

McDougall, Libbey C.

From: Smith, Theresa L.
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 8:57 AM
To: LaClerk
Subject: FW: [EXT] RE:Notice of Public Hearing Plan 9210430, Block 3, Lot 37

From: Jing Wang [mailto:wangjingwsu@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2017 8:49 AM
To: City Clerk
Subject: [EXT] RE:Notice of Public Hearing Plan 9210430, Block 3, Lot 37

Dear City Council,

This email is submitted to you as per instruction sent mail to me regarding the land located at **48 Edgebrook Circle NW (Plan 9210430, Block 3, Lot 37) from R-C1 to R-C1S.**

I'm the land owner of 55 Edgebrook Circle, living right cross. Personally I do NOT wish the redesignate of R-C1 to R-C1s happen due to the following reasons

1. Parking issue. 48 Edgebrook Cir has already 4 vehicles in average and sometimes vehicles of them parked right in front of my drive way, making it hard for me in and out. With the change, more vehicles could make the matter even worse.
2. Health issue. Basement by architect design is never meant to reside for continuous long time. With the furnace burning and low elevation point in the entire house, it's not good for residents health.
3. Safety. Contextual one dwelling means electrical re-wiring for fridge and oven and ventilation. However, when Edgemont community was originally designed and constructed, contextual dwelling is not part of the HSE scope. It will pose great safety issue.

I'm a registered Professional Engineer of Alberta. My license number is 98151 and my name is Jing Wang. I've worked my entire career to protect public health and safety. To me, the proposed change above captioned DOES pose jeopardy to public health and safety. Thus I'm opposing it.

Thank you for the public hearing opportunity to hear our concerns. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me. Due to work, I won't able to attend the public hearing. Hope my email can serve as a formal document.

Jing

McDougall, Libbey C.

From: Smith, Theresa L.
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 3:12 PM
To: LaClerk
Subject: FW: Calgary Assessment Review Board - Complaint Copy
Attachments: 48 Edgebrook.jpg

From: LARRY FREDERICK [mailto:larry.frederick@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 2:47 PM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Assessment Review Board (ARB)
Subject: [EXT] Re: Calgary Assessment Review Board - Complaint Copy

Re: 48 Edgebrook Circle, amendment from R-C1 to R-C1s.

We have not received a Notice of Hearing as noted below, but there is now a sign on the property saying that we have to notify you by October 30 if we wish to address Council on this matter.

The sign refers us to www.calgary.ca/developmentmap for more information. This site has absolutely nothing about this application and your proposed change, so it is impossible to know whether we are in favour of it or not. Since there is no information, we must object until you actually supply the information. Attached is a screenshot of this non-useful page that you direct us to.

The link in the email below (www.calgary.ca/arb) is broken.

Please supply the information about what is being proposed, and what you are approving so that we can determine our response.

Please expect us to object to this matter.

Regards, Larry

----- Original Message -----

From: arb@calgary.ca
To: larry frederick <larry.frederick@shaw.ca>
Sent: Sun, 03 Feb 2008 02:03:13 -0700 (MST)
Subject: Calgary Assessment Review Board - Complaint Copy

Thank you for your recent assessment complaint(s) submission using www.calgaryonlinestore.com. For your reference, a copy of the complaint(s) is attached. Your Notice of Hearing will be sent to you in the next month or two. Please refer to www.calgary.ca/arb for more information on the complaint process.

Portable Document Format (PDF) files are viewed using Adobe Acrobat Reader. A free copy of Acrobat Reader can be downloaded from Adobe's site at www.adobe.com.

Assessment
Review Board #222
City Clerk's Office, The City of Calgary
4th
floor, 1212-31 Avenue NE

Phone: (403) 974-4050
Fax: (403) 277-8421

CPC2017-321
Attachment 2
Letter 2

From: [Albrecht, Linda](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Rezoning 48 Edgebrook circle NW
Date: Monday, October 30, 2017 7:48:19 AM

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: Sheree Parker [<mailto:shereeparker56@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:43 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Chu, Sean <Sean.Chu@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] Rezoning 48 Edgebrook circle NW

I am opposed to the rezoning of 48 Edgebrook circleNW from R-C1 to R-C1s. when we purchased our home in this area in 1994 we liked the quality of the area and that it was designated R-C1. We have maintained the quality of the neighbourhood and been good neighbours. The house at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW has had several owners during that time but the present owners moved in two years ago and the neighbourhood changed. They have a day home in the home and that has created more traffic at a very blind corner with the parents making u-turns and parking illegally too close to the corner. Also this corner is very dangerous for pedestrians because they have to walk on the street because the sidewalk is blocked by an overgrown hedge. Also in the winter the sidewalk is seldom shovelled and the snow really collects at this corner. Over the years we have helped several motorists maneuver through the drifts.

The present owners do not maintain the quality of the neighbourhood. Their grass can be almost a foot high with several blooming thistles and other tall weeds. Also the fence surrounding the lot has several broken boards from repeatedly hit with a soccer ball. I cannot imagine how they will find time to be good landlords if they cannot be good neighbours.

If this lot is rezoned then it becomes possible for others to apply and be accepted. There is only limited parking for one extra vehicle in front of every home so I do not agree with secondary suites in this area.

We pay taxes in a comfortable family suburban neighbourhood in which we have chosen to live. The owners at 48 Edgebrook circle knew when they purchased the home what kind of neighbourhood they were going to. Edgemont was a new community when we bought our house and along with the other residents of Edgemont we have worked and volunteered to develop it into a mature well respected community. We would like the members of city council to respect our wishes and keep the area as is with no rezoning.

Thank you.

Sheree Parker
87 Edgebrook Circle
shereeparker56@gmail.com

Please forward to all Councillors and the Mayor Sent from my iPad

From: [Albrecht, Linda](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: Objection - Re-designation of land at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW from R-C1 to R-C1s
Date: Monday, October 30, 2017 7:41:04 AM
Attachments: [Comments Regarding LOC2017-0167.docx](#)

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

From: Steven Ho [<mailto:stevenho@shaw.ca>]
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2017 9:52 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Chu, Sean <Sean.Chu@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] Objection - Re-designation of land at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW from R-C1 to R-C1s

City Clerk, **(Please forward to all Councilors and Mayor)**

Please find attached, a Word document outlining our comments and objections to the proposed re-designation of 48 Edgebrook Circle NW.

Our objections are based on:

- 1) The unsuitability of the dwelling which leads to safety issues. #48 is situated on a corner that handles significant incoming and more importantly, outgoing traffic from a number of households. As outgoing traffic make their right hand turn, the overgrown hedges (planted in 1992) create a blind corner. This outgoing traffic also faces an uphill climb, creating accelerating vehicles in summer and sliding/stuck traffic in winter.
- 2) A full-time day home business has been operating since the current owner(s) moved in (2015). This makes #48 a very busy location with parents making U-turns and dropping off/picking up their children. All the parents stop their vehicles right after the blind spot (illegally) created by the overgrown and un-maintained hedges, creating unsafe conditions.
- 3) The need for this application and a secondary suite have not been demonstrated by the applicant.
 - a. In the application, there is much ambiguity as to how the "extended family" has been defined.
 - b. Based on my knowledge, the owner's eldest son is currently attending junior high school and the other siblings are still in elementary school. They do not, will not, and probably should not have their own families for many years to come. A secondary suite would not be justified by summer visitors (parents) guests.

We believe safety is already being compromised at this location due to the lack of maintenance and full time business being conducted. As the owner(s) have not provided any clarity on to the term "extended family" and their sons and daughters are not even close to majority age, they have not demonstrated the need for this application's approval. The mention of parents visiting in the summer appears to be a side note to the application. As much as we believe the justifications are weak, we are concerned about the omissions (i.e. fulltime daycare home business, ages of sons/daughters) and lack of transparency in the application.

We trust Council will give thoughtful consideration to these comments objecting to the subject application.
The attached document provides more detail to our objection.

Regards,

Steve Ho (587-573-3444, stevenho@shaw.ca) and Celina Dalton-Ho (403-999-8333)

44 Edgebrook Circle NW

Calgary, Alberta

T3A 5A4

Jill Sonogo, File Manager, Planning & Development, IMC #8076

Comments Regarding:

Application for Land Use Amendment: LOC2017-0167 (48 Edgebrook Circle NW) from R-C1 to R-C1s

We (Steven Ho and Celina Dalton-Ho) are the occupants and owners of 44 Edgebrook Circle NW, next to the land/house for which the application was submitted. We have lived continuously at this location since 1992, when our house was built. One of the principal reasons we chose to build and live in this neighborhood was the quality and R-C1 zoning of the area. The applicant(s) recently moved in 2015 and are the 5th owner(s) of #48. After review of the application, **we strongly oppose the land use amendment of #48 from R-C1 to R-C1s. and recommend the application be rejected.**

Our opposition is based on the following reasons:

- **SAFETY: Unsuitability of the location, land and house for secondary suite**
 - #48 does not have a walk-out basement or suitable landscape for such. The house style and size is likely inadequate to handle more than one family safely.
 - With current sour economic climate and high vacancy rates in Calgary, there is no pressing need for more secondary suites in the city.
 - #48 is situated on a corner that handles significant incoming and more importantly, outgoing traffic from a number of households. As outgoing traffic make their right hand turn, the overgrown hedges (planted in 1992) create a blind corner. This outgoing traffic also faces an uphill climb, creating accelerating vehicles in summer and sliding/stuck traffic in winter.
 - The aforementioned hedges were finally trimmed this last week after several neighbors complained. The overgrown hedges made it impossible to walk on the sidewalk without stepping on the street for an extended time. I walk our dogs regularly and this was a dangerous situation caused by the owner's lack of care and maintenance. This concern was shared by other neighbors as well. My dog and I have been close to being hit by a vehicle at this corner while on the sidewalk, due partly but primarily to the lack of care and maintenance by the owner(s). Even after the recent & first trimming, there is only space for 1 person to walk along the corner.
 - In the winter, this corner receives significant more snow and snow drifts. The current owner has occupied #48 for 2 winter seasons and the sidewalk is rarely shoveled and maintained. The driveway for #48 is also never shoveled, creating dangerous conditions with Calgary's alternating thawing and freezing conditions.
- **The current condition of the land and house**
 - The current owners of #48 do not typically & adequately maintain their land and house. As a person who walks his dogs regularly, I can attest that #48 is by far, the poorest maintained location within Edgebrook Circle. Amendment to R-C1s would only exacerbate this problem. As a note, the previous 4 owners of #48

always maintained the property diligently. The current owner(s) of #48 inherited a house/yard that was very well maintained in the summer of 2015.

- The lawn is rarely mowed. #48 is overgrown with grass seeding, numerous weeds and litter. I believe an election sign from the 2015 Provincial election still litters the front lawn behind said hedges.
- The fences on both sides are in poor condition, partly due to age but also caused by some of the kids kicking soccer balls against it, demonstrating lack of adult supervision.
- The hedges are grossly overgrown (as discussed previously), creating a dangerous situation with cars, pedestrians, children and daycare/home clients converging on a blind spot.
- As an example of lack of care, the storm doors in front and back of #48 are often left open to flap open/close in the wind. The broken light by the back door remains unfixed since 2015.
- **Full-time Child Day-home/care business**
 - A full-time day home business has been operating since the current owner(s) moved in (2015). This makes #48 a very busy location with parents making U-turns and dropping off/picking up their children. All the parents stop their vehicles right after the blind spot created by the aforementioned hedges, creating unsafe conditions.
 - I have witnessed 2 cases (once in front of the house, once in backyard) where the children from the daycare/home and family teased and taunted our younger 1 yr old dog by calling the dog and then screaming and running away when the dog paid attention. This is not a safe situation and can be attributed to the owner's lack of knowledge/supervision as opposed to malicious intent. Fortunately, our 1 yr old dog is very friendly and trained so the incidents did not escalate to danger. I explained to the children both times how dangerous that could be. Obviously the first explanation did not prevent the second incident.
- **The need for this application and a secondary suite have not been demonstrated by the applicant.**
 - In the application, there is much ambiguity as to what the "extended family" has been defined. The house does not have a full two storey, is the site of a full-time daycare/home business that creates significant traffic of its own, and is, based on its current condition pushed to its occupancy limit.
 - Based on my knowledge, the owner's eldest son is currently attending junior high school and the other siblings are still in elementary school. They do not, will not, and probably should not have their own families for many years to come.
 - A secondary suite would not be justified by summer visitors (parents) needs.

We realize it would be tempting for the city to dismiss many of the points made above (i.e. hedge overgrowth, non-existent lawn maintenance, litter, lack of snow clearing) as a 311 issue, but they are still significant for you to consider towards the rejection of this application as they demonstrate the current erosion of property standards, safety and value caused by the current owner(s) of #48. We firmly believe the approval of this

application and addition of occupants to this location will further exacerbate and negatively impact our neighborhood significantly. It is our contention that the current poor maintenance of the property and the lack of supervision of the children proves the owner(s) should not be granted more responsibility attached to operating a secondary suite.

If approved, we will be seeking significant compensatory property tax relief for the neighborhood as the city will have a direct hand in the further erosion of our neighborhood standards, value and lifestyle. The approval of this application will negatively impact all the surrounding residences. As noted above, we chose to settle in an RC-1 location many years ago. We are certain the same can be said of many of our neighbors.

It is my opinion the location and owner(s) are woefully inadequate and incapable to handle multiple families in a secondary suite and a fulltime daycare home business in a responsible manner. We believe safety is already being compromised at this location due to the lack of maintenance and full time business being conducted. As the owner(s) have not provided any clarity on to the term "extended family" and their sons and daughters are not even close to majority age, they have not demonstrated the need for this application's approval. The mention of parents visiting in the summer appears to be a side note to the application. As much as we believe the justifications are weak, we are concerned about the omissions (i.e. fulltime daycare home business, ages of sons/daughters) and lack of transparency in the application.

We trust you will consider our comments and reject the application. If you have any questions or require additional information/clarification, please contact us at your convenience. We would be happy to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

Steven Ho (587-573-3444 cell, stevenho@shaw.ca)

Celina Dalton Ho (403-999-8333 cell)

cc. Sean Chu, City Council members

From: [Albrecht, Linda](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Comments on redesignation of land use at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW from R-C1 to R-C1s
Date: Monday, October 30, 2017 7:48:52 AM

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

From: Haiming Li [<mailto:lhans34@yahoo.ca>]
Sent: Sunday, October 29, 2017 7:47 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] Comments on redesignation of land use at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW from R-C1 to R-C1s

Dear Office of the City Clerk,

We are the owner of the property at 71 Edgebrook Circle NW, Calgary, AB, T3A 5A4. Regarding the redesignation of the land use of the property located at 48 Edgebrook Circle NW, we are concerned that the redesignation may disturb the calmness and tranquillity of our circle and even cause traffic issues. With the owner running a child care at present, there are already lots of vehicles parking around the property. We won't want to see the situation get worse. We hope that you can take into consideration of our concerns when you make your decision. Thank you.

Regards,

Haiming Li and Yan Zhang

From: [Albrecht, Linda](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] rezoning of 48 Edgebrook Circle
Date: Monday, October 30, 2017 8:16:03 AM

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Ontko [<mailto:barbaraontko@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2017 6:05 PM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Chu, Sean <Sean.Chu@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] rezoning of 48 Edgebrook Circle

Please forward to all Councillors and the Mayor

There has been an application for rezoning of 48 Edgebrook Circle to accommodate a secondary suite. When I purchased my house in 1992, I checked the zoning of my lot and the neighbouring lots. This was a factor in deciding to purchase a home here. Now a neighbour has moved in 2 years ago and has decided to change the zoning. There are many other neighbourhoods where secondary suites are legal. Why come here?

Zoning, when I purchased was a function of the city. I considered it an agreement of basic rules between myself and my neighbours governed by the city. When my next door neighbour speculated about the future of the vacant lots left on our street, I reassured him that I had checked the zoning and only single family homes would be built here.

The applicant has made a number of statements on his submission. I would like to point out that Calgary transit gives travel time from the bus stops on either bus which services our street, as 20 minutes to Dalhousie Station from the time you get on the bus. We have signs at our bus stops stating "bus detour in extreme weather conditions" meaning don't anticipate that a bus will come in bad weather and incidentally if it does, it may not get back up the hill. The applicant lot is on a corner. Because there should be 5 meters from the corner and 1.5 meters from the driveway there may not be any legal parking in front of the house. Parking at the side of the house has always been used by the community for the cars driven by our teens and our company. This is something that I looked at when I purchased.

Maintenance has been an ongoing issue for this house. Grass can grow to several feet high. Dandelions and thistles can be tall and flowering. Snow is not consistently removed.

The family rationale for rezoning could be disregarded, the lot, if rezoned, will retain its new designation forever. We do not have the services and facilities enjoyed by inner city, higher density neighbourhoods like reliable, frequent transit, libraries, pools and arenas. We do have a comfortable, family, suburban neighbourhood in which we have chosen to live.

I would ask that Council reject this application.
Barbara Ontko
105 Edgebrook Court NW

barbaraontko@gmail.com

CPC2017-321
Attachment 2
Letter 6

From: [Albrecht, Linda](#)
To: [LaClerk](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT] Objection to File LOC2017-0167 - 48 Edgebrook Circle NW Redesignation from R-C1 to R-C1s
Date: Monday, October 30, 2017 11:02:39 AM
Importance: High

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

From: John Gray [mailto:jackandjudy@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 10:30 AM
To: City Clerk <CityClerk@calgary.ca>
Cc: Chu, Sean <Sean.Chu@calgary.ca>
Subject: [EXT] Objection to File LOC2017-0167 - 48 Edgebrook Circle NW Redesignation from R-C1 to R-C1s
Importance: High

Please forward to all City Councillors.

Good Morning,
We are writing to oppose the above noted file number changing from R-C1 to R-C1s.

We are concerned about this File being approved. We have been in our home for 25 years, building the house and moving in July 1992.

When we built our home, we loved that the neighbourhood was designated as single family homes, and NO secondary suites. As much as city council says that parking would not be an issue, well we have first experience with parking being an issue. We live at 43 Edgebrook Circle NW, and our neighbours directly next to us at 47 Edgebrook Circle were renting out rooms in their home. We did have by-law come and check the home (File # 2013-01363), as their tenants were constantly taking up parking space in front of our home, so when we had guests they had to find parking down the street. In winter, it posed an issue as some of our guests were elderly and it was unsafe for them to park so far away. Does City Council consider Calgary's winter conditions and that the side streets become very unsafe and icy. The corner at 48 Edgebrook Circle is not safe in winter! We've had friends stuck at this corner during high snow falls. If this file is approved, and there is an accident due to traffic on this corner, then City Council must take responsibility for this.

The house in question also runs an Approved Family Day Care, so it's not just residents and potential tenants who increase the traffic in this home, it's also families dropping off and picking up their children as well. When this application was first submitted, we took the time to ensure that this Approved Family Day Home was legitimate. When we finally found the organization who is responsible for approving and monitoring the day home, (Davar Childcare

Society), they were unaware that an application was in the works to move to R-C1s. We find this unusual as you'd think they would be upfront with their plans and work with the Day home approvers to ensure they understand that all residents moving into this location would need police clearance. We find that having this point not included in their original application, very suspicious? Why not be completely upfront?

We understand that the Edgemont Community Association is also opposed to allowing secondary suites in Edgemont and we are happy to hear that they support us in this. If we don't protect our community and investment, who will?

In closing, what is most upsetting is that this application, with so many opposing it - it causes neighbours to be upset with neighbours. We all love our street and have paid big dollars to keep our homes maintained with pride of ownership. Our investment in our homes, is part of us, and we all love our neighbours. Why would the City approve this application and pit neighbour against neighbour? It's very disappointing to think that our concerns aren't addressed, and are not heard.

Thank you for listening and please consider the above when making the decision to approve or **not approve** this application.

Judy & John Gray
43 Edgebrook Circle NW
Calgary, AB
T3A 5A2
Phone - 403-547-1583

McDougall, Libbey C.

From: Albrecht, Linda
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 12:32 PM
To: LaClerk
Subject: FW: Objection to file LOC2017-0167 / 48 Edgebrook Circle NW

LINDA ALBRECHT
Administration Services Division
City Clerk's Office
The City of Calgary
PO Box 2100, Station M, #8007

RECEIVED
2017 OCT 30 AM 11:55
THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S

T: 403-268-5895 F: 403-268-2362
E: linda.albrecht@calgary.ca

From: S LOZINSKI [mailto:s.plozinski@shaw.ca]
Sent: Monday, October 30, 2017 11:55 AM
To: City Clerk
Cc: Chu, Sean
Subject: [EXT] Objection to file LOC2017-0167 / 48 Edgebrook Circle NW

Please forward to all City Councillors.

Good Morning,

We are writing to **oppose** the above noted file number changing from R-C1 to R-C1s.

We have lived at 39 Edgebrook Circle NW across the street from the above address for 15 years and want it recorded that we strongly oppose their application for a secondary/backyard suite.

I find it very disheartening that I am having to write regarding our objection to this file once again and that none of our concerns were even taken into consideration during this approval process by the planning department as noted by Jill Sonogo. I understand that our concerns can be heard at a public hearing, but that is not an option for us as we are working on November 6, 2017.

Our opinion is that they should have bought in a newer community or a community that was zoned for secondary suites instead of trying to change an established neighborhood's zoning requirements if this was their intention from the beginning. They bought in the area knowing that it isn't zoned for secondary suites and therefore should not be pushing this change on us when the majority do not want it. We bought in this area knowing it was a single family dwelling area, paid the price for a single dwelling neighborhood and have enjoyed it this way for the past 15 years. We have great relationships with our neighbors and trying to push this on us leaves a sour taste in our mouth for the current owners of 48 Edgebrook Circle.

Their argument about having their kids' family live with them is a ridiculous reason as their kids are in Junior High School and younger so the need for a secondary suite is not a pressing issue.

From what has been printed about secondary suites, that in the current dwelling wanting a secondary suite that the unit would have at least one exit that that leads directly outside. This home does not satisfy this as this is not a walk out home. The argument that there is ample parking on a corner lot is untrue as

they have no parking in front of their home and the parking on the side of the house can be used by other homeowners in the circle and is not necessarily only for their use. Also, In their initial application there is no mention that this home is already designated as a regulated Day home provider. How do the requirements change in this circumstance? I hope there are strict guidelines for approval when a home is looking after minor children and their safety!

Also their reason that our area is in close proximity to transit, the University and SAIT is untrue. The University is at least a 20 minute drive and the CTrain is at least a 10-15 minute drive (longer if travelling by bus to the station) as I travel this way ever day.

The owners do not have reasons that are strong enough for this application to be approved and **strongly urge you to reject** this application.

If you need to discuss this any further, please feel free to give us a call.

Paul and Sharon Lozinski
(403)251-7543