



Your Community, Your Association, Your Voice

November 30, 2017

Dear Members of City Council:

We understand your need to address the inordinate amount of time which Council spends addressing land use re-designation to allow for secondary suites, and appreciate that this process needs to be revised to minimize the time commitment which is required of Council given our current Land Use Bylaw.

We understand that you are looking at the possibility of making secondary suites discretionary for R-C1/single family lots. If this comes to pass, we have several concerns which we feel need to be addressed.

**We do NOT support garage and backyard suites as automatically becoming a discretionary use for these lots--** they should still require a land use re-designation to R-C1s (or the new equivalent land use that you are considering).

Unfortunately, "discretionary" simply means that the development has to fit within certain parameters in order to be approved, and allows very limited input from affected neighbours. **There need to be additional guidelines in place when dealing with these applications, which will allow for and heavily weigh neighbour input, and uphold any restrictive covenants on the properties** (even though these covenants are not tied to the LUB).

**Meaningful changes will also need to be made to the Community Standards Bylaw** to enable better enforcement around issues such as the exterior appearance of a property, as well as noise and parking concerns. This will require an increase in budget for additional enforcement, as well as enforcement around illegal suites in these properties.

**Council needs to reinstate the fees for land use re-designation to R-C1s, etc, as well as the development application and fees for basement suites in R-C1/single family properties--** given the budget cuts the City has to make, these fees should be covered by the user, not the taxpayer.

**We are also very concerned that Council maintains a minimum lot width which precludes secondary suites on 25 ft lots--** we do not want our R-C2 properties becoming 4 plexes.

**With any change intended to facilitate additional secondary suites, we request an administrative change that includes secondary suites in all calculations for density.** Using secondary suites as a means of achieving our 60 year MDP goals, and then not including them in the calculations is unacceptable-- this practice needs to change. In addition, our Council representation and community funding is based on density calculations-- secondary suites need to be included in these calculations.

Rutland Park is a unique community that already exceeds the 60 year density goals set out in the MDP. Only 12% of our residences are zoned as single family, and they have restrictive covenants on them to restrict them to single family homes. If changes are made to make suites discretionary in these properties, **we ask that City procedures dictate that these restrictive covenants be upheld.** We do not want to be pitting neighbour against neighbour in the Courts.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We will be following the Council discussions with interest.

Best wishes,

Leanne Ellis

President Rutland Park Community Association