

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Audrey Bil [abbil@shaw.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 8:00 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: White horn bylaw 229D 2016

This email is to inform whom it may concern that We are totally against the re zoning at 5190 Whitestone Road into a rental unit. We bought our house at 5182 Whitestone Road over 30 years ago because it was a single family housing area. Please submit at September meeting with City Council When this subject is discussed. Thank you. Audrey and James Bil.

Sent from my iPad

RECEIVED

2016 AUG 30 AM 8: 56

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Smith, Theresa L.

From: Bob Shelast [bshelast@telusplanet.net]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2016 9:23 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: Whitehorn Bylaw 229D2016
Attachments: City of Calgary Rezoning Whitehorn Bylaw 229D2016.docx

As an adjacent property owner, attached is my letter opposing the rezoning of the property at 5190 Whitestone Road under the proposed bylaw amendment. I trust this letter will be made available to City Council in their deliberations on this bylaw amendment.

RECEIVED
2016 AUG 31 PM 1:43
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

RECEIVED
2016 AUG 31 PM 1:43
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Bob Shelast
5186 Whitestone Road NE
Calgary, Alberta
T1Y 1T6

8/30/2016

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

Attention: City Council

**Reference: Application for Land Use Amendment, Whitehorn Bylaw 229D2016
5190 Whitestone Road NE**

In response to the application for a Land Use Amendment, I am strongly OPPOSED to the rezoning of the property at 5190 Whitestone Road NE from RC-1 to RC-1s. Our property is adjacent to the property identified in the application.

My wife and I have lived at our present address in Whitehorn since 1989 and have raised our family here. What attracted us to this neighborhood was that it was zoned as single-family residential and it was not in close proximity to multi-family developments. Over time, we have befriended several of our neighbors on the block and maintain a social network with them.

The current and previous homeowners at the residence in question have had a multitude of tenants over the course of several years in what I suspect are illegal suites. In my mind, this application is just an attempt to legitimize what may already be an illegal activity. Past tenants have created parking problems, one was a drug dealer, and one group even parked a vehicle on the front lawn for an extended period of time before it was removed. I have reported my suspicions of illegal suites on the property to By-law services but was told that they weren't necessarily illegal suites. With that indifferent response, I did not see the point in pursuing it any further.

Although I don't believe it is illegal, the previous and current owners even rent out the double detached garage in the rear of the property. This just creates additional traffic and "strangers" to the area, all for the sake of a few extra dollars in revenue to the property owner.



Although not unique to secondary suite properties, my observations are that there tends to be very little property maintenance done by the tenants and the absentee owner due to the lack of pride in ownership. These properties just become a place to live for the tenant and a revenue source for the owner. The property in question falls into this category.

So, is this the type of neighbor anyone wants? Now I know you may say that if such issues occur, bylaw enforcement should intervene. My response is that the City should not encourage the formation of such conditions by allowing properties in single-family neighborhoods to be converted to secondary suites to house transient, itinerant individuals. These developments serve no benefit to the neighborhood and the community as a whole. The sole purpose is to provide a revenue source for an absentee landlord. Why fracture the neighborhood so that an investor can profit on it at our expense? The quality of life in the neighborhood will not be the same.

When communities are planned, they are zoned to allow for multiple users in certain areas. Why are we now trying to intersperse a single, secondary suite development within established single-family neighborhoods? This is akin to having a commercial or industrial development in the middle of a family neighborhood. I am sure the City does not allow that type of development so how is this any different? Respect the foresight that previous civic planners had in designating this area single-family. Cluster secondary suites around areas that are currently zoned as multi-family rather than destroying the integrity of single-family neighborhoods.

So the question before City Council is whether the financial gain of one individual supersedes the quality of life for a number of residents. I believe the answer is clearly NO.

In closing, I implore you to deny the application so that we can preserve at least some semblance of a single-family neighborhood. The financial gain of one real estate speculator should not override the quality of life of the community. Because of lower house prices, communities like Whitehorn are the most vulnerable to speculators who are looking to develop secondary suites to "pay their mortgage". It is these communities that need the protection from hodgepodge development that fragments the community. We rely on you as regulators to preserve the integrity of our communities.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments in your deliberations. I can be contacted at (403)293-1182.

Sincerely,

Bob Shelast