

# AGAINST R1 Mass Redefinition

**Bylaw 24P2018 [www.Save-R1.ca](http://www.Save-R1.ca)**

*From Southwood Resident Larry Heather [jerusalem1@shaw.ca](mailto:jerusalem1@shaw.ca) Ph. 403-253-0676*

We have lived in our Southwood residence on 104<sup>th</sup> Ave. SW in Southwood for 54 years. Conflicted domain communities result in inevitably less safe communities, higher turnover and less neighbor surveillance due to increased anonymity. This area of Southwood was designated R1 Residential from the beginning, but a scheme installed by Imagine Calgary & repeated in the MDP is being used to override all past guarantees. The proposed Bylaw also conflicts with the Restricted Covenant communities, and are sure to provoke years of Court battles for those wanting to enforce those Covenants. *Number the ways City Hall makes it hard for Residential 1 Investors to defend their R1 Zoning Assets in Southwood:*



**1. Obscurity of Letter:** *The letter to R1 owners dose not clearly define the changes being proposed.* This tactic matches the small print in legalese R1 to R1s in the sign to the left is what appears on this property. It has been repeatedly requested that a Large Letter title should be Secondary Suite Application so passing drivers can identity the topic. This the Calgary Planning Department has refused to do. Only the homes directly adjacent to the applicant are mailed a letter of notice. This sign is a confusing obscurity, not visible to anyone other than pedestrians, about 5% of the traffic.

**2. The Stealth Wealth Transfer to Applicant:** What must be understood is that the zoning change to a R1s secondary suite in an R1 district is a type of wealth/ asset transfer. The potential increase of renting a secondary suite is a gain for the applicant, but a loss of value

(red arrows) for the surrounding R1 residential properties. The more secondary suites approved, the more of the value of purchasing into an R1 single dwelling Southwood is devalued. R1 owners, having invested thousands in the improvement of their properties, begin to invest less when secondary suite approvals break up visibly their former quality of living. Like all finer things in life, R1 Residential living provides far more that what meets the eye than less density. We also may have objections based on past use of the property, parking, and investment values.



**Secondary Suite Value Transfer Effect**

**3. Divisive free Development Permit giveaways:** paid again

by the very unwilling taxpayers from whom R1 assets, polarize society into segments, some getting what they want at somebody else's R1 Investment loss, This creates mutual bitterness that can harm community unity in City-wide. First the City taxes the living daylight out of us via property and utilities, then entices our stressed neighbors to transfer our R1 assets to them.

**4. Up-zoning & Flipping without Development:** With a no fee cost to development



permits for 2 years, it is very probable that many applications are mere up-zonings, calculated to flip the property at a higher price even though no actual suite was developed. Councillors have repeatedly asked planning to enumerate the applications which never proceed to development and they have so far divulged that it is running around 14%. Revoking Zoning: Moreover, an annual list of

failures to develop should revert to the previous R1 zoning, but this never happens. Meanwhile, the area assessments could be needlessly increased because of supposed values of the up-zoning.



## **5. Obstructionism of City & Planning Officials:**

In September 2016, a planning presenter in an open public hearing actually said on the mike, that objection letters to the applications were, 'frankly irrelevant' In 2016 they have also taken to citing the peak and current population of each community involvement, guilting the residents for not maintaining density despite natural family ebb and flows over the years.

Some members of Council consistently berate citizens for sharing their true feelings on past land use behavior of the applicants or sharing personal motivations for seeking or opposing a change. Or even being called racist for disagreement over differing cultural expectations and obligations to maintain community standards. This is a major Charter infringement of freedom of speech. This has no doubt will hinder some Southwood residents from presenting at the Public Hearing.

## **The mythical world of Transit Oriented Development**

By John A. Charles Cascade Policy Institute Policy Perspective 1019

Quote: "Has the dream of transit-oriented living been realized? Surprisingly, none of the local TOD advocates knows the answer. Neither Portland nor Tri-Met has done any monitoring to see how people who live there actually travel."

Quote: "Attempting to retrofit the suburbs through TOD will be a costly exercise in futility, while making regional traffic problems worse. Local transportation officials should accept that fact and stop wasting money on nostalgia trips into the last century."

Yours Truly, Larry Heather

- Southwood Carma Developers Guarantee of R1 Residential Zones Below

