From:

Mike MacDonald [mike1mac2@shaw.ca] Saturday, August 01, 2015 3:20 AM

Sent: To:

City Clerk

Subject:

proposed change to midnapore bylaw 128d2016

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

Please accept this as my strong opposition to this planned change.

As an owner of an adjacent property I feel my opinion must be taken into account. This change will have direct effect on me and my property. I only get limited sun in my yard and on my deck. This proposed building next my property will deminish that. I plan to sit on my deck and enjoy the sun and the sunsets I now how for many years of retired life. To allow a building 40 ft. from my property line that is 2 storeys high is outrages. The loss of daily sunlight and my view of the sunsets is not acceptable to me. The loss of value to my property because of that is also not acceptable.

Please take into account that just because an applicant wants to change zoning for his or her "affordable housing" it does effect all resident in our community. Loss of privacy, parking, existing codes are all other considerations to take into account. Please reject this application. This community does not want R-C1s zoning!

Michael MacDonald 351 Midvalley Dr.S.E.

2016 JUN -2 AM 8: C

From: Sent:

Andre Passarelli [alpass@shaw.ca] Wednesday, June 01, 2016 10:01 PM

To:

City Clerk

Cc: Subject:

Councillors Assistant - Ward 14; Andre Passarelli LOC2016-0029

RECEIVED

2016 JUN -2 AM 8: 00

THE CITY OF CALGARY CITY CLERK'S

Hello City Councillors,

I am writing this letter as a formal protest as well as an appeal to the city councillors who are about to vote on a rezoning application LOC-2016-0029 located at 316 Midvalley Way. It is currently zoned R-C1 and the current owner but not occupant is applying to have it rezoned R-C1S. As I can fully appreciate his desire to have the property rezoned, one must ask if it is fitting to the area and how will it impact the neighbourhood.

We chose to purchase in Midnapore approximately 10 years ago because of its charm and variety, which the developers purposefully included a wide variety of housing styles. We have an existing wide spectrum which include subsidized low cost housing, affordable starter homes mid level homes and executive homes that range in the multi-million dollar range. When we purchased our house, we did not conceive the notion that one day another dwelling might be erected in my neighbours yard which could possibly rob us of our privacy. Midnapore was developed using a zero lot line system which worsens the fact that another structure would literally cast a dark shadow depriving us of sunlight, privacy and potentially add increased levels of noise. We recently invested tens of thousands of dollars in developing our back yard to include and in-ground swimming pool whose current privacy would be negatively affected by an over garage suite in which the current owner plans on building.

All of my current neighbours strongly oppose this re-designation and I am hoping the wish of many out weigh the desire of one to try and have changed a zoning which was put in place for a reason. As the relatively new owner of the property, it seems indifferent to try and inflict such a change which can potentially negatively affect the value of several homes adjacent to him. Hence I plead with council to consider the potential loss of value as one of the arguments to vote against this application. Not to mention that parking is already an issue as there are several half duplexes that are being rented out to as many as 6 individuals which renders our streets quite difficult to park on already. It was brought to my attentions that this application made it past the first step because of public transportation near by which I find quite troublesome that would have much bearing. Did my purchasing a house near a bus stop and have to endure the very loud noise of a diesel engine on a regular basis also mean my property could possibly be so negatively affected by another house being built on a lot and neighbourhood that wasn't designed as such.

I understand the need for affordable housing and believe there are communities that would benefit from secondary suites. My wife and I on the other hand sold our house in the inner city for the benefits of a more private setting and as such endure legnthy commuter to and from work. it would be a terrible shame to have all that lost because of the desire of one person, once again for the sake of many home owners who risk being financially impacted in a negative way for the gain of one person who has already communicated in writing to the city one story and has told me another. The property already houses an oversized double car garage which seems to be used as a business and the owner wishes to replace it with a triple car garage which would seem to support the business and increasing the level of itinerant traffic travelling in the area. Please ask yourselves when voting on this issue, how would I feel if this was my neighbour and is does this negatively affect the value of the adjacent homes. Having built our last home in Lake Chapparal and not even having the choice of colour for our house due to architectural controls, I find it disheartening that this rezoning is even being considered for this area. Please do what's right for the many and deny this application.

Thank You Andre and Lisa Passarelli 320 Midvalley Way SE Calgary, Alberta T2X-1L4 403-255-8602

From:

Bruce Cotton [bcotton06@hotmail.com] Wednesday, June 01, 2016 10:31 AM

Sent: To:

City Clerk

Cc: Subject: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 14

Bylaw 128D2016 (LOC2016-0029) CPC2016-133

RECEIVED

2016 JUN - 1 AM 10: 43

THE CITY OF CALGARY CITY CLERK'S

Office of the City Clerk:

Please reject the application to amend zoning for the land located at 316 Midvalley Way SE (Plan 7810798, Block 23, Lot 24)

from Residential - Contextual One Dwelling (R-C1) District to Residential - Contextual One Dwelling (R-C1s) District.

We strongly oppose the request as we live next door to said location and we want the zoning designation to remain as R-C1.

Before this process proceeds any further we ask City Council to consider the following issues:

1. The single mother and kids have been living in the house since the family moved in 4 years ago!

Why change the zoning bylaw?

2. If the zoning request is approved: Why can't the applicant build a secondary suite in the house instead of tearing down the 2 car garage and building a 3 car garage with suite above?

Our family will have to contend with all the noise from machinery, equipment, vehicles and tools from the destruction of the 2 car garage and construction of the 3 car garage with suite above.

Secondary suites are unnecessary in our neighbourhood especially when the Calgary vacancy rate is increasing, rents are falling and it's a buyer's market for houses.

Yours respectfully.

Bruce and Lydia Cotton 312 Midvally Way SE Calgary, AB T2X 1L4

From:

Colwell, Martin J.

Sent:

Monday, May 23, 2016 3:15 PM

To:

City Clerk

Subject:

Letter of Opposition

I am the property owner at 248 Midvally Place SE Calgary T2X1L3, and I would like to oppose the porposed bylaw# 128D2016 at 316 Midvalley Wy SE from R-C1 to R-C1s.

Reasons stated for opposition are summarized as follows:

- Increased traffic and demand for on-street parking;
- Secondary suites will accommodate transient occupants and create derelict properties;
- Lowering of existing property values;
- Loss of privacy due to overlooking issues;
- Impacts to views from rear yards;
- Quality of building architecture and design;
- Inconvenience of noise and activity from construction.
- The application could set a precedent for future applications
- The development is not suited to the neighbourhood

Thank You Martin Colwell 248 Midvalley Place SE 403-651-3445

RECEIVED

2016 MAY 24 AM 8: 24

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S