



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

April 5, 2016

Mayor Nenshi and Members of the Calgary City Council  
700 Macleod Trail S.E.  
Calgary AB T2G 2M3

Dear Mayor Nenshi and City Councillors:

Once again we find ourselves **raising objections** with regards to proposed LUB changes, namely those reflected in **M-2016-004**, because of the detrimental impact they would have on our community. We are also extremely concerned that the Public has not been engaged with regards to these proposed changes and their potential impact. These proposed changes contravene the MDP section 2.2, which focuses on-- *Reinforcing the character, quality and stability of neighbourhoods*, and section 2.2.1 *Lessening the impact on stable, low-density areas*. **We are vehemently opposed to the following changes:**

- 1. Reducing the minimum parcel width requirement to 7.5 metres** in the R-C1N, R-C2, R-1N and R-2 districts when all of the required parking stalls are provided on site —this will have a huge detrimental impact on our un-subdivided/un-redeveloped R-C2 properties, as 6 stalls can be accommodated on a 50 ft wide lot, opening up all of our R-C2 lots to 4 dwelling units instead of 2.
- 2. Increasing the maximum floor area of a secondary suite, where it is currently regulated, from 70 square metres to 100 square metres** and from 75 square metres to 100 square metres for backyard suites. —this will have a huge negative impact on our R-C1 properties (see argument below), by effectively allowing “duplexes” or completely separate dwellings on R-C1 lots as the City promotes re-designation to R-C1s and moves toward a secondary suite policy.

**There is ambiguity in the wording for semi-detached dwellings (and in the wording for single detached dwelling with secondary suite) which would allow for side by side “duplexes” to be built on R-C1 properties if the maximum suite size is increased to 100 square meters.** The definition for semi detached dwelling can actually be read as-- the term semi detached dwelling means a building which contains 2 dwelling units OR a secondary suite within a dwelling unit.

**However, what does "located within" really mean.** Why would a basement suite, which is located entirely below the main residential unit, or an upstairs suite, which is located entirely above the main residential unit, both be considered to be "located within" the main residential unit?

**Similarly, what if the 2nd dwelling unit is made a few square feet smaller than the first dwelling unit -- would that not be sufficient to make it "secondary to the**



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

main residential use". In previous Public discussions around removing the maximum suite size, Rollin Stanley has said that a suite could potentially be the same size as the main residential unit. He has also stated that it did not matter if the units were above and below each other, or beside each other in the same building.

**Then, what if the builder made sure that the party wall separating the two units did not go all the way to the roof, such that the building clearly did not satisfy the definition of a Semi-Detached Dwelling?**

Given these considerations, **why couldn't a semi-detached dwelling** (particularly one with 1 unit slightly smaller than the other, and maybe a party wall that stops short of the roof) **be characterized as a Single Detached Dwelling with a Secondary Suite for the purposes of 1P2007, especially if both dwelling units were clearly completely within the same building envelope** and presented as having only 1 front entrance?

At this point, we are not prepared to wait for the developers to make the semantics work for them—in an era where we are trying to reduce our environmental footprint, 100 square meters is no longer a modest secondary suite. These proposed changes encourage the demolition of existing housing stock and mature trees, resulting in a negative impact on our landfills as well. They would also effectively double the density of existing lots, yet secondary suites are not included in density totals when the City is calculating density with regards to infrastructure and services.

**Reducing the minimum lot width for secondary suites to 7.5 meters opens up all of our R-C2 properties to 4 dwelling units. Increasing the maximum suite size to 100 square meters opens all of our R-C1 properties to the potential of “duplexes” and completely separate dwellings with these proposed amendments**, as the City promotes re-designation to R-C1s and moves toward a secondary suite policy. Our community is at risk, our urban canopy is at risk, and once again, the Public is not being made aware of the consequences of the proposed changes.

**We are opposed to reducing the minimum parcel width for secondary suites to 7.5 meters** (9 m is acceptable). **We are opposed to increasing the maximum suite size to 100 square meters** (75 is sufficient). The Public needs to be engaged before making these changes, and they need to know what the potential consequences are.

**Please reject these 2 proposed changes in M-2016-004.** Thank you for your time and serious consideration of these issues.

Regards,

Leanne Ellis



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice  
Rutland Park Community Association VP Development and Traffic