

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Gordon Larmour <gord@jenesis.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 12:30 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Land UseAmendment LOC2017-0144 804 Sierra Morena Pl SW

I received a letter regarding this subject advising that a Mr R. Wright found citizen comments disturbing and not appearing to be accurate. I would like to be advised as to what comments were found to be disturbing and what is not accurate. Who is Mr R Wright? Please advise.

What I find disturbing is that a homeowner approximately thirty (30) meters from the house in question (804 Sierra Morena Pl SW) has yet to receive any notification from city hall regarding this matter. When I spoke with Mr Oching on May 28/17 at 9:15am I was assured that only persons living within the immediate area of 804 (his words) would have a say in any zoning change.

Last weeks letter also included an aerial photograph showing four vehicles parked adjacent to the property in question. The letter also stated that this neighbourhood did not have any parking restrictions. Perhaps this is because no rental suites are zoned for this neighbourhood.

The previous planning commission ruled this area as RC-1 and families purchased their homes in this area because of that by-law. If any person wanted to have a rental property, there are many semi-detached, multi-storied condos, assisted living quarters and in-fill homes in the surrounding areas.

Perhaps the applicant was not aware that the zoning did not have to be changed because she wanted her mother to visit?

Perhaps the applicant wants to open an Air bnb?

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to e-mail or call

Gordon Larmour
196 Sierra Morena Circle SW
403-242-2975
(Gord@jenesis.ca)

RECEIVED
2017 AUG 22 PM 2:15
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Smith, Theresa L.

From: jsieber1 <jindrasieber@telus.net>
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2017 12:52 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] CPC2017-286 submission for Sept. 11 Public Hearing

Dear City Councillors,

As a longtime resident and homeowner at 197 Sierra Morena circle I strongly oppose any attempt to re-designate the land use in our neighborhood at 804 Sierra Morena Place SW from Residential-Contextual One dwelling (R-C1) District to Residential -Contextual One Dwelling (R-C1s) (secondary suite) District for the following reasons:

1) putting in a mother in law suite and living as an extended family does not necessitate a change in zoning. Several of our neighbors have had relatives living with them for long periods of time and two of our neighbours live as extended families of three generations.

2) permanent change in zoning from (R-C1) to (R-C1s) would have negative future consequences for our neighbourhood which has been extremely stable. Many of us have lived here for more than twenty years, which has allowed us to build a supportive community. While there are quite a number of neighbours who have raised their families here and are now retired, there are also families with young children.

If the secondary suite would be used as a rental property (which may be the real reason for the above application) the neighbourhood would become more transient and thus less safe. There would be parking issues (particularly in the cul-de-sac or on the street in front of the mailboxes). In the winter, it is unsafe having cars parked on the road because of icy conditions.

3) the Richmond /Signal Hill communities have been impacted negatively by the 2015 opening of the new Airport runway and by having a flight corridor over the area. There are going to be further changes with the south-west ring road which may be stressful. Changing zoning in the community would further destabilize our neighborhood, making it a less desirable place to live.

4) allowing re-designation of land use to one applicant becomes a slippery slope. What would prevent other people from wanting to put in secondary suites for what ever reasons. The changes in zoning would eventually result in a very different neighbourhood along with de-valuation of property values.

I am surprised that despite 12 objections from neighbours this application has been recommended for Council's approval. Why consult with neighbours when their unanimous feedback is then ignored?

Sincerely,

Jindra Sieber

197 Sierra Morena Cir SW
Calgary, AB
T3H 2W8

RECEIVED
2017 AUG 28 PM 1:19
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Smith, Theresa L.

From: eprintcenter@hp.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2017 6:34 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] Scanned document from HP ePrint user
Attachments: filename-1.pdf

This email and attachment are sent on behalf of **robothr@shaw.ca**.

If you do not want to receive this email in future, you may contact **robothr@shaw.ca** directly or you may consult your email application for spam or junk email filtering options.

Regards,
HP Team

August 23, 2017

City of Calgary – BYLAW #284D2017

City of Calgary – File Number LOC2017-0144

Representation to the City Clerk

City Hall, Calgary

E-mail: cityclerk@calgary.ca

Address: 804 Sierra Morena Place SW

From: R-C1 To: R-C1s

Dear Sir

We reside at “184 Sierra Morena Circle SW” and strongly object to the reclassification of the subject property. We purchased in this neighborhood because it was classified as R-C1 and a very desirable area. The reclassification of this property would devalue the neighborhood and set a precedent for future requests.

Parking on this cul-de-sac would be a problem and lead to parking on the Circle. This would be on an uphill on a curve and create a dangerous situation in the winter.

It is noted that there were 12 objections submitted regarding this proposal. How many letters of endorsement were received? I do not believe the Signal Hill Community Association generally comments on these applications. We rely on our Councilor to express the position of Ward 6.

Sincerely



Robert Robotham

184 Sierra Morena Circle SW

Calgary, AB. T3H-2W8

403-240-0448

E-mail: robothr@shaw.ca

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Manuel Martin <mmartin@mtroyal.ca>
Sent: Monday, August 28, 2017 12:25 PM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Submission for Sept. 11 Public Hearing, Agenda item CPC2017-286
Attachments: Office of the City Clerk.docx; Att 1 Sienna Hills density.pdf; P1000767 (2).JPG

Dear Sir/Ms:

I am attaching a letter and 2 attachments to be attached as a submission regarding item CPC2017-286, a redesignation application for 804 Sierra Morena Place SW.

Place notice that att. 1 needs to be duplicated in colour to make any sense and that care has to be taken that it is not too light, otherwise lot lines will disappear. The photo in att. 2 has been converted to B&W, and can be printed monochrome.

I plan to attend the meeting and speak to the matter in person.

Sincerely,

Manuel Martin

RECEIVED
2017 AUG 28 PM 1:17
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

RECEIVED

2017 AUG 28 PM 1:17

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Office of the City Clerk
The City of Calgary
700 MacLeod Trail SE P.O. Box 2100
Postal Station 'M'
Calgary, AB, T2P 2M5

Manuel Mertin, PhD
197 Sierra Morena Cir SW
Calgary, AB, T3H 2W8

RE: September 11, 2017 Agenda item Land Use Amendments CPC2017-286

September 22, 2017

Dear Councillors,

In regards to the above application, recommended for approval by the planning Commission, I wish to make several comments opposing approval as an original (1991) neighbour across the Circle of the property in question. I shall move from the broader to more specific issues closing with a couple of observations of the process.

A. Neighbourhood context: a medium density neighbourhood.

Sienna Hills was planned as a medium density neighbourhood. Att. 1 shows that there is a mixture of low, medium and high density residential housing of varying types. R1C is thus not the default zoning for the neighbourhood but one of several differential zonings. The proposed re-zoning to R1Cs in fact converts a property from R1 to R2 density. While we approve of mixed zoning and medium density neighbourhoods, here this is achieved through having distinct locales for different zoning. The application thus proposes change within one of those distinct locales.

B. The Property: parking on Sierra Morena Circle along Lot 27

The specific parcel is not well suited to higher density. It is a corner lot with a Cul de Sac with no room for on street parking facing ENE and the Circle side facing NNW in a downward right curve (see Att. 2). Because of the location of the building and a solid fence along the NNW side, the Circle on the property side is iced up for most of the long winter. In addition, this side of the property contains a community mailbox, which most users approach on the way home coming down the hill and then pulling into the opposite lane to stop before the boxes. Just below the boxes, on the back of the property in question, a footpath, well used year round and also icy much of the time, leads to the linear path which connect residents to bus stops. Thus there is considerable traffic accumulation in this particular area in an already hazardous environment. As original residents, we have seems numerous cars and one truck losing control as they come downhill in icy conditions and ending up in the opposite lane close to the outside curb. We have even had a car lose control, overcorrect and come crashing through our own hedge on the inside of the curve causing considerable damage. No residents park their cars on the side of that property in the Winter because they know better. There is no safe year round parking available for additional residents on either side of the property.

C. Rationale for Application: short term needs vs. long-term implications

Since the applicant supplied a reason for the application, I would like to comment on it. We have nothing against the owner's parents coming to reside in the house. There are several multi-generational households in the neighbourhood, including directly West of the applicant. We welcome additional family members in an increasingly empty-nest neighbourhood. What we do object to is the long-term impact of a secondary suite once the parents no longer reside in the house. With parents, parking can probably be managed on the drive-way and garage, but that is less likely with independent tenants. It is also likely that a multi-generational family can live together with an arrangement which does not have the characteristics of a secondary suite and still meets the needs of the parents as is the case with other such arrangements found in our neighbourhood.

D. Process: a flawed process at work

Finally, a few words about process. As has been mentioned in numerous places, a complex and supposedly consultative process with an 83% approval rate does and should raise eyebrows. Either the process is unnecessary or it is flawed. Although it is not an appropriate comparison, it reminds me of 95% conviction rates in some authoritarian court systems. The fact that the Planning Committee received 12 letters opposing the proposed re-zoning, dismissed those as disturbing and inaccurate without providing detail, summarized them unconvincingly, did not mention the parking issue along the Circle side which several of us mentioned, and never provided a larger than one block context of the neighbourhood does not inspire confidence in the process and adds to the cynicism of many voters.

E. A Future Suggestion: separate categories meeting different needs

Maybe a by-law allowing mother-in-law suites as a separate, use specific, category could facilitate applications such as this, allowing secondary suites as independent rental accommodation to remain as the current "s" category.

Thank You for your attention.



Manuel Mertin, PhD

Att. 1: Map of Sienna Hills density

Att. 2: photo East view of 804 Sierra Morena Pl. from Sierra Morena Cir.

cc. Dan Pigeon, President Signal Hill Community Association

Richard Pootmans, Alderman for Ward 6



