

From: Brad McCrea [mailto:bradm@avenir-software.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 24, 2015 2:34 PM
To: 'Shane.Gagnon@calgary.ca'
Subject: Opposition to Rezoning Application

RECEIVED

2015 NOV 12 PM 4: 15

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Hi Shane,

My wife and I own the home at *151 Arbour Glen Close NW* and it has just come to our attention that there has been a rezoning application filed for **159 Arbour Glen Close NW**, with the intent of adding a secondary suite.

We strongly oppose this rezoning and respectfully request that it be declined by the City.

Arbour Glen Close NW is a quiet, friendly and close knit community and the addition of a secondary suite will certainly be a detriment to all residents, and will present us with unnecessary problems for years to come. Please consider the following:

- Additional traffic on the street will be disruptive and dangerous. There are many young families with young children who would be put at increased risk. Noise will most likely increase and further harm the community.
- Parking will be a problem with the additional residents. The applicants suggestion that they have 4 parking stalls on their property is nonsense. It would never be workable for the owners and tenants to park two vehicles in the garage and another two on the pad blocking the garage. They would most certainly be parking on the street in front of their property or the adjacent properties.
- The applicants are already operating a Children's Daycare business from the house. I would think it would be problematic to now bring additional tenants and their friends, etc. into such an environment with many young children.
- The house has not been constructed to accommodate a secondary suite. There is no separate entrance to basement and the windows in the basement would not qualify as legal egress windows. I understand that renovations could be done, but if the applicants are claiming financial hardship it is highly unlikely they could afford tens of thousands of dollars to renovate. I am concerned that instead the basement suite would be rented as is, creating more problems and also putting the tenants at risk.
- Although I feel compassionate for the applicants claims of financial hardships, the solution is not to inflict an unwanted rezoning on the community. It is conceivable that due to these financial hardships the applicants could eventually decide to sell the house and leave our neighbourhood, in which case the remaining residents would be stuck with the problems indefinitely while the applicant is long gone.
- Many of the neighbours are longtime residents and owners. We have been here for 18 years now and we know of many that have been here longer. We have invested in making this a viable and prosperous community, and we have invested what for many of us is our life savings into our homes. To change the zoning now, especially when there is overwhelming opposition, would be unfair and punitive. Our community would be changed for the worse and our property values would suffer considerably. For many of us this is our retirement fund and we simply cannot afford to have it diminished by this application.
- Lastly, on the issue of openness and communications the applicants have not been dealing with the community in good faith. To the best of my knowledge they never discussed this with any of the neighbours, and the public notice sign that was posted on their lawn is intentionally being

blocked from the public's view. Since the sign was placed on the lawn the applicants have parked a car in front of it so that it cannot be noticed by anyone driving by. In addition the notice sign is right next to their Daycare sign further making difficult to see and read. Attached are pictures showing this.

Thank you for your time in reading this, and thank you for the work that you do – I imagine it must be challenging at times. My contact information is below if you need anything more.

Brad McCrea

Work: 403.247.8566 Ext. 1

Cell: 403.860.7731

Email: bradm@avenir-software.com

Albrecht, Linda

From: IAN MCCONACHIE [macondesign@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2015 6:39 PM
To: Albrecht, Linda
Subject: City File Ref: LOC2015-0069 Rezoning Arbour Glen Close N.W.

CPC2015-200
ATTACH 2
LETTER 2

156 Arbour Glen Close, N.W.

Calgary,

Alberta, T3G 3Y8

19-Nov, 2015

Attn. City Clerk

City ref File: LOC2015-0069

RECEIVED
2015 NOV 20 AM 7:36
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

Please be informed that we are vehemently opposed to the altering of our neighborhood zoning to accommodate a secondary suite across the street from our house. Our street has mostly large houses with either two or three car garages and street parking is already at a premium. This venture would reduce it even further as the home in question, 159 Arbour Glen Close, is already a two car family and they would need to park on the street to accommodate even a one car rental family, where would their friends and visitors park? There is already a commercial daycare (a branch of Thorncliff Daycare) operating at that address, with cars coming and going.

When we bought our lot at 156 Arbour Glen Close in 1993, we bought into it as a neighborhood zoned R1 for single family residences. This R1 zoning came with a higher price for the property and of course, this is reflected in the higher property taxes we have to pay. If this secondary suite is approved, we worry what will happen to the value of our property and will our taxes be lowered accordingly?

We are not opposed to secondary suites per se, **BUT**, you can't take our money and then change the rules halfway through the game. This is inherently unfair and undermines the trust people should expect, when purchasing a home in Calgary.

If a neighborhood is going to be zoned for secondary suites, then people who are buying in that neighborhood, should know upfront what the zoning designation is.

Unfortunately, we are unable to be present at City Hall for the hearing, due to a prior commitment.

Margo and Ian McConachie

Smith, Theresa L.

From:	Shanda Naylor [naylor@shaw.ca]	CPC2015-200
Sent:	Monday, November 23, 2015 11:01 AM	ATTACH 2
To:	Albrecht, Linda	LETTER 3
Subject:	Opposition to rezoning - 159 Arbour Glen Close NW	
Attachments:	Rezoning comments letter re 159 Arbour Glen Close.docx; ATT00001.htm	
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up	
Flag Status:	Flagged	

Attention: City Clerk, City of Calgary

My husband and I own our home at 148 Arbour Glen Close NW and lived there for over twenty years. We strongly **oppose the application to rezone the property at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW. from R-C 1 to R-C 1s** and respectfully request that the application be declined by the City of Calgary. Our reasons for opposing the application were initially sent to Shane Gagnon, Planner, North Planning Area, Planning, Development & Assessment with the City of Calgary on May, 29, 2015 and are as follows:

Community Character and Property Values

The purchase of a house is the largest financial commitment that most people will make in their lifetime. In making such a commitment, buyers must consider, amongst other factors, location, zoning, amenities and potential future value. The R1 zoning of the area was one of the one of the key factors in our decision to buy our home on Arbour Glen Close. In speaking with our local friends and neighbours, we know that many have been similarly influenced by the R1 Zoning.

We are concerned that if the application for rezoning is approved and a secondary suite is developed, the character of our Close will change and there will be a deleterious effect on local property values.

The R1 zoning of the area has defined the nature of the community since its construction. Modifications to this zoning in a piecemeal and uncoordinated fashion, without looking holistically at the needs and values of the community residents, would be an ill-advised approach to urban planning and redevelopment. The implementation of such an approach will have a negative impact on the liveability in our Close.

Traffic

Additional traffic on the Close will be disruptive and potentially dangerous. There will be an increase in traffic resulting from the secondary suite. There is only one access to Arbour Glen Close off of a major street, concentrating traffic flow through a playground zone. As such, the increased traffic generated by a redeveloped 159 Arbour Glen Close NW will impact every residence on Arbour Glen Close and Arbour Green Glen, and create increased risk for neighbourhood children using the playground.

The increase in traffic will compound the current situation - the occupants of 159 Arbour Glen Close NW operate a Day Home at their residence. We have already noticed an increase in traffic from this business operation. The availability of street parking has already been impacted. Further, people dropping off and picking up their children do not drive safely – they commonly use neighbours' driveways or do U-turns in the street when driving away. Children-at-play, walkers, and household pets are all at risk – the street was simply not designed to safely support the traffic generated by a business. This disregard for road safety by Day Home customers and the increased traffic resulting from the residents and guest of the secondary suite raise real concerns for safety and will impact the use and enjoyment of our neighbourhood.

Parking

Parking will be a problem with the proposed development. Arbour Glen Close has one egress on to a major street, there are no back alleys, and that there is a sidewalk only on one side of the street. All houses have front attached garages, leaving little room for street parking between driveways.

When vehicles are parked on the applicant's driveway, access to the parking stalls in the garage will be blocked. Due to the limited availability and accessibility of parking, the secondary suite, when added to the primary residence and Day Home, will cause significant parking demand, which will naturally overflow onto the street and impact neighbouring properties.

Amenity

The proposed redevelopment will unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood and materially interfere with and affect the use and enjoyment of our properties. Redevelopment of the current property will negatively affect the neighbourhood and our enjoyment of our properties may be compromised due to the nuisance of increased noise due to construction and the eventual numbers of people using the public green space and/or backyard space at 159 Arbour Glen Close.

Community Consultation and Engagement

The application for rezoning 159 Arbour Glen Close NW has implications for our neighbourhood, and the rest of the community of Arbour Lake. Therefore any decision on this application for a proposed land use amendment (rezoning) should not proceed without taking into account how these plans affect the property, adjacent neighbours, the neighbourhood and the community of Arbour Lake. Pursuant to section 687 (3)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, applications should only be approved if the development does not unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood or materially interfere with or affect the use or enjoyment of the neighbouring parcels of land. We do not believe that these criteria have been met.

While we respect the right of the occupants 159 Arbour Glen Close NW to make an application for rezoning of their property, we are hopeful that the City of Calgary will act to protect the interests of the majority of the people residing in the Close and as such, the property should remain zoned as R-C1.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments, our objection and rationale for opposing the proposed Land Use Amendment application on the property located at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW.

Sincerely

Doctors John and Shanda Naylor
148 Arbor Glen Close NW Calgary

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS
2015 NOV 24 AM 7:58

RECEIVED

Smith, Theresa L.

CPC2015-200

ATTACH 2

LETTER 4

From: Kimberly Davies [mikenkim@telusplanet.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2015 4:05 PM
To: Albrecht, Linda
Cc: info@arbourlakecommunity.com; communications@arbourlake.com; Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; Gagnon, Shane
Subject: Opposition to Application for Secondary Suite at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW, Calgary
Attachments: Brad McCrea secondary suite letter.docx; Naylor response May 29 Rezoning.docx; City of Calgary 159 Arbour Glen Close.docx

Importance: High

To Whom It May Concern,

My wife and I are writing to voice our **opposition** to the application being made by the homeowners at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW for a rezoning from R1 to R1s. (Secondary Suite) We are in **total disagreement** with this application.

We have included some of the letters that neighbours have sent to the City regarding this application.

I plan to attend the Public Hearing on December 7 starting at 9:30 am to personally voice our **opposition**.

Your assistance to stop this application is greatly appreciated.

Regards,

Mike and Kim Davies
162 Arbour Glen Close NW

RECEIVED
2015 NOV 12 PM 4:13
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERKS

May 25, 2015

Shane Gagnon
File Manager
Planning, Development and Assessment, IMC #8076
PO Box 2100 Station M
Calgary, AB
T2P 2M5

RECEIVED

2015 NOV 12 PM 4:14

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Dear Mr. Gagnon,

Further to your letter dated May 20th regarding the application for a proposed land use amendment for **159 Arbour Glen Close NW from an R-1 to R-1s. (Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2015-0069)**

We are their direct neighbours across the street and **we are not in favour** of this application. They are acting very odd since the City placed the sign on their lawn requested comments or suggestions about their application. Not only have the owners not consulted with residents about their planned secondary suite, they have gone to great length to park their vehicles directly blocking the sign so that neighbours don't see it, read it and respond. I'm assuming they didn't realize every adjacent home received letters with the same information. This behavior is concerning and dishonest among residents of the Close.

Furthermore, they currently operate a day home in the house to which many neighbours are opposed. As an aside, prior to starting the day home, the owner approached my wife and asked if she would consent to this business. She felt cornered to answer yes and would have said no if approached differently. To this end, there have been a number of clients to their home that have been disruptive in their driving habits on the street. Some have been speeding down the road to get to their house quicker, others have been backing into our tree that overhangs our front yard, partially blocking our driveway and other neighbours' driveways with their vehicles when picking up/dropping off, and yet others use the end of our driveway as a turnaround instead of continuing around the Close to exit the street.

Additionally, we homeschool our children and spend a large majority of our day at home or outside. We have felt uncomfortable with the day home business and the lack of respect some of their clients have for children playing on the street or driveways. To now be informed they want to add a secondary suite to their home, we are **completely opposed**. We **DO NOT** want any additional increase in traffic on the street, nor the vehicle(s) of potential additional residents to the home parking outside on the street as it is already crowded with the vehicles of current homeowners in the Close. Furthermore, the lack of privacy concerns us with potential strangers coming and going right across from our home where our children regularly play outside. We all purchased in Arbour Lake knowing that it was only zoned for primary residences and not secondary suites. Our street is a very friendly, family oriented neighbourhood, not filled with secondary suites. For the sake of our children's safety, we want to ensure it stays that way.

If you have any further questions, we would be happy to help in any way possible.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak up regarding their application.

Sincerely,

Michael and Kimberly Davies

162 Arbour Glen Close NW

Cc Ken Jones, President, Arbour Lake Residents Association
Joe Magliocca, Ward 2 City Councillor

May 29, 2015

RECEIVED

2015 NOV 12 PM 4:13

Mr. Shane Gagnon
Planner, North Planning Area
Local Area Planning & Implementation
Planning, Development & Assessment
The City Of Calgary
P.O. Box 2100, Stn M. #8076
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 2M5

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Re: Application for a Proposed Land Use Amendment (rezoning) Arbour Lake
LOC2015-0069 (location: 159 Arbour Glen Close NW.)

Dear Mr. Gagnon,

It has been brought to our attention that there has been a rezoning application for 159 Arbour Glen Close NW with the intent of adding a secondary suite to the property. The opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed Land Use Amendment application is greatly appreciated.

My husband and I own the home at 148 Arbour Glen Close NW and we have lived there for the past 20 years. We strongly oppose the rezoning of this property and respectfully request that the application for rezoning the property located at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW be declined by the City of Calgary. The rationale for our opposition to the application is outlined below.

1. The purchase of a house is the largest financial commitment that most people will make in their lifetime. There are many factors that influence ones decision to purchase a property, including, but not limited to location, zoning, amenities and potential future value. One of the key factors that influenced our decision to buy our home on Arbour Glen Close was that the area is zoned as R1. We have developed friendships with many of our neighbours and their decision to purchase in Arbour Lake and on this Close was also influenced by the R1 Zoning. There are concerns that if the application for rezoning is approved and a secondary suite is developed, it will have a deleterious effect on our property values and that the character of our Close will change. Certainly, this type of speculation is difficult to quantify, but qualitatively, we along with many of our neighbours, are of the opinion that this would in fact be the case. In addition, it is an unwelcome precedent to change the zoning in this area, that has since its beginnings, been designated as R1. It could be argued that by taking a piecemeal and uncoordinated approach to urban planning and redevelopment it will have a negative impact on the liveability in our Close for our residents. The desire of the occupants of 159 Arbour Glen Close NW, should not dictate the interests of

the majority of the people residing on the Close and in the community. Therefore, in our opinion, the property should remain zoned as R1 in order to protect our and other neighbours' interests and enjoyment of our homes.

2. Additional traffic on the Close will be disruptive and potentially dangerous. There will be an increase in traffic resulting from the secondary suite. It must be noted that there is only one access to Arbour Glen Close off of a major street. Traffic going to the residence at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW will affect all residences in the Close and the playground that is at the entrance to the Close. There are no rules governing how many people can live in secondary suites and since the applicant is proposing a two bedroom suite, there could be a number of people living there, which would in turn increase traffic in the area. In addition to the increased traffic from the secondary suite, it must be noted that the occupants of 159 Arbour Glen Close NW currently operate a Day Home at their residence. We have already noticed an increase in traffic from this business operation. People dropping off and picking up their children have affected parking and then use neighbours driveways or do U turns in the street when driving away. There are many young families whose children play in our area and people who walk in the neighbourhood. The current disregard for road safety of the users of their Day Home and the increased traffic resulting from a secondary suite and the visitors/friends of the occupants raise real concerns for safety and will impact the use and enjoyment of our neighbourhood.
3. Parking will be a problem with the proposed development. The applicants submit that " there are already 4 parking stalls for this house, 2 covered indoor by an oversized attached garage and 2 outdoor parking on the house driveway." I refer you to the area map of subject site (attached to the Circulation Reference circulated on May 20, 2015) and draw your attention to the fact that Arbour Glen Close has one egress on to a major street, there are no back alleys and that there is a sidewalk only on one side of the street. All of the houses have front attached garages leaving little room for street parking between driveways. When vehicles are parked on the applicant's driveway, access to the parking stalls in the garage will be blocked. Due to the limitations of the parking availability, there would be an overspill of parking resulting from the secondary suite in combination with the single detached dwelling as well as their Day Home operation, thus affecting adjacent and other neighbouring properties. Furthermore, if the vehicle parked on the applicant's driveway was a longer, larger model, (i.e. truck), then it would encroach on the sidewalk and impede pedestrian traffic. As previously mentioned, the sidewalk is on the side of the street of the applicant's property and if people were forced to walk on the street due to sidewalk obstructions, it would present a safety issue.
4. The proposed redevelopment will unduly interfere with the amenities of the neighbourhood and materially interfere with and affect the use and

enjoyment of our properties. In his submission, the applicant describes his property (points 3,4,7,8,9, and 10). The dimensions and description cited in his application are clearly those of a single family dwelling designed and built for a Residential - Contextual One Dwelling (R – C1) District. The owner notes that in order to have a secondary suite, redevelopment of the current structure would be required. The redevelopment required (i.e. windows that would meet legal egress, separate entrance, an independent heating and ventilation or multi-zone furnace), permits and inspections lead one to question the veracity of his first point – “to create affordable housing” and that their motivation for putting in a secondary suite is more related to his second point, which is to get financial assistance with his mortgage. Redevelopment will be costly and if the owner is already experiencing financial difficulties and expecting “to get some help in paying my mortgage” one wonders if they have the funds to redevelop the space to meet standards and Bylaw requirements. Furthermore, the applicant talks about the availability of outdoor garden space in his yard and the adjacent green space backing on to his property. As mentioned earlier, the applicants operate a Day Home. The Family Day Home Standards Manual for Alberta (Government of Alberta, 2013), require an: Outdoor Play Space (Standard 4C, p.28). One questions the safety of having tenets and their friends sharing the same outdoor space in the yard with young children from their Day Home. While there is a public green space directly behind the applicant’s home, we believe that it is not appropriate to consider having access to and using that space to further one’s own commercial interests. If the rezoning goes forward, it will negatively affect the adjacent neighbours, one of whom is an elderly couple and the other with a young family. Their enjoyment of their own backyard space may be compromised due to increased noise and numbers of people using the public green space and/or backyard space at 159 Arbour Glen Close.

5. The applicants have not been open about nor have they engaged neighbours or the Community of Arbour Lake regarding their application to have their property rezoned. We became aware of the application while walking in our neighbourhood and saw the sign posted by the City. The sign is only visible if you are walking on the sidewalk in front of their house. Since the sign has been posted, they are parking their cars directly in front of the sign, which obscures it from the street. They have also placed their Approved Day Home sign adjacent to the City of Calgary Public Notice, further obscuring it from the public’s view. Photos are attached to illustrate these points. The application for rezoning in in this has implications for our neighbourhood, and the rest of the community of Arbour Lake. Therefore any decision on this application for a proposed land use amendment (rezoning) should not proceed without taking into account how these plans affect the property, adjacent neighbours, the neighbourhood and the community of Arbour Lake; and pursuant to section 687 (3)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, that the development does not unduly interfere with the amenities of the

neighbourhood or materially interfere with or affect the use or enjoyment of the neighbouring parcels of land.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments about the proposed Land Use Amendment application on the property located at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you require additional information.

Sincerely

Doctors John and Shanda Naylor
(h)403-239-0165 (cell)403-818-7637
email: naylor@shaw.ca

Smith, Theresa L.

CPC2015-200
ATTACH 2
LETTER 6

From: Jim Mah [jimymah88@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 1:39 PM
To: Albrecht, Linda
Cc: Commn. & Community Liaison - Ward 2; info@arbourlakecommunity.com
Subject: 159 Arbour Glen Close, Calgary AB and it's application for Land Use Bylaw Amendment

November 20, 2015

155 Arbour Glen Close N.W.
Calgary, AB T3G 3Y8

Office of the City Clerk
City of Calgary
700 McLeod Tr. S.E.
P.O. Box 2100
Postal Stn. M
Calgary, AB T2P 2M5

RECEIVED
2015 NOV 20 PM 2:21
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

Attn.: City Clerk

Subject: Land Use Bylaw Amendment for
159 Arbour Glen Close, Calgary, Alberta

We are owner/occupants of 155 Arbour Glen Close N.W. which is the property immediately adjacent west of the above noted address which is applying for Land Use Bylaw Amendment from R-C1 to R-C1s.

We had previously opposed this same property owner's application for a secondary basement suite in our correspondence of June 6, 2015 to our Ward 2 alderman's office. Our Alderman's office indicated that the current land use bylaw amendment application is a continuation of the same applicant's efforts to seek approval for a secondary suite.

Again we are expressing our opposition to this land use bylaw amendment for the same reasons stated in our June 6 correspondence to our Alderman. Our opposition is based on concerns related to but not limited to the following:

- 1: Compliance and conformity: Compliance and conformity with the original land use designation for the area should be maintained. When our neighborhood was originally established in the early 1990's, it was entirely zoned R-C1. We are not aware of any properties on our street or in the immediate neighborhood which has received approval for rezoning.
2. Resale value: It is very likely that if our neighbour's property is rezoned R-C1s, the value of our property will be diminished.. It is bad enough that our property value is likely already reduced by the fact that the adjacent property has been approved for a child day home business. We do not want to have our property value cut further by having the neighbour rezoned to R-C1s allowing a legal secondary suite. We are an elderly couple in our 80's and may require to move to an assisted living facility in the near future so we need to recover as much home equity as possible to prepare for such an event. We have worked too long and hard in building our home equity with maintenance and improvement expenses etc. to have our property value reduced by a rezoning decision in favour of the adjacent property.

3. Parking congestion and increased traffic: With the subject property having recently been approved for a child day home, there is already a noticeable increase in traffic and parking patterns on our street as their clients drop off children in the morning and do afternoon pickups.. Currently we use much of our double garage for storage. For this reason we use the two parking spots on our front driveway regularly and frequently use the one street parking spot directly in front of our property. The subject property owns at least two vehicles and regularly uses at least one of the two spots available in their driveway along with one car parked on the street in front of their house. This leaves only one spot available for a tenant and their visitors. Therefore additional secondary suite tenants and their visitors could compound street parking demands. There is unrestricted parking on our street. If the subject property's tenants have visitors, there may be unnecessary competition for parking spots with their day home clients along with ourselves and other neighbours. The result would be additional and unreasonable parking congestion.

4. Noise issues: We have had past concerns with noise from other neighbours including dogs barking at odd hours of the night etc.. So we don't need our adjacent property's future tenants with possible dog barking problems or other noise issues. Also when their day care business reaches full capacity more of their childcare clients will likely be outside playing and making noise. If this is combined with their tenants making noise, it may be unacceptable to their neighbours.

5. Public safety and security: The adjacent property's day home operation combined with future basement suite tenants may raise security issues related to the safety of the children and others due to added traffic on their driveway and the street. Children's safety may also be compromised as there are no restrictions on the number and types of tenants renting there. The renters don't require police background checks so may be a security concern for child safety if they're not properly screened. Also there are seniors living in this area including ourselves who have lived here for many years and we know and trust our neighbours. We feel very safe and secure inside and outside of our homes here at all times. Rezoning for an adjacent secondary suite would definitely adversely affect our sense of safety and security.

Summary: In summary, we have to remember that the original master plan from over 20 years ago for this part of the community was for a quiet single family residential street and not for properties with secondary suites combined with child day home businesses. All of our neighbours probably made their home purchases and improvements over the years acting in good faith that the city would continue to maintain the R-C1 land use designation for the area. To this end there is no reason to change the zoning for any of the properties on our street.

Our discussions with our neighbours indicated that all of us are totally against the land use amendment in question. All agree with our concerns about land use zoning compliance and conformity, resale value, parking and traffic congestion, noise, and safety and security issues etc. Such community opposition should trump the applicant's reasons and motives for their application for land use amendment.

Any land use amendment approval in favour of the applicant property would result in a serious breach of our trust in the City to protect the interests of the vast majority of property owners in our community. We trust that you will do the right thing by denying this application and preserve the vibrant and valued character of our community in conformance with the original R-C1 zoning.

Sincerely,

James and Jean Mah

c.c. Joe Magliocca, Ward 2 Councillor

Leesa Edington, President Arbour Lake Community Association

Miroslav & Stanislava Lehky
67 Arbour Glen Close NW
Calgary, AB T3G 3Y6

RECEIVED

2015 NOV 20 PM 12:16

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

November 17, 2015

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

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Application to Amend the Land Use Designation at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW

We are writing regarding the proposed land rezoning at 159 Arbour Glen Close NW. We strongly disagree with this rezoning and strongly object to any amendments of land use on our street. This letter outlines our concerns and objections.

Firstly, this change will greatly decrease our property value. Originally when our street was being developed, the City decided to zone Arbour Glen Close to be a residential area without secondary suites. This zoning determined the property values and subsequently also determined the property taxes.

We selected Arbour Glen Close because we specifically looked for an area without rental units. We value that our street has single family homes. We paid extra money to live in a lower density street. We have been paying extra city property taxes for this privilege. We believe it is unfair to all of a sudden change this original land use designation.

Secondly, this proposed rezoning will set a precedent. This proposed change opens the door for everyone in our neighbourhood to build a rental suite, which would double the population of our street and effectively decrease our property value.

Additionally, in Arbour Lake, we pay a community association fee, which allows us access to the lake. That fee is paid per house, and not per person. If all of a sudden, we have more people, for example two families with children living in houses, then it impacts our lake facilities. We have a small lake that will be used by more people, and potentially without contributing funds to the maintenance.

As well, the street was originally designed for a certain capacity of people and vehicles. All the infrastructure surrounding us was designed to handle only a certain capacity of people. For example, the Crowfoot Library is already overcrowded now. The parking lot is already full during specific times of the day, and therefore what can we expect if more people will be living in the same size area.

Finally, in their original submission, the applicants mentioned that their first reason for this rezoning is their wish to create affordable housing, however, as a second reason they list their goal to get help in paying their mortgage. These two reasons seem to contradict each other. Since the applicants wish to pay for part of their mortgage, it seems unlikely that they will rent the suite for less than the market rate.

Our other concern is that the home is already operating a daycare facility, and this has increased morning and afternoon traffic to our cul-de-sac street. The home at 159 Arbour Glen Close seems to be already engaged in a home business that has impacted our entire street.

In conclusion, we strongly disagree with the rezoning of 159 Arbour Glen Close. We feel that this home already greatly impacts our street and this rezoning would further contribute in a negative way to the quality of life in our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,



Miroslav Lehky



Stanislava Lehky