

From: [James Mercer](#)
To: [Public Hearings](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed BYLAW NO. B-30/2024 Amendment - Comment
Date: Tuesday, December 3, 2024 4:55:24 PM

CAUTION This email originated from outside the organization. Do NOT click on links or open attachments you do not trust.

Hello,

My name is James Mercer and I have been a resident of Luxstone here in Airdrie for the past 12 years. I received this bylaw amendment notification and felt compelled to comment because in my experience the statements made are false and will negatively affect myself and my neighbors. I'd like to start by noting that holding public consultations during the middle of the working day for the majority of the public is not very convenient and means taking time off work. It is my hope that this email will carry the same weight as if I were to attend in person.

Whoever wrote this on the Airdrie web site is pushing an agenda or an opinion and had obviously not consulted the public or definitely not the public in my area.

<https://www.airdrie.ca/index.cfm?serviceID=2079>

Debunking myths

Myth: Accessory suites decrease property values.

Fact: Contrary to this belief, accessory suites can increase property values by providing additional income potential and appealing to a broader range of buyers.

Yes it increases the property value for the property with the suite owner only and at the cost and inconvenience of the neighboring residents in increased traffic and parking. I considered purchasing a home with a secondary suite and the prices are all inflated for those suited properties so this is true, but the adjacent neighboring properties definitely are not. My preference if I was looking to purchase a single family home, I would not want a neighbor with a secondary suite and the parking problems that go with it. I believe many people feel the same if they were asked.

Myth: They lead to overcrowding and parking issues.

Fact: The City implements careful planning to ensure adequate parking and maintain neighborhood aesthetics and functionality.

This is a total falsehood in my neighborhood. Parking is already a severe issue in my neighborhood and street. Many families here on my street have 2 adults with 2 or more teenage and adult children and all of them have vehicles. Easing the conditions on parking requirements for suites will only make matters much worse. There is a home with a basement suite a few doors down from me (I am not sure its legal but it has been there for years) and I have witnessed people in this neighborhood getting upset and speeding on the street (definite safety concern) because they are frustrated they have to park so far from their own home because the street is full of vehicles. I see many cars use peoples driveways as a turnaround point because they would have to go to the end of the street to maneuver a turn when the street is full.

This new change in section 4.4 is going to create problems. It's also being implied that suites will typically only have a single person with a single or no vehicle and that is also wrong. In my opinion and experience 1 suite typically equals two additional vehicles on the street. Maybe in some neighborhoods there is room for parking on the suited property, that is certainly not what I observe here on my street.

As far as secondary suites go in general, I am not opposed to them but I believe parking is already a notable problem in this community (not just my street but many) and those who would proport that parking is not an issue and that it's a 'myth' are simply wrong.

So in conclusion, I as a resident of Airdrie am strongly opposed to the change in parking requirements for secondary suites. Parking specifically is the issue to me. I believe the requirement should stay as it is written currently and any property owner who gets a permit for a secondary suite needs to provide non-street parking for the suite occupants.

Thank you

Screenshots:

Existing regulation from the Airdrie website. (which I support keeping based on bedrooms and parking needing to be on the suite owners property).

Section 6.22.3 of the LUB outlines the regulations that apply to Secondary Suites. However, there are six important regulations that determine if your property can accommodate a Secondary Suite:

1. The land use district of the property lists a secondary suite as a permitted use or discretionary use.
2. The secondary suite must be proposed within a single detached dwelling (they are not allowed in a duplex, townhouse or other types of residential units).
3. The property must not already contain a bed and breakfast, child care facility, supportive housing facility, another suite, or a home business that interacts with clients at the property.
4. The property (not the house) is at least 13.0m (approx. 42ft) wide.
5. The property (not the house) is at wide and at least 400m² (approx. 4,300ft²) in area.
6. There must be two parking spaces provided for the main dwelling/house, plus one space per bedroom (up to a maximum of two) for the secondary suite in accordance with Section 4.4 of the LUB. All parking must be located on the property. On-street parking is not counted as parking for the purpose of a secondary suite application.

Proposed change loosening this condition completely. (which I am opposed to)

3. That Section 4.4(1) Table 5 is amended by deleting the Minimum Parking Required for Accessory Uses and replacing with the following:

Section 4.4(1) Table 5

Use Classification	Minimum Parking Required
Accessory Uses	
Dwelling, Garage Suite	1.0 stall per suite PLUS Parking as required for any other land uses provided on the site.
Dwelling, Garden Suite	
Dwelling, Secondary Suite	