

McDougall, Libbey C.

From: Smith, Theresa L.
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 1:11 PM
To: LaClerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] Secondary Suite Objection BYLAW #374D2017 or #37402017

From: kokes [mailto:kokes2@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 30, 2017 12:54 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Constituent Liaison - Ward 11
Subject: [EXT] Secondary Suite Objection BYLAW #374D2017 or #37402017

I am opposed to this application to amend the bylaw.

I made a complaint when this was attempted a month earlier. Consult the results of BYLAW

And my complaint is the same as follows:



kokes <kokes2@yahoo.com>
To: Ezra.Wasser@calgary.ca

Good day Mr. Wasser.

At this point anyways, I know this information will be kept confidential on my complaint on a neighbour redesignate their property from R-C1 to a R_C1s.

My name is Mark Kochems and I live down the street at 168 Sackville Drive. I am opposed to the number of reasons.

Firstly, this particular Drive is already congested with traffic. Two schools (K-9), a community center facility, two skating rinks, a basketball court and a skateboard park dominate the large green space within Sackville Drive. Many school kids are present either at the school or walking to and from nearby residents. School buses, parent pickup, mailbox delivery (4 drops offs), and community activities (baseball, hockey, hall rental) already overwhelm the area with traffic. So public safety considerations need to be assessed when adding a "residence" for all intensive purposes, which is occupied by a number of individual and vehicles.

Secondly, there are currently two confirmed ILLEGAL suites in the area. This issue continues to cause problems with some neighbours and requires bylaw intervention.

Thirdly, there is no need to develop the area for secondary suites when additional low cost housing is available near the Anderson LRT Station just down the street from here.

Lastly, we have lived here for over 17 years. People take pride of ownership in the area and many have renovated. House prices are higher as a result. This is an economic long term benefit for the residential community. Not only do rental units cause more traffic issues but they also impact the selling price of the area. In other words, we want growth in our property investment in the future. This proposal affects the person but affects the rest of us. And yes, I have spoken to a few neighbours down the street and they have wholeheartedly with me in that. **we do not want secondary suites in the area for the reasons I**

So thank you for your time and if you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Let me know the status of the file as we move forward as well as any appeal mechanisms that are available for recourse.

Thanking you in advance.

*For your convenience, here is the word for the above:
Good day Mr. Wasser.*

At this point anyways, I know this information will be kept confidential on my complaint on a neighbour's proposal to redesignate their property from R-C1 to a R_C1s.

My name is Mark Kochems and I live down the street at 168 Sackville Drive. I am opposed to the redesignate for a number of reasons.

Firstly, this particular Drive is already congested with traffic. Two schools (K-9), a community center, an air-cadet facility, two skating rinks, a basketball court and a skateboard park dominate the large green space within Sackville Drive. Many school kids are present either at the school or walking to and from nearby residents. School buses, parent pickup, mailbox delivery (4 drops offs), and community activities (baseball, hockey, hall rental) already overwhelm the area with traffic. So public safety considerations need to be assessed when adding a "residence" for all intensive purposes, which is occupied by a number of individual and vehicles.

Secondly, there are currently two confirmed ILLEGAL suits in the area. This issue continues to cause parking problems with some neighbours and requires bylaw intervention.

Thirdly, there is no need to develop the area for secondary suites when additional low cost housing will soon be available near the Anderson LRT Station just down the street from here.

*Lastly, we have lived here for over 17 years. People take pride of ownership in the area and many houses have been renovated. House prices are higher as a result. This is an economic long term benefit for the rest of us in the community. Not only do rental units cause more traffic issues but they also impact the selling price of the houses in the area. In other words, we want growth in our property investment in the future. This proposal only benefits one person but affects the rest of us. And yes, I have spoken to a few neighbours down the street and they agree wholeheartedly with me in that.. **we do not want secondary suites in the area for the reasons listed above.***

So thank you for your time and if you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. And please let me know the status of the file as we move forward as well as any appeal mechanisms that are in place for possible recourse.

Thanking you in advance.

In addition to the aforementioned, most of the houses around this block do not have a front drive. In other words, many park in the street as a result. Further creating parking issues in the area.

Now, I am not prepared to respond to this every month. Changing the email addy and posting the same Notice a month later is surreptitious in my mind. I know some councillors and the Mayor are pushing for secondary suites so that is likely the reason. Having said that, I have copied Jeromy Farkas, city councillor in my area so he is informed of our wishes.

To reiterate, we are opposed to secondary suites in this area. If this amendment gets approved or if another Notice is posted on said property, then we will bring in the media.

Regards