

themayor@calgary.ca; ward.sutherland@calgary.ca; joe.magliocca@calgary.ca; jim.stevenson@calgary.ca; sean.chu@calgary.ca; ray.jones@calgary.ca; richard.pootmans@calgary.ca; druh.farrell@calgary.ca; evan.woolley@calgary.ca; gian-carlo.carra@calgary.ca; andre.chabot@calgary.ca; brian.pincott@calgary.ca; shane.keating@calgary.ca; diane.colley-urquhart@calgary.ca; peter.demong@calgary.ca

Dear Members of Council:

I am writing to express my concerns with regards to the POLICY AMENDMENT – LAND USE BYLAW 1P2007 AMENDMENTS FOR SECONDARY SUITES AND BACKYARD SUITES IN WARDS 7, 8, 9, AND 11.

In particular, the removal of the minimum lot width for secondary and backyard suites, could have an extremely detrimental impact on our community of Rutland Park, when you consider our R-C2 properties. Over 40% of our low residential properties are already zoned R-C2, and only 2 of them have been redeveloped. As a community which has not undergone redevelopment of our R-C2 lots, the potential impact of a built form accommodating 2 dwelling units and 3 parking stalls on each 7.5m lot is grossly out of scale and character with the surrounding residences.

This issue is unique to our community at this point because we have not redeveloped. Other communities in wards 7,8,9 and 11 will not experience the same impact. Those communities with mainly R-C2 zoning have already undergone significant redevelopment. Those which are predominantly R-C1 will not be affected by this change.

In addition, the removal of the maximum size for a secondary suite would allow for a “side by side duplex” dwelling to be constructed on an R-C1 lot. Because we have not undergone redevelopment, this makes our existing housing stock more lucrative for developers who can remove a single family home, replace it with a “duplex” and sell both sides as condos. This is not in accord with the Municipal Development Plan which promotes-- *Lessening the impact on stable, low-density areas (Section 2.2.1).*

We are also extremely concerned about the impact to our urban canopy as developers remove private trees to accommodate massive infills and parking stalls. The Municipal Development Plan Section 2.3 specifies--*Providing citizens with opportunities to become involved in decision-making processes and effectively engaged in shaping their local communities. Councillors have not been campaigning for changes to R-C2 properties, nor have they been campaigning to replace single family homes with “duplexes”,* so I am extremely concerned to see these included in the proposed amendments. **Affordable secondary suites tend to be those built in the basements of existing homes. These 2 particular changes are not necessary to create the additional affordable suites the City needs.**

I strongly encourage you to maintain the minimum lot widths and the maximum suite size for secondary suites and backyard suites, instead of removing them as part of the proposed amendments. If this is something which is critical to the amendment, then I ask that **Rutland Park be removed from Suites Area 1 of Map 2.1 Suites Area Map for the Policy Amendment—Land Use Bylaw 1P2007, because of the negative impact these changes will have on our R-C2 and R-C1 properties, and our urban canopy.**

Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Your Name

Resident of Rutland Park