

**McDougall, Libbey C.**

---

**From:** Smith, Theresa L.  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 04, 2018 8:01 AM  
**To:** LaClerk  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] Fwd: Opposition To Zone Change (R-C1 to R-C1s) Application by 25 Tuscarora HTs NW

**From:** daomin zhang [mailto:zhangdaomin@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 03, 2018 5:03 PM  
**To:** City Clerk ; Atkinson, Matthew L.  
**Subject:** [EXT] Fwd: Opposition To Zone Change (R-C1 to R-C1s) Application by 25 Tuscarora HTs NW

To whom may concern,

Just saw the notice (at 25 Tuscarora HTs NW) today (it should not have been published more than 2 days) --- below is our opposition sent last Fall upon the previous notice, and our opposition persist. We haven't heard back or seen anything regarding this until today.

Also, I am not sure about the lead time for this notice, but the possibly late publication, holiday/vacation season and the extreme cold had made the notice less noticeable for the neighborhood so please take that into consideration for the response deadline.

Thanks,  
Zhang, Dao Min & Sun, Lu Yang  
73 Tuscarora HTs NW, Calgary, T3L 2H2

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** daomin zhang <[zhangdaomin@gmail.com](mailto:zhangdaomin@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Sat, Sep 2, 2017 at 11:14 AM  
**Subject:** Opposition To Zone Change (R-C1 to R-C1s) Application by 25 Tuscarora HTs NW  
**To:** [giyan.brenkman@calgary.ca](mailto:giyan.brenkman@calgary.ca)

Hello,

We are writing this email letter to express our serious concern and strong opposition to the application of zone change (R-C1 to R-C1s) submitted by 25 Tuscarora HTs NW.

The Reason being is that this community was designed and built not for large house with second suite- the lot size and the space/distance between neighbors/houses won't agree with the adding of another suit/attachment because of the following problems/concerns:

1. Break the harmony of the current layout: the second/additional suite will inevitably occupy some of the current backyard space and stand too close to adjacent neighboring houses, thus create an overcrowded situation thus will impact the style/pattern of the whole neighborhood
2. Deteriorated Privacy: as mentioned above, adding of second suite will inevitable eats up the space and shorten the distance between neighboring houses which is already at the minimum, thus impact the life quality of the neighbors
3. Safety concerns: even the new design can pass the fire code, the reduced distance between houses and the

addition of fire sources within the second suite still increase the risk of fire breakout as well as likelihood of fire spreading too fast thus more disastrous consequences

4. Change the nice residential community to a rental hub: even if (possibility can't be ruled out) the current owner (25 Tuscarora HTs NW) won't rent out some of the room/space acquired by the addition of the second suite, it'll be very likely the next buyer of the house will do so, because a normal family profile within the community won't need the second suite at all; once this application get approved, more people seeking financial gains(by renting) will start doing the same, with the precedence of approval, further inspired by the proximity of our neighborhood to the LRT station. It will just be a logical development.

5. Following the rentals, parking will become a problem and the community will see more traffic than the neighborhood designed to accommodate, increasing the risk for the residents, especially for the kids

6. Potential crime rate hike is another concern because of the more complex demographic change introduced by rental population.

We do want my little one to grow up in the nice neighborhood, which we currently have, not a bustling rental hub.

Overall, the application is trying to satisfy one family's need at the cost of more problems for the whole neighborhood, so we strongly oppose it and will do whatever is legally possible to prevent it from getting approved.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Zhang, Dao Min & Sun, Lu Yang

73 Tuscarora HTs NW, Calgary, T3L 2H2

Home Phone: [\(403\) 208-6498](tel:4032086498)

January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Fred Gerry & Anita Hansen  
62 Tuscarora Heights NW  
Calgary, AB T3L 2H2

MATTHEW ATKINSON  
Planner 2,  
City of Calgary, Community Planning  
Calgary City Hall  
800 Macleod Trail SE  
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5

CC: Mayor and City Council

**RE: Application # LOC 20170246 - Property at 25 Tuscarora Heights NW Application**  
Re-Zone from R-C1 to R-C1s to allow for a Secondary Suite

Dear Mr. Atkinson;

As original and current homeowners residing a few houses up from this property, having purchased our home off the developers plan, we adamantly, completely, oppose the re-zoning of the property at 25 Tuscarora Heights NW, or any property in our community of Tuscarora and Tuscany, to allow for secondary suites.

The very purpose of purchasing and maintaining a residence in a single family neighbourhood is the fact that it *is* single family. If we had wanted to live in a multi-family zone, obviously we would not have bought a home in a single family zoned community in Tuscarora/Tuscany. Been there, done that.

All the neighbours we have spoken to about this application for a secondary suite are also vehemently against it. Though many may not find the courage, time or means to lodge their objections with you, or trust their voices will ever be heard, they share the exact same opposition, and objections that we are documenting in this letter.

They are as follows.

- Residents here purchased their homes based on a R-C1 zoning, they should remain zoned as R-C1.
- Re-zoning is completely contrary to why people live in our community; it is a colossal betrayal of the single family zoning designation which was a major selling feature for homebuyers here.
- Homes are domiciles; sanctuaries away from business, commerce, retail, industrial, corporate. Their purpose is not to generate revenue. Those who wish to generate revenue need to live or purchase in districts zoned for revenue generation.
- Secondary suites *are* businesses, pure and simple, which makes them undesirable and entirely incompatible with the purpose, design, intent, environment or peaceful character of Tuscarora Heights and Tuscany. It is vital to preserve and maintain the density, appearance and function of our community as initially planned and constructed, ensuring that all homeowners can continue the quality of life we enjoy on our street and surrounding Tuscany community.



- The character, nature, quality, safety and environment of our street and surrounding community will be unsustainable if homes are allowed to be used as business structures to generate revenue. This is not a business zone, therefore, our homes and community need to be protected from being turned into one.
- Traffic congestion, environmental degradation, parking, mobility and number of cars in Tuscany and on Tuscarora Heights are already well past acceptable or sustainable. The unregulated toxins from carbon emissions spewing from every tailpipe are a travesty, posing a huge health problem and eroding our air quality.

Every street in Tuscany is already lined with the cars of homeowners who have, unbelievably, a vehicle for every over 18-yr member of the family. Many people park in their driveways or on the street, taking up public space in order to utilize their garages as storage units or workshops. This does not serve the residents, nor the character and quality of our community well. If anything, an area named Tuscany should be less populous and much greener.

Excess density via secondary suites only exacerbates these existing problems, adding even more traffic, more parking problems, releasing more carbon into the regular amount of deleterious emissions from the aforementioned over-abundance of cars in our community (and city). All of which are undesirable consequences for our community; the population of which is already at maximum capacity.

- Secondary suites impose a higher cost burden on municipal infrastructure; placing an additional toll on existing infrastructure designed for single family residential use only. Further compounding the costs of maintenance, repair, replacement, of water, sewage, electrical, roads, waste disposal, et al. Resulting in additional tax burden on single family homeowners.

In a CHMC study conducted in BC's lower mainland, surveyed homes with secondary suites were found to consume 35-63 per cent higher water and sewer services than homes without suites; to produce 36-42 per cent more garbage, and; to have 27-40 per cent higher car ownership rates, accommodated on site.

None of which is either desirable or beneficial to our community; or the environment.

- It is statistically proven that crime rates are higher in communities where there is a larger population of renters and transients.
- While the LRT station has been a most welcome addition, it has also made Tuscany vulnerable in ways it never used to be, providing easy access to the area for those with criminal intent.

There has been a major increase in break-ins, car thefts, and vandalism, in our Tuscarora Heights neighbourhood as well as on every street in Tuscany. We have personally called the police on several occasions to report persons breaking in to cars, roaming neighbours yards, or totally strung out on drugs, late at night.

- Property values decline when neighbourhoods are re-zoned to accommodate business interests over the best interests and wishes of the private residents.

- Statistics show that secondary suites are inclined to be in less expensive properties, and that the property value of homes without suites were 18% higher than those with.
- Statistics prove what is common knowledge: The higher the value a property has, the less likely it will contain a secondary suite. Particularly in west-side districts.
- To quote another study, "The differences between secondary suite renters and their owner neighbours are more pronounced. Renters have significantly lower incomes than owners. Owners are also older, are in more family-oriented households, and move house much less often." The Role of Secondary Suites: Rental Housing Strategy – Study 4 City of Vancouver 2009
- Renters do not have the attachment to, nor the vested interest in their residences in the same way homeowners do. Their focus is not about the character, purpose, environment, safety, privacy or standards of the neighbourhood they reside in. The majority are in a temporary, transitory situation, intending to move on at some point.
- One secondary suite is one too many. Once one application for a secondary suite is approved, it opens the door for others to follow. The proverbial "slippery slope."
- Secondary suites create an additional burden on by-law enforcement and administrative costs, especially if dealing with problems created by secondary suites is not a priority.
- Non-enforcement of by-laws, or not responding to complaints would leave our community vulnerable to a myriad of associated problems, ones we currently do not have to contend with as a single family zoned district.
- Local governments are open to potential legal liability, including lawsuits in the case of injury or death associated with secondary suites.
- Due to the amount of green space and lot size, Tuscarora/Tuscany is not considered a high density neighbourhood. Nor was it ever intended to be.
- Overcrowding causes a plethora of social ills. Not the least of which is crime and violence.
- Secondary suites create instability in neighbourhoods. Properties are often not properly maintained, particularly if both units are rented. A very negative impact on the character, look, standards, quality of our community, equally damaging to property values.

It is also worth reminding you how the residents in other Calgary communities objecting to the applications for secondary suites in their neighbourhoods responded. In particular, the objections from the residents of Parkland, which mirror exactly what we are also saying, and which were the supposed takeaways learned by city planners, as posted on the internet:

- Residents here purchased their homes based on a R-C1 zoning, they should remain zoned as R-C1.



- People who are investing in the largest purchase of their life want assurance that what they purchased (a home, yard, view, security, type of neighbourhood etc.) cannot and will not be haphazardly changed by those charged with protecting their interests. City Council must protect the assets value as it is related to the community it is in, (and what it was initially intended for)
- The City's shifting sands approach to remove permit fees and relax bylaws without providing clear rules and standards; beyond Provincial building codes; promotes distrust between residents and City Council.
- In place of clear, distinct, public guidelines and regulations set by City Council, the onus is now on each home owner to "watch their neighbour" and to vocalize any and all concerns to that neighbour, the ward Councillor, City administration, and the Community Association board. This passing off of responsibility to residents and volunteers in the neighbourhoods is considered poor governance and does not promote good neighbour relations.
- The City has no information on the web site for residents wanting to oppose or offer suggestions regarding secondary suites.
- How can residents prevent more applications from coming forward?

This surreptitious residential density increase through secondary suites, at the whim of city officials who do not, and will not ever have to put up with living in a neighbourhood of lesser value with secondary suites, is undermining our neighbourhoods, our communities, our city, our freedom to choose, our quality of life.

Communal living, a tent pole of autocratic, authoritarian regimes, is a symptom of the inability of governments to address the social and economic needs of its population. It is also a symptom of unrestrained, unnecessary and unsustainable population growth to provide short-term gain for the wealthy few at the expense of the already over-burdened, disappearing middle class, as well as the poor. All at a terrible cost to the environment, on which we all depend.

Secondary suites are a poor response to changes in housing needs, passing the responsibility onto the residents of established neighbourhoods. They are a political mechanism for increasing the supply of rental housing supplanting substantial local government investment. What is known as 'invisible' density increase, an oxymoron if there ever was one.

In other words, reducing the city's responsibility by foisting it on the backs of citizens to deal with, instead of having the ability to create affordable housing, set rent controls, or the fortitude and wisdom to limit the population of the city, and imposing a moratorium on acceptable density as a whole.

We do not take the opportunity and ability to live in our community for granted, after years of struggle and hard work to afford to move to the suburbs where we could live in our own single family home. We have had many years of living in rental accommodations and multi-family dwellings in overcrowded cities, communities, suburbs.

We have made a substantial investment in our home and property, as well as incurring the costs of expensive upgrades and improvements in keeping with Tuscany's character and charm.

The reason people moved to North America in the first place was to flee from communal living; to be able to have peace, less stress, space, to potentially own land, their own single family dwelling, in the neighbourhood of their means. And of their choosing.

We pay for that privilege through taxes - property, provincial, federal, along with numerous service fees.

We, in Tuscarora Heights and all of Tuscany, also "want assurance that what we purchased (a home, yard, view, security, type of neighbourhood etc.) cannot and will not be haphazardly changed by those charged with protecting our interests. City Council must protect the assets value as it is related to the community it is in, (and what it was initially intended for)."

Yours truly,



Fred Gerry, Anita Hansen  
Homeowners, Residents