

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Jon Boruch [jboruch13@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 01, 2017 6:57 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Subject:** CPC2017-056

Office of the City Clerk  
The city of Calgary  
700 Macleod Trail SE  
P.O. Box 2100, Postal Station "M"  
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

RE: Midnapore / BYLAW 60D2017

I, Jonathan Boruch, homeowner of 35 Midlawn Green SE Calgary AB am opposed to the redesignation of 143 Midlawn Close SE (Plan 7710317, Block 1, Lot 39) from R-C1 to R-C1s (CPC2017-056). My wife and I have the following concerns with this potential redesignation of this property.

1.The property is already not maintained well and never has been in the 5+ years we've owned our home directly across the lane 2.I believe with limited parking at the front of the home there will be problems with vehicles parking in the lane 3.When the overfilled garbage and recycling bins are leaking their contents in the back lane the garbage does not get picked up 4.We live in a single dwelling neighbourhood and adding units could have a negative impact on my property value 5.With an increase in tenants our privacy across the lane will become compromised 6.The potential of a backyard suite would cause a lot more noise and traffic in our lane

Regards,

Jon and Tamara Boruch  
35 Midlawn Green SE

RECEIVED  
2017 FEB -2 AM 8:07  
THE CITY OF CALGARY  
CITY CLERKS

**Smith, Theresa L.**

---

**From:** Mike Anderson [anderson@dbblaw.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 31, 2017 5:18 PM  
**To:** City Clerk  
**Cc:** norm.campbell@shaw.ca; van Fraassen, Kate G.  
**Subject:** Re: Application to Amend Land Use Designation (zoning) for 143 Midlawn Close SE

January 31, 2017

To whom it may concern:

Re: Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2016-0270  
Location: 143 Midlawn Close SE

With respect to the above-referenced application for a secondary suite, we would like to formally submit an objection in relation to same. In November, 2016, I submitted the concerns I have in relation to this application, which list of concerns I would be happy to discuss further with members of City Council. The following are the concerns I submitted in November:

1. Expectation of single family dwellings.

I moved into this house, at 139 Midlawn Close SE, in September, 2009. Our house is next door to the house which is the subject of the application, i.e. 143 Midlawn Close SE. When I was looking at houses in 2009, one of the most attractive features about this street was that the houses were all stand-alone, single-family dwellings. It was hard to find a nice area in my price range that featured single family dwelling and I was very happy to find what I was looking for. Midnapore is a community with a real blend of dwelling types. There already exist many multi-family dwellings in our community and it would be unfair to the existing residents of our street to change this valued feature of the neighbourhood.

2. Traffic.

Midlawn Close is a crescent; therefore, there is traffic coming from both directions. As the street exists currently, there is a fairly high volume of traffic for a residential street, especially compared to, for example, a cul-de-sac. There are some young families on the street, some of whom have little kids. More traffic on this street would be dangerous to children, and would likely discourage young families (like ours) from wanting to remain in the area. We have a real concern that traffic would be increased further in the event that secondary suite applications were approved on this street.

3. Parking.

Parking is already at a premium on our street, especially due to the fact that the lot sizes are small and there are no front-of-property driveways. It can sometimes be difficult to find parking for residents' own vehicles, let alone having available parking for their visitors. Approving the above-referenced application would, in our opinion, create further issues with parking.

4. Lot size.

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the lot sizes on our street are small, as are the houses. Secondary suites would result in a busier street, with less space being enjoyed by individual residents. While this is a common feature of multi-family dwellings (and one which is often even favoured by people who prefer

condo-living), this is not a feature that most existing residents would favour, nor is it one that they chose when they moved into their single family dwellings.

5. Property value.

The possibility of decreasing property values in connection with the approval of secondary suites is a real concern to us, and likely to other residents as well.

6. Privacy.

With small lots, small houses and zero lot lines, privacy is already less than optimal. Part of the benefit of living in an area with single family dwellings is that there is somewhat more privacy, even if the houses and lots are small. There are legitimate concerns that existing privacy freedoms could be reduced if secondary suite applications are approved. For us, this is particularly significant, as the application in question relates to the house directly next door to us.

While we understand that, from the City's point of view, Midnapore has population volumes which may accommodate the approval of secondary suite applications, we would be extremely disappointed if a secondary suite was approved in the house next door. If that result was reached, it would feel as though the City has imposed something on us (as well as our other neighbours), unfairly, and contrary to the conditions under which we all took possession of our homes.

In addition to the above-stated concerns, there is the additional concern that, if this application is approved, there will be a precedent for other home owners on the street to do the same. This would create significant over-crowding and could actually double the number of people on our crescent. Packing more people into the small (roughly 1,000 square foot) houses on the street would have an extremely negative impact on the privacy of current home owners.

With respect to Point #1 above, there are a multitude of housing options in Midnapore. On a recent walk around the community, I noticed: apartment buildings, condominiums, townhouses, duplexes, bungalows, split-levels, two-story houses, mansions on the lake, and even retirement housing. The variety of housing options in our community is diverse; therefore, I would suggest that there is no reason to modify the designation of existing housing.

We feel that, for the above reasons, the application referenced above should be rejected.

Finally, please note that I have copied my next door neighbour, Norm Campbell, on this email, as he and I have discussed the matter. Norm and his wife Karen have stated that their position is the same as that of myself and my wife.

Yours truly,

Mike Anderson

Michael D. Anderson  
Dunphy Best Blocksom LLP  
(403) 750-1142  
[anderson@dbblaw.com](mailto:anderson@dbblaw.com)

\*\*\*\*\*  
This communication may contain confidential information.  
If you are not the intended recipient or believe you received  
this communication in error, please advise the sender and  
delete the copy you received. You should not print, copy,  
retransmit, or otherwise use the information.

THANK YOU

\*\*\*\*\*