

CITY OF CALGARY
RECEIVED
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER

SEP 08 2014

ITEM: CPC2014-095

CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT

From: **Michael Mak** <michaelgmak@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, May 4, 2014 at 1:06 AM

Subject: Application for Land Use Amendment LOC2014-0058 - 9 Signature Close Comments

To: brad.bevill@calgary.ca

To All whom it may concern;

My family lives in 65 Signature Way SW; two houses away from the proposed land use amendment location of 9 Signature Close. I am STRONGLY against the amendment and DO NOT wish to see a child care service in this residential area. I have lived in this area for more than 20 years and have seen this community evolve. Below are some reasons why my family does not wish to see this child care service in this residential zone:

I have seen the community from farmlands to seeing the construction and completion of signature mall and west hills and all the new commercial malls in Aspen. Each brings more and more traffic to the area. Where it use to be sleepy neighbourhood, now requires parking passes and signs to restrict parking so that we may park our own cars along our own property. Signature Way now has permit parking. Before the signs were dozens of vehicles lined up to get to the train stations. Now that the signs are put up, there is a marked decline in cars parked our front lawn but no longer would I trust my children or would like to see anyone elses children to play on the lawn for fear of an accident. Vehicular traffic has definitely gone up.

The applicant submission says that signature close, is a less travelled street but Signature Way and Sirrocco are both high travelled streets now. Both, as the letter implies, as able to "aid in parking" have had parking restriction signs on them because it would be lined with as the parking for the c-train station overflows into the residential areas. Seeing as how the parking passes and signs were approved, I do not think I was the only house that was VERY disgruntled about the increase of cars filling our streets. There are very many cars going to work during the times that parents would need to drive or walk with their children to this proposed daycare increasing risk of accidents ESPECIALLY when people are in rush to go to work or go home and there are several streets that children would need to cross in order to get to/from the LRT station. Would the entire street be put into a playground/school zone? Would this daycare be another step into increasing the traffic in the area so that it becomes a high vehicular travel area like signature way and Sirrocco? If one was to stand on the corner of this block and count the number of cars that travel down these roads in the morning or after work, there would be a car that would pass between 5-10 seconds on average.

As previously stated, there are numerous strip malls nearby. We are in no shortage of them. I do not understand why a daycare facility cannot be based in one. They would have the proper parking facilities and children would be safe as speed limits are much slower in a parking lot. There are MANY options but they would rather commercialize the residential area even further.

The application states that the marketing of this child care service will be kept with community. However, the community doesn't have ANY marketing because they are all residential houses. I fail to see how any type of signage would keep up with the community integrity. I STRONGLY

SEP 08 2014

oppose the commercialization of residential areas.

I do not want to see a decline of property value because of another resident that wants to operate a business from their homes. It doesn't make sense to me that I should be a victim while they reap business. If I wanted to live in a commercial/residential mixed zone, I would pick somewhere such as Kensington.

In conclusion, I strongly oppose the establishment of a daycare facility at 9 Signature Close SW. I feel that my rights as a homeowner and citizen that has been living here for 24 years have been violated. It would be as bad as changing the signature "signal rocks" that adorn our lovely hill to more residential houses for the sake of business. The culture of the entire hill would be ruined. I do not wish to see my community commercialized to the point where it's another Kensington. The approval of this change would set a precedent and a slippery slope of more approvals lest there be discrimination. What would be next? A billiards bar; a temple; a drop in centre; or a 30 story condo in the middle of these houses to reduce urban sprawl? I do NOT want to see us down that road.

Michael Mak