



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

Mayor Nenshi and City Councillors:

**This is being presented on behalf of the Rutland Park Community Association and the residents it serves.**

Proposed LUB changes M-2016-004 could have a huge detrimental impact on our community. Two of these proposed changes were what we as a Community Association formally opposed during the last round of proposed secondary suite amendments in June 2015. (A petition with almost 300 signatures from our residents was also shared with Council opposing these changes at that time.) These two changes have the potential to almost triple the density of our current low density bungalows.

- 1. Reducing the minimum parcel width requirement to 7.5 metres for secondary suites in any district, even 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, if they were subdivided.
- 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 as the City promotes re-designation to R-C1s, and permits second dwellings that are even larger than some of our original dwellings.

**Reducing the minimum lot width to 7.5 m for secondary suites would effectively double the current permitted units for our R-C2 lots if they were subdivided.** Most of our R-C2 lots have not been subdivided or redeveloped, and contain only 1 dwelling unit. By reducing the minimum lot width to 7.5 m, all current and future infills will be permitted to have secondary suites as well; new builds will likely opt for a garage suite to make things more lucrative for developers.

**Increasing the maximum suite size in all districts to 100 square meters above grade means that the secondary suite could be over 1000 sq ft**—certainly not a modest living space, especially if you can add a basement and do not need to include the basement in the total square footage.

With every single R-C1 property now easily re-designated to R-C1s, there is the potential to have “duplexes” because each unit could be over 1000 sq ft, not counting the basement (Rollin Stanley has publically stated that it makes no difference if the suites are beside each other or above/below each other), or massive garage suites (larger than a triple garage), or a second bungalow added to an R-C1 lot. Right now, we have a number of bungalows in our community



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

which are less than 1000 sq ft– the secondary suite could be even bigger than the original house on our R-C1 lots and still fit within the 45% lot coverage.

**Once a property becomes R-C1s, a backyard suite while still discretionary, suddenly becomes very attractive when it can be over 1000 sq ft.** In previous garage suite workshops around the City, speakers have also indicated that Calgarians are able to turn both dwellings into a condominium plan and sell them separately. (Edmonton does not permit this, by the way. Their garage suites are also a maximum of 60 sq m and only allowed to be 6.5 m in height. Their minimum width for backyard suites is 15 m and ALL secondary suites require a minimum of 3 on-site parking stalls. Secondary suites below grade can be as large as the main floor of the house, but only 40% of the main dwelling up to 70 sq m if above grade.)

Will the average owner turn around and create backyard suites? Not likely, because of the cost, but builders are quite happy to pick off older homes on R-C2 lots and put in 4 units, or buy up older R-C1 lots and build 2 units. Once the doors are open, you won't get them shut again.

**These proposed changes would have a very detrimental impact on both the character of our community and our urban canopy**, as developers look to maximize profit by doubling the current allowable dwelling units. This does not *reinforce the character, quality and stability of neighbourhoods or lessen the impact on stable, low-density areas as set out in Section 2.2.1 of the MDP.*

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, and probably not considered toward our MDP density goals either.) **In addition, they actually discourage affordable secondary suites, as existing homes are demolished to make way for upscale dwellings. New builds are increasingly expensive in Calgary, and not conducive to being rented at an affordable rate. These changes also have the potential to create more illegal suites—residents are less concerned about reporting illegal suites if the property is already zoned to allow for a secondary suite.**

**Reducing the minimum lot width for secondary suites to 7.5 meters opens up all of our R-C2 properties to the potential of 4 dwelling units if they are subdivided. Increasing the maximum suite size to 100 square meters makes our R-C1 properties more attractive to developers who can double the number of allowable dwelling units through a simple land use re-designation to R-C1s.** (The City is even currently waiving the fees for this re-designation.)

**While these changes are not about re-zoning/re-designation in any way, they have the potential to effectively DOUBLE the permitted density on all of the low density residential lots in the City.**



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

**We are extremely opposed to reducing the minimum lot width for secondary suites to 7.5 meters in any district (9 meters is acceptable). We are also strongly opposed to increasing the maximum suite size (above grade) to 100 square meters (75 square meters is reasonable) in any district.**

**The Public needs to be engaged before these 2 changes are considered, and they need to be fully aware of the potential consequences of such seemingly innocuous amendments.**

**Please reject these 2 proposed changes in M-2016-004.**

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Meera Nathwani-Crowe

RPCA President

Leanne Ellis

RPCA VP Development and Traffic

**Regarding Appendix II**—This has not been referenced back to 1P2007, but rather to the changes proposed in the appendix, the intent being to set the minimum lot width for secondary suites to 9.0 m for all districts, and the maximum secondary suite size above grade to 75.0 m for all districts and uses including Backyard Suites:

- a. In subsection 351(2) delete "70.0 and replace it with 75.0"
- b. Remove b altogether from the appendix, so leave it unchanged in the LUB (re-letter appendix after making all of these changes)
- g. Delete subsections 409(1)(b) and (c) and replace them with the following:  
(b) 9.0 metres for a parcel containing a Backyard Suite or Secondary Suite
- j. Delete subsection 429 (a.1) and replace it with the following:  
(a.1) 9.0 metres for a parcel containing a Backyard Suite or Secondary Suite
- q. Delete subsection 464 (1)(b) and (c) and replace them with the following:  
(b) 9.0 metres for a parcel containing a Backyard Suite or Secondary Suite
- (t) Delete subsection 479(a.1) and replace it with the following:  
  
(a.1) 9.0 metres for a parcel containing a Backard Suite or Secondary Suite