

 TRUMAN

the WILLOWS

FOR RENT

**1 & 2
BEDROOMS**

587-893-RENT(7368)

RENTTRUMAN.COM

 **TRUMAN**
RENTALS



DUPLEXES & TOWNHOUSES

3 BED 2.5 BATH

FROM \$600S

1282 - 1528 SQ.FT.

2ND PHASE - SOLD
3RD PHASE - AVAILABLE

403.888.8491



Slokker
COMMUNITIES

DISCOVERY CENTRE



THE ORION 116, 205 SPRING CREEK COMMON





 TRUMAN

the WILLOWS

FOR RENT

**1 & 2
BEDROOMS**

587-893-RENT(7368)

RENTTRUMAN.COM

 **TRUMAN**
RENTALS















DUPLEXES & TOWNHOUSES

3 BED 2.5 BATH

FROM \$600S

1282 - 1528 SQ.FT.

2ND PHASE - SOLD
3RD PHASE - AVAILABLE

403.888.8491




Slokker
COMMUNITIES

DISCOVERY CENTRE



THE ORION 118, 205 SPRING CREEK COMMON





Calgary - rezoning for housing
Land use designation amendment.

April 12, 2024

Dear Members of Council

I am the current resident and owner of the property located at 99 Signature Heights S.W and as such have been notified that my property would be redesignated to Grade Orientated Infill (R-CG) District from R-C1. Please find below a summary of my points of objection to this blanket ruling effecting all residents of the city.

1) The address is in a well-established designated neighborhood of executive style homes that have existed for over 25 years. I would submit that people living in this community have either built and remained in the neighbourhood or chose to purchase within it for specific reasons. Notwithstanding, one of the most important considerations would be the designated zoning (R – C1) which would be consistent with their investment in neighborhood stability, safety, minimized traffic and parking issues, quality of life and continuity and retention of market appeal as it pertains to property value. In short, a premium was paid and continues to be so, not only in property value but also in ongoing tax assessments.

Due to past experience with a re-zoning/planning amendment which result in a precipitous drop in my property value, I purchased my current residence after an exhaustive search (real estate agents, lawyers, area structure plan reviews etc.). It was critical to me to have confirmation that the neighborhood would not be subject to this type of re-zoning and remain true to its design as a designated estate area, older neighborhood, no existing secondary suites, no back alley conducive to carriage house/suite development etc. Is it not the purpose of zoning to provide confidence to the homeowner that there is protection or at least stability in property values and enhance community welfare? Purchasing under such should be respected and honored.

Perhaps what could be considered a larger issue, is the question of respect and the fact that, it would seem, some of the basic tenants of democracy are being fragrantly disregarded. Should these principles not be extended to all residents within the community?

- What is proposed effects the entire city, yet not one of the individuals we have in trusted with our municipal welfare, campaigned nor even indicated that this was their position on city planning and housing issues at the time of being elected. Are you truly representing your constituents?

- Furthermore, the majority (albeit - slim) of council voted against a public plebiscite that would allowed for more widespread and inclusive response on the issue.

- It is interesting that any attempt at gaining wide spread public opinion is only taking place after the proposal was approved (September 2023) and after a public plebiscite was voted down.

2) In simple math my current residence under the rezoning could conceivably go from being a single family detached home to a residence with 4 units (possibly an average of 4 people/unit) with each unit having the potential for a secondary suite (estimate 2 people/unit) and a backyard suite. Conservatively, this could bring the total residence on the existing lot to..... 24 not including the possible residents in any backyard suites (an additional 8?). More, so, that is just 1 property in the area.

I would suggest that the aging infrastructure (gas, utilities, water, sewer etc.) is not equipped to manage such a change in density. Not to mention the issue of parking!! My property is located on a cul de sac. The increase in traffic congestion brings with it a very real concern of safety. I see that in your Q & A that street parking (paid option) and other suggestions are offered. I would encourage you to reflect on the popularity and feasibility of those options in an established neighbourhood.

Also, in the principles of urban planning, I understand such a proposal of rezoning will take time to be reflected in the structure in a neighborhood. However, this change will also be emulated in an actual shift in property value from the building (ie: home) to a land-based asset. Fundamentally, what is proposed will irrefutably change the concept of neighbourhood and community and give the citizens of Calgary no other option.

3) I am not unsympathetic to the nationally housing issue. However, it is also important to be conscious of the current political theatre of federal funding contingent on the city imposing blanket rezoning, despite, I believe, sound opposition from the majority of the residents.

I went and looked at a condo - an effort to be a part of the solution. The new build was pricing a full \$500,000 over what I could possibly hope to sell my existing residence for and then there was the matter of monthly condo fees on top of what is becoming prohibitive operational costs (heat, electrical, water etc.).

Furthermore, this seemingly knee-jerk reaction, does not address many of the fundamental issues that are impacting many of our tenets of life in Canada - access to health, education and housing are probably the ones that are top of mind. It is inconceivable that any level of government would increase a population by 1.3 million (98% by international immigration) in one year and expected that this would not create a massive housing shortage. The corollary of this ill-conceived immigration policy, is for our city council to unilaterally, substantially effect the lifestyle choice of every individual in this city.

In conclusion, people require housing. In this country and city, up to this point, we have been free to choose between a variety of housing options. What is proposed is both unfair, undemocratic and does not respect people's long-term investment in their lives. People want the freedom to choose the home that is the best and safest for themselves and their families which may or may not align with your rezoning housing proposal.

Denise Gibson - 99 Signature Heights S.W. Calgary, AB. T3H 3B9

