scale urban farming, extensive agriculture, indoor commercial farming
- Intensive sounds like a terrible practice
- Aquaculture ought to be redesignated outside of livestock. Application matters.
- Seems to be creating an additional hoop for people to jump thru. Spin farming is intensive - would this need to be council approved?
- Definition - first step.
- Yes, create a definition for intensive agriculture
- What is difference between extensive and intensive?
- Include Stampede as intensive & get Stampede barns off of the river bank as per Alberta environment rules
- Should be defined and council should have clear guidelines so everyone has an understanding
- Yes, if this is intended as a way of separating from other more easily permissible activities like growing produce or raising a few chickens
- Needs to be defined and have clear guidelines
- Can this be combined with extensive agriculture as one category?
- Yes only with public input
- Perhaps define and provide levels of intensification - feedlots & animals barns highest level



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Board 8: Urban Grazing

Opportunity: There is a lot of city-owned land where weeds and grass can be managed by livestock grazing.

Current rules: Livestock grazing in the city is regulated by the 'Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw' and is generally not allowed.

Possible idea: Allow The City to use livestock to manage weeds and grass on city-owned land.

What do you think of this idea?

- No! Who manages livestock? Feces in storm water!!
- YES! Thank you! Rotational grazing will be important along with winter accomodation.
- Yes, allow.
- I totally agree to let livestock graze on city own property but who takes care of them would be my concern.
- What is the cost of animal management vs mowers, etc?
- I do wonder where livestock comes from and who takes care/manages them?
- Doesn't the City already have goats? More things like this need to happen. Chickens are another excellent plant manager.
- Agree, if full life cycle costing shows net benefit.
- No. Who takes care of animals?
- Good management alternative to chemical or non-chem systems.
- Yes. Managed, intensive grazing (see Alan Savory) can greatly improve soil, water absorbsion & plant diversity.
- GOOD IDEA.
- Yes.
- This is a fantastic idea. Goats?
- Absolutely!
- Chickens should be permitted! But regulated.
- Yes, no brainer. Would private enterprise be invited to graze or city managed herds?
- Yes!
- Who would deal with feces issues & complaints? Run off into storm drains? Rivers?
- Chicken Tractors
- Yes, efficient & natural.
- YES
- Yes! I imagine the pilot went well - why wouldn't this be expanded & capitalized on.
- Yes. Efficient. What type of city owned land would be able to use this?
- Why not?
- Yes. Reduce pesticide use and realize urbanites share the planet with animal world
- What about the bees?



- Better than chemicals if animals controlled
- My only concern is fencing.
- How does this cost compare to existing systems? How would this affect employment (previous system vs. proposed?)
- Yes! Swiss cows, common in urban fields produce wonderful organic milk.
- I like the idea.
- Absolutely.
- Get out the goats. Scapegoat already.
- City should allow to livestock grazing on city property
- Yes! May have to limit ie. sheep, goats & other smaller animals. Guidelines for safety?
- Urban chickens please!
- Save money on herbicides. Let goats eat the weeds!
- Also consider planting types of plants/flowers that are lower maintenance & benefit wildlife
- Yes
- Allow citizens to grow food on city-owned land
- Yes
- Better than chemicals, but only sheep/goats
- If this can reduce costs/energy associated w/ other management techniques
- Yes! Improves fertility and reduces herbicide use!
- Yes!
- Yes. Not just an option for the City. How can private business/landowners take advantage of this approach.
- Yes! This would be useful especially around community gardens and schools.
- Yes, already common outside of Calgary. Animals grazing instead of mowing & spraying. Is it cheaper than mowing & spraying.
- Good idea
- Yes. How can a private service do the same? Interested.
- Great idea. Need to ensure animal safety. Great around community spaces.
- Yes. Goats in Nose Hill. Work with nature, not against.
- I want chickens in my yard. Why is this still not allowed??
- Great idea for goat and like animals
- Yes. Encourage grazing animals in utility corridors
- Backyard chickens

Board 9: Growing food on boulevards

Opportunity: Can I grow food on a boulevard (the city-owned land between the sidewalk/curb and a residential property line)?

Current rules: The 'Streets Bylaw' requires permission from The City.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

Possible idea: Put in place rules that allow residents to garden on boulevards without the need of official permission.

What do you think of this idea?

- Not sure this appropriate for food. Flowers & trees maybe.
- Promoting food for pests (skunks, mice, etc.)
- Yes
- No
- Yes
- Official permission should be a streamlined application - there may be areas where growing food isn't appropriate or creates risks to pedestrians & drivers.
- Yes. Reduce the need for infrastructure/upkeep, ie. grass cutting/watering of grass/herbicide application.
- Consider: contaminated land sites as potential risk.
- No!
- This would be a great start to allowing more urban Ag. on city property - which is necessary & has so much potential for +ve economic impact! Fully support.
- Yes
- Yes and further more create curb cutouts to harvest runoff to self water perennials. All boulevard trees could be fruit trees or nut.
- No - too much potential for interfering with traffic - both street and pedestrian. Also too open for damage by passing traffic.
- Yes
- Also, curb cuts for water management. Ex. Brad Lancaster Portland. Salt tolerant selections.
- YES
- Consider "curb cuts", divert rainwater from streets. Allow settling of sediment and grow food at once.
- Yes. Food not grass. Rules should indicate that food not grown on public land is public food, to avoid conflict over ownership.
- Would this food be safe to eat if grown by a busy road?
- For sure, good use of residential land and cut the red tape.
- No. If road widening or city needs to dig it up will be issues & PR nightmare.
- Yes, more beauty/diversity with food and native pollenators. As long as beautiful and managed.
- Woodbox (13th AV SW Beltline) restaurant requested to plant Gooseberry and Apple trees instead of Elm on boulevard and its working!
- Will homeowners complain that the boulevard space has been ruined by snow plows etc?
- Yes. Boulevards in spring can be littered with road debris.
- Yes, residents will be invested in their public space.
- Yes, will help w/ placemaking & community growing.



- Please consider the impact to existing plants in place. How does the city maintain the area around the growing area.
- YES! GRASS IS A WASTE OF RESOURCES.
- Yes - boulevards ARE public space. Love the idea that residents can take action themselves to improve the wasteful lawn with food, pollinator gardens, native plants, etc. - would love a ideal guideline such as avoiding synthetic herbicides/pesticides/fertilizers, etc.
- City please plant food in public gardens & fruit and nut trees on public land & blvds.
- Already do & its wonderful
- Plant more fruit trees
- People grow flowers already w/o permission. Just grow food.
- Yes. Encourage/subsidize a variety of fruit trees. Encourage gardens that capture water!
- Must be chemical free
- Chemical free. Hire urban farmers to create safe healthy systems. Let us store carbon in the soil - carbon tax
- Yes - residents only and only non commercial & only if well regulated in terms of maintenance
- Remove all barriers to front yard gardens! Fruit trees on city parks.
- Boulevards are in everyones visual space. What if people don't maintain? And - experience, not joking - food theft is very common from trees & bushes
- Yes - make permission accessible by community census
- Yes but need to have guidelines about what should or could be grown an check soil quality
- Yes, but agree it needs to be a chemical free activity
- Yes! How does this relate to growing on front yards. Also...not just food...can beautify in other ways too.
- Be aware of watering requirement. Is there safe access to potable water for irrigation? (Can't have hoses etc run all over from water sources)
- City needs to monitoring this - else risk is that people may start gardens with enthusiasm but may not take care of the garden, leaving a mess behind.
- Yes
- Yes
- Why not?
- Need more specific guidelines
- Should be allowed. But if an area is used one year & not the next who is responsible for making sure it looks ok - registry system?
- Should fall under community garden bylaws
- City should lease an monitor city owned land to citizens
- Yes
- Yes, less grass, more food!
- Yes, because it reduces grass that needs maintenance.
- We need a way to enforce responsibility for caring & maintaining public land, if used for a garden.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Allow people to apply to grow on public land via an app or the cities website. All food grown on these spaces should be donated to local charity
- I would encourage a 'curb cut' bylaw for passive watering of boulevards.
- Yes! Or city should plant fruit trees on boulevards.
- Are there locations where this is not appropriate? Otherwise yes.
- Remove the barriers to local food production, less red tap.e
- No - people should need city permission for boulevards.
- If people understand regenerative agriculture that is what should be applied to boulevard. We have to keep it chemical free. Run off goes to our river and drinking water.
- Wonderful
- Yes

Board 10: 'Pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land

Opportunity: Can The City help promote local healthy food by allowing 'pop-up' food sales on city-owned land?

Current rules: There are currently no rules that allow 'pop-up' sales.

Possible idea: Allow temporary 'pop-up' local food sales on city-owned land when permission is given by The City.

What do you think of this idea?

- Pop up food sales are Regulated by Alberta Health Services. All food sales required to follow food safety requirements.
- The City should not "blanket" allow this!
- Yes. Helps get food to people!
- Is there water & electricity provided to vendors?
- Perfect! Use iron containers for these pop-up sales.
- Yes
- I don't think they should be sales. They would need heavy regulations at too high expense. Trade would be ideal.
- Yes - what a great extension of "farm-gate" sales for the small-scale urban farmer or food-biz. This would also greatly help to enhance access to healthy food for consumers.
- Yes
- Could we raise chicken for free free range eggs but all go vegetarian
- This doesn't align with other city departments: licensing & transit for example.
- How about also post signage on these sites and include on a webpage so everyone can find these impromptu markets!
- YES
- Yes



- Yes, I'd like to see this.
- YES
- Yes, maybe create conducive market areas.
- Yes
- Awesome idea.
- YES
- Yes. Totally.
- Define "Pop Up"
- Yes! And there should be an hourly fee or one time/use fee that is less than \$100 for local (100km) produce products of 50% of retail
- Yes
- Yes.
- Yes. How would it be regulated?
- Yes
- More incentives for making diverse cultural beauty. Good for small scale farmers as well.
- Good idea.
- Yes but pop up needs definition
- Good idea, allow on private land too!
- Yes
- Yes! Define "temp" though.
- Yes, please also consider restriction by AB Health. This will properly mostly be fresh raw veges.
- Yes. Make permission easy & v. low-cost
- Yes & don't require licenses.
- Yes allow pop ups
- \$700 to buy a permit to sell at "pop-up" food sites for local food grown outside Calgary. Is that right?
- Pair w/ other pop-up retail/activities
- The Wandering Farmer was a project of U of C EVDS that did get permission to sell food on public land - precedence?
- Or just encourage more use of community farmers markets
- Let's empower our citizens to access local food - and local commerce more easily.
- Absolutely! But should be at least predominantly locally produced - not bananas!
- Absolutely c-train stas. Libraries, public parks etc.
- Sounds great. What/who is local? Permission process should be simple and appropriately priced if necessary.
- Yes, more access to healthy food in a car-centric city is needed. No food deserts in Calgary please! Innovative, low cost solutions are needed.
- Yes, the gazebo on 17th Ave SW on thinks
- What does permission achieve?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- YES!!
- Yes
- As long as its "locally grown"! No BC fruit or California produce.
- Designated sites/times that don't require permission (like busker spots)
- Yes! Designate areas where you can sell without permit or cheap permit
- Yes!!
- Yes!!! (Permit?)
- YES!
- Yes! Make sure permission is an easy process
- Great Idea - permit? If so needs to be affordable. Great CED opportunity.
- Yes. Food safety and clear/true food labelling must be controlled though.
- Absolutely! Lots of great opps. Especially in neighbourhoods w/ limited access to grocery stores.
- Sure -we need more farmers markets in areas that people can access
- Yes!
- What would be considered local food? What about temporary pop up sales on non-city owned land. Is it currently allowed?
- Yes
- With cities permission, yes
- Great idea! This could be very successful if it is easy to obtain permission or the permit to sell. Yes!
- Yes, farmers market style, following those rules.
- Support! Need latitude from food inspectors to make it manageable for sellers.
- Yes! Fun summer activity.
- Yes!
- Yes pop-up transit markets! Downtown produce "food trucks"

Board 11: An 'Agriculture Land Use District'

Opportunity: Should The City have a land use district or zone to accommodate permanent agricultural uses within city boundaries?

Current rules: Low impact or 'extensive agricultural uses' are allowed, such as crops and animal grazing, but new permanent agricultural developments such as large barns or greenhouses are not permitted.

Possible idea: Create a new 'Agriculture Land Use District' so that land can be used for permanent agricultural activities.

What do you think of this idea?

- Yes, take advantage of large grass spaces that we waste money mowing & spraying chemicals on. For example imagine grazing goats all along STONEY trail where there are large open spaces. Partner with schools! Children could learn & experience & help raise animals! So many opportunities.
- GOOD IDEA.
- Any approach that will allow to support agriculture in urban setting! Yes.
- Yes - this would allow for food production year round (greenhouse)
- Yes - I don't see it happening much in residential areas, but could be similar to have these parcels with the city
- Yes. Some areas should be multi-zoned to allow rooftop gardens in dense zones.
- This is such an important step towards resiliency of a local food system. It could be combined with market space
- How would space allotted be managed? If I build a greenhouse, I want to ensure I need not move it in a few years. Would a "100 year lease" be an option, where by I would purchase the lease, and sell what remained when I no longer wanted it?
- If animals are to be raise for grazing or food? They should be free range & ethically treated.
- I think this has to be elevated or more discussion on it.
- I think this is needed. The city area needs to provide more of its own food needs.
- I think a redesign of AG zoned lands development for agricultural purposes is essential.
- One zone? No. One district? No. Many = YES. Basically anywhere the other uses are being considered can also be considered for permanent
- Would this be MR? open space? Would it impact the parks system?
- Yes. I think allowing a broader suite of Ag activities w/in city limits would greatly benefit Calgary's food syst. & enhance opportunity, innovation & resilience.
- No. A city needs to have certain density to make other infrastructure viable.
- Could it be expressed as a % of land within city limits? Would encourage several hubs.
- I am concerned of the potential implications of this, but like the idea of more greenhouses.
- Unique sought after areas with this infrastructure (Greenhouse/barn farm) creates great areas all over city limits.
- YES!
- No. Different from parkland? Who buys land? Is it given to City by developers?
- If chickens are restricted then restrict dog size and # to. No? then chickens are fine in backyards. No permits.
- The Stampede has land use for agriculture.
- Current rules are good, add larger animal opportunities in districts (chickens anywhere is good). Backyard chickens are good!
- Yes, great use of City of Calgary golf courses & unused green belts
- Are all neighbourhoods considered equal?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- If there is no intended use for the land it is better to use it for regenerative agricultural purposes. Newcomers to Calgary are surprised by the space. Some with agricultural background would love to make use of land in productive regenerative ways.
- The entire city should be an ag district. Grow everywhere.
- Calgary has been built on farmland...it was an "ag district"
- Ok but this may be hard to implement eg. scale of extensive ag. Should be allowed, no reason for urban/ag split. Noise & odor issues??
- May have to consider adjacent LU - eg. residential areas next intensive livestock operations?
- Yes, especially for greenhouses. Allow for emerging tech food production. Odors are a concern for land-based livestock.
- Not sure. How will this affect density & cost of housing? Don't make it too expensive.
- Yes! Including old parts of city too
- Yes
- No
- There was a designated green zone that was slowly eroded, would the same thing happen? Is there a demand for this? Is the vision not more little gardens all over? Would this limit ag. Activity to this area only.
- Yes, great idea! Also allow permanent agri. In industrial districts.
- Paves the way for a food hub good idea.
- Yes, but needs some detail. What types of ag & how does this fit within ex. Neighbourhoods ex. Industrial ag. Vs. low input/small scale.
- This would be great if there is a focus on efficient farming
- Would need to be done in consultation with residential neighbourhoods. Consult with Kelowna on their system.
- What would the land be suited for. More info.
- Maybe. What taxes could be expected for this.
- Yes, but is it realistic to expect the users can afford the Calgary property taxes.

Board 12: Breweries, wineries and distilleries

Opportunity: Now that The City has had some experience approving permits for breweries, wineries and distilleries, should they be allowed as a 'permitted use' (uses that are automatically approved if they meet city rules) in some industrial districts?

Current rules: They are currently considered 'discretionary use' in existing buildings (which means they can be approved or refused based on The City's discretion).

Possible idea: Move breweries, wineries and distilleries under permitted use bylaws in the I-G districts when in existing buildings.

What do you think of this idea?



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Yes! Encourage small business and affordable industry options for small scale production and sales.
- Yes! Keep production local.
- Yes
- Yes, competitive and fun market. New oppertunities for many.
- Yes.
- YES
- yes
- Yes
- YES.
- Yes
- YES
- Yes. This is currently one of the biggest economic drivers in Alberta - makes sense to expediate & simplify the process.
- I agree to it being a permitted use.
- No./maybe. 'parking' can be a problem in I.G.
- No need to limit to existing buildings. No need to limit to industrial. Consider the many successful brew pub examples.
- YES
- YES!
- YES
- Please! This will allow microbrewery and winery growth.
- Yes!
- Keep alcohol discretionary
- Yes.
- Is this a need to have or a nice to have. Big picture community benefit to be considered
- Yes - agree w/ comment about allowing multiple uses in industrial districts.
- Engage local producers. Make the connection to the booze and the local produce that can be used by these businesses.
- Yes industrial districts have space to accommodate space needed for breweries.
- Yes - this industry is booming in Alberta.
- Support
- Caution. Residentials down wind of brewery should have a voice in Yes/no. As Inglewood knows breweries are stinky.
- Yes they should
- So long as it doesn't stink up neighbourhood - we need more diversity.
- Would also like to see easier res/comm approval if certain additional requirements are met. (hours, size, etc.) Breweries are not necessarily "stinky" ...yeast factories perhaps
- Great composting opportunity.



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Yes, for industrial Lus. Makes sense!
- Some sort of community consultation process/invitation should happen.
- Allow the breweries and distilleries to work in strip malls.
- Yes!
- Yes. We need more mixed use buildings so allow this and also allow this to be in building with many other uses.
- Yes
- Yes

Board 13: Rooftop Greenhouses

Opportunity: Some developments provide few, if any, opportunities to grow food on the ground; should The City encourage rooftop greenhouses?

Current rules: Rooftop greenhouses are allowed but are included in a building's maximum height.

Possible idea: Exempt rooftop greenhouses from maximum building height.

What do you think of this idea?

- Yes! But must balance building design. Passive solar with insulated North wall better than gable style. Could potentially incorporate airflow into the building below in fall/spring/winter to pump hot air from greenhouse into the building as a source of heat
- OF COURSE!
- Yes
- Yes
- Great. Please consider the impact of having green house of garage/assessury building.
- Yes!
- Yes - this has many positive benefits & is an efficient use of space. As long as the building is able to support the additional load.
- Exempt existing buildings. Make new buildings design this height in from the beginning
- Encourage across all zones/uses incl res/comm/ind
- only in commercial & industrial? Good idea.
- Yes.
- Yes!!
- As there are already other exemptions (ex. mechanical), I agree.
- Yes, and non greenhouse growing.
- YES
- Not a blanket exemption but pending the size and height of the greenhouse due to structural components of the building (dirt and water are heavy!) So: mostly exempt



- I love the idea. Will consultants of some sort - professional or volunteer - be available to help implementation and maintenance?
- Yes
- Yes, good idea.
- Yes
- YES
- Good idea. Maybe promote and give incentives for green roof and rooftop raised bed gardens
- Yes! New city owned buildings should also be required to have green roofs
- Yes
- height limited based on guaranteeing solar access for neighbors
- Yes. I think that is a good idea.
- Yes - in all districts also allow/encourage rooftop gardens/raised beds/cold frames
- No to height exemption yes to greenhouse on roof
- Yes for commercial & multi-residential sites
- No. Next door roof top greenhouse will shade my outdoor garden and impair its growth
- Rooftop greenhouses are a great idea - but cannot be at the expense of building safety
- Green roofs or green houses or solar panels should be mandatory
- Absolutely! There is so much wasted rooftop space.
- Yes, main issues are water & weight. Rules need to be in place for that!
- Yes the City should examine it.
- Yes! Mesh this with community building through gardening and education integration.
- Yes
- Yes. Remove all regulatory barriers to farming within food safety guidelines.
- Need more info - does this relate to corporate or residential Calgary? Does City Hall have rooftop garden open to public?
- Support in theory.
- Agree
- Still needs to be esthetically pleasing (not too high)
- I think this depends on impact to surrounding buildings/res. Does a greenhouse block sun on a neighbours garden?
- Yes! Definitely exempt greenhouses
- Yes, if using rainwater great way to reduce volumes to deal with stormwater facilities
- Yes! We should be utilizing sunlight hrs we have for food production year round. Similar to Toronto and Montreal examples.
- I could see where this could be contentious. Eg. view sheds near waterfronts. Support in principle, but only in some districts.
- Yes, depending on greenhouse structure and the roof its going on
- Yes!



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

- Will this trigger landowners w/ at grade gardens requesting solar access be secured? Protected?
- Yes. Allow residential lots green houses on accessory building ie. garage. Lots are small as they are possible percent coverage of accessory building of green house.
- Lots of pragmatic limitations to rooftops. Structural retrofitting. Passive vs. heated costs. Climate, especially (?) of light.
- Maybe - often water intensive. Would want to see efficiency of system first!
- But make exempt from height regulations. If they're good systems.
- No changes for rooftop greenhouses.
- Yes - start with new developments.

Other comments left with the project team

- Leave the current situation regarding honey-bees as is.
- I know it's not going to happen now, but someday I hope urban chicken coops will be permitted in Calgary.
- Vancouver, Edmonton, Red Deer are all kicking Calgary's butt in regards to urban chickens!! Lets catch up.
- In regards to getting people to take action please look into community based social marketing instead of traditional education. See www.cbsm.com for more information. Amazing research & ways to implement programs that result in significant action.
- growing' impacts city visual space. Don't think we should regulate who can grow, but maybe non-fee citations would help regulate.
- Growing isn't always profit driven - a lot of these are commercial production. Need more discussion on small scale hobbyists
- What has been implemented elsewhere? Can't we just use their best practices?
- Remove all barriers to rainwater harvesting if there are any.
- City could benefit from a food growing resource person.
- Using greywater or rainwater for irrigation.
- A lot of these are for growes. What about hobbyists? Yard raised rabbits?

Email responses (identifying personal information has been removed)

Email 1

Neighbourhoods have a distinct character, which is both pleasing to the eye and the lifestyle of the residents. The substantial front landscaping, including grass, trees, other plantings, and seasonal flowers, etc., contributes much to the character of the community.

Changes to the Land Use Bylaw that impact established areas must be respectful of and sensitive to the character of the existing neighbourhoods. Proposing food growth in front yards and City boulevards without a size limit, does nothing to maintain the established residential character of our communities, nor conserve, or enhance, or preserve the established nature of the neighbourhoods. The short growing season would leave size-unregulated



Promoting Calgary's Local Food System

Report Back: What We Heard
December 22, 2016

plots subject to wind erosion causing dust, thus negatively impacting the use and enjoyment of neighbouring properties, and contribute to an unwelcome eyesore during much of the year.

Furthermore rooftop green houses in established residential areas must not exceed the maximum building height. Failing to control this will result in shadowing, loss of privacy and overlooking issues, especially since they will also serve as a rooftop balcony.

Email 2

Hi. I am unable to attend the presentation, but have read through the materials. We are supportive of creative ways of increasing sustainable food production, but have several concerns with the material. **These concerns relate specifically to their application in established low density residential areas:**

We do NOT support a blanket policy that encourages FRONT yards to be turned into vegetable gardens.

Doing so would create perpetual issues with dust, much like a neighbourhood that is under construction. Vegetable gardens have a very short growing season in Calgary, and the rest of the year they would be an eyesore. Front yards in established low density communities should be landscaped and maintained.

Rooftop green houses in established low density residential areas cannot exceed the maximum height for the building. Doing so could create privacy and overlooking issues as well as shadowing issues, depending on the construction materials and density of growth in the greenhouse.

Please make sure to include our concerns in your feedback to Council.

Email 3

We are supportive of creative ways of increasing sustainable food production, but have several concerns with the material. These concerns relate specifically to their application in established low density residential areas:

We do NOT support a blanket policy that encourages FRONT yards to be turned into vegetable gardens. Doing so would create perpetual issues with dust, much like a neighbourhood that is under construction. Vegetable gardens have a very short growing season in Calgary, and the rest of the year they would be an eyesore. Front yards in established low density communities should be landscaped and maintained. Companion gardening is most welcome where vegetable and fruit production is mixed with perennials in the landscaping so that soil is retained and aesthetics are maintained. This could take the form of inclusion in existing beds or restricting front food-production-only beds to a maximum size of 40 square feet so the entire front yard does not become a dirt pit.

Rooftop green houses in established low density residential areas cannot exceed the maximum height for the building. Doing so could create privacy and overlooking issues as well as shadowing issues, depending on the construction materials and density of growth in the greenhouse.

Please make sure to include our concerns in your feedback to Council.