

Dave & Arlene Rose

Dave & Arlene Rose
7 Biggar Heights Bay
Calgary, Alberta Canada

June 17, 2020

Attention: Mr. Stefan Kunz

Re: File Number: 06701019
Application Number: PL20200024

Dear Mr. Kunz:

We are hereby registering our concerns with the above application. "You", hereafter, refers to the County of Rocky View and/or The Municipal District of Rocky View, et al.

We purchased our lot almost 40 years ago from the developers, George and Edith Biggar. At that time, we enquired about further subdivision and were informed by the Municipal District of Rocky View that any further subdivision of lots within the Subdivision was not allowed. We own the adjacent property, Lot 7, immediately to the west. The lot in question was originally a municipal reserve and likely would have remained as such except the MD sold the land because of a dispute we had with a neighbor who had been granted privileges on that property by You that we vehemently objected too.

The Rocky View Strategic Plan states, "Our mission is to preserve the Rocky View County's diverse landscape, lifestyle..." For 40 years this statement has stood true. The Biggar Heights Subdivision has stood preserved as developed and as purchased by all as R2.

Concerns:

The entire Biggar Heights Subdivision is R2 as is the vast majority of the Section.

Our concern with granting this approval is we believe setting a precedent and blueprint for the entire Subdivision to now become fragmented R1. We believe that granting approval to subdivide one lot would set a precedent to grant further subdivision requests for other/all lots as they are virtually identical. It is highly unlikely the County could refuse others from subdividing; Municipal water, drainage, wetlands etc. are all non-issues.

Page 2/3

Others could and will apply arguing on precedent. If they are enabled to subdivide, then so am I. Be prepared to approve my request when it comes before Council a week after this is approved. Point stated, we have no need or intention to do this. We purchased 4 acres within this Subdivision for the lifestyle it affords us and You have stated your mission is to preserve lifestyle.

Our entire Subdivision is covered by a Restrictive Covenant which generally conveys a higher standard and restrictive uses. If people want higher density, they have the option of moving to the city a mile away or purchasing one of the numerous smaller sized acreages for sale nearby.

In fact, there is, currently for sale, a 2-acre remainder parcel from a 20 acre subdivide immediately adjacent to the land being proposed for subdividing. If the subdivision approval is being requested by the owners of Lot 3 to provide a home for a family member, they can purchase this one. The aforementioned 2 acre residual made sense since this parcel came from the much larger undeveloped parcel. We had no issues at the time of this larger subdivide because it was well within the existing guidelines, not part of Bigger Heights and the parcels were the same or larger than ours, a completely separate entity unto itself.

As stated previously, this application if approved, will effectively become a blueprint for the re-designation of the entire Biggar Heights Bay Subdivision as others pursue the same path and rest assured, they will. The property immediately to the west of us just sold and the new owner asked us about this very topic. He was thinking of demolishing the older home on site and I believe his intention was splitting the existing lot into two lots. The property for reasons unknown to us is for sale again.

Another concern is Section 48.8 of the Land Use Bylaw.

Both R1 and R2 permit according to:

48.8 R1 / 50.8 R2

Maximum dwelling units per lot is one (1) Dwelling, Single Detached, and one (1) Accessory Dwelling Unit.

So, in effect, we and others could potentially have 4 dwelling units (1 lot divided into 2, each potentially with an accessory dwelling unit) next to us/others versus a maximum of 2 now et al, with others subdividing, a potential mess. This could result in pitting neighbors against neighbors. As we said previously, we went thru this exact scenario 33 years ago on this exact lot when You tried to lease the then lot designated as MR to a neighbor.

Page 3/3

There is this multiplier effect which MUST be considered. Two dwellings, turns into four which turns into eight This is not preserving lifestyle; this is going condo. This is happening in my birth community of Calgary, demolished homes replaced by infills and my old neighborhood was zoned for this 70 years ago so we are not fantasizing here, we can see reality

In Summary:

We are opposed to this re-designation on the grounds that the entire Subdivision is at risk of becoming a high-density redevelopment which has remained R2 for 40 years. People, such as us, purchased because of the original designation. .Too change it now would be bad faith upon the County

Please refuse this Application and follow your Mission which, as stated, is to preserve Rocky View County's diverse landscape, lifestyle,...". Lifestyle is the operative word here. Metamorphose the Subdivision to R1, which will inevitably happen over time as others will apply on precedent if this application is approved, is NOT preserving lifestyle, it is more about yapping dogs, cars, loud music, dirt bikes, garbage and tax revenue.

Once this barn starts burning there will be no stopping the flames and only ashes will remain where once a beautiful barn (development) stood.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Dave & Arlene Rose', with a stylized, elongated flourish extending to the right.

Dave & Arlene Rose

Attachment

