SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
MEETING AGENDA

TIME: 6:30 pm
DATE: Wednesday, May 22, 2019
PLACE: Council Chambers, Cochrane Ranch House

Chairperson: David Helmer
Board Members: Scott Gibson-Craig
Jenna Graham
Brenda Samborski
Scott Shannon
Doug Townsend
Alex Reed, Councillor

Town Staff: Riley Welden, Manager, Planning
Adam Nordquist, Planner II

Recording Secretary: Karen Babin

1. RECONVENE HEARING 19-004
2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM HEARING NO. 19-003 AND HEARING NO. 19-004 ADJOURNED ON APRIL 16, 2019
3. AGENDA – AMENDMENTS AND ADOPTION
   3.1 Reconvened SDAB Hearing No. 19-004

DP2018-248
144 Quigley Close
Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154
Accessory Suite (Basement)
SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

TIME: 6:30 pm
DATE: Tuesday, April 16, 2019
PLACE: Council Chambers, Cochrane RanchHouse

Chairperson: David Helmer

Board Members: Scott Gibson-Craig
Jenna Graham
Brenda Samborski
Scott Shannon
Doug Townsend
Robyn Usher, Alternate
Alex Reed, Councillor

Town Staff: Drew Hyndman, Senior Manager, Development Services
Adam Nordquist, Planner II

Recording Secretary: Karen Babin

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES FROM HEARING NO. 19-003
3. AGENDA – AMENDMENTS AND ADOPTION
   3.1 SDAB Hearing No. 19-004
      DP2018-248
      144 Quigley Close
      Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154
      Accessory Suite (Basement)
1. NAME(S) OF APPLICANT (please print): Verna Lynn Parker
   Mailing Address: 100 Windgate Close, SW AIRPORTE, AB
   Postal Code: T4B 3T1
   Phone 1: 403-797-3706
   Phone: 403-819-3577 (Ext)
   Email Address: Verna-lynn@outlook.com

2. NAME(S) OF REGISTERED OWNER, if not applicant: Verna Lynn Parker and Robert Parker
   Mailing Address: 100 Windgate Close, AIRPORTE, ALBERTA
   Postal Code: T4B 3T1
   Phone 1: 403-819-3577 (Ext)
   Phone: (604) 403-797-3706
   Email Address: Verna-lynn@outlook.com and rob.parker.29@gmail.com

3. LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots(s): __________ Block(s)/Unit(s): __________ Plan: __________

4. MUNICIPAL ADDRESS: 441 Ghigley Close

5. LAND USE ZONING:

6. EXISTING USE OF LANDS AND BUILDINGS:

7. PROPOSED USE OF LANDS AND BUILDINGS:

8. ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, PARKING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area (m²):</th>
<th>Basement Floor Area (m²):</th>
<th>Ground Floor Area (m²):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>541.57 m²</td>
<td>46.9072 m²</td>
<td>47.27 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Floor Areas (m²):</th>
<th>Suite Area (m²):</th>
<th># of Parking Spaces:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>541.57 m²</td>
<td>42.303 m²</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. BUILDING SETBACKS: (for Garden Suites only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front (m):</th>
<th>Side (m):</th>
<th>Side (m):</th>
<th>Rear (m):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. OTHER INFORMATION: Please provide any other pertinent information below or on separate sheet(s).

    We are the new owners who purchased this property for our son, Matthew Parker, and his family to live in while he is attending school to become a pastor. The previous owners built/finished an illegal suite in the walkout basement area. We would like to make this suite safe and legal, legalizing the secondary suite.
NOTICE OF DECISION

DECISION DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2019

TO: VERA-LYNN PARKER
100 WINDGATE CLOSE
AIRDRIE, ALBERTA T4B 3T1

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NUMBER: DP 2018-248

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVED: ACCESSORY SUITE (BASEMENT)

MUNICIPAL ADDRESS: 144 QUIGLEY CLOSE

LEGAL ADDRESS: LOT 22, BLOCK 32, PLAN 971 1154

This development has been approved by the Cochrane Planning Commission and is subject to the conditions contained herein.

Conditions of Approval:

1. This development is classified as an Accessory Suite (Basement) and is a Discretionary Use in the Single and Two Dwelling (R-2) District, on the lands legally described as Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154.

2. An Accessory Suite (basement) of 42.3 square meters is approved in accordance with the approved plans. Any changes to the design, format, location, orientation, capacity or use of any part of the development must receive the approval of the Development Authority before they may be commenced.

3. There shall be no use or occupancy of the accessory suite unless verification is obtained, by means of a Final Inspection, from the Town of Cochrane Safety Codes Officer that the accessory suite meets the requirements of the Alberta Building Code (2014), to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.

4. In addition to the parking required for the principal dwelling, the applicant shall provide and maintain one (1) off street parking stall at all times for the use of the accessory suite. The parking stall shall be hard-surfaced and have dimensions of 2.75m x 6.0m. On street parking for this development shall not be permitted.

5. The area leading to the parking stall from the entrance of the accessory suite shall consist of hard-surfacing material, including: asphalt, concrete, brick, or interlocking block. The pathway to the parking stall shall be grated and surfaced to ensure conformance with the Surface Drainage Bylaw, as may be amended from time to time.
6. Construction materials, including garbage, shall be stored securely in weather-proof and animal-proof containers to the satisfaction of the Development Authority so as not to create a nuisance to neighbouring properties.

7. The applicant/owner shall be responsible for the clean-up of any garbage, materials or other items that may be unsightly, or disperse beyond the boundaries of the subject property during the construction of this development.

8. In accordance with Section 1.5.1 of Land Use Bylaw 01/2004, a Development Permit, if issued, is valid only if development commences within one year of the date of Development Permit issuance and the development is completed within two years of the date of issuance. A new Development Permit may be required unless a request for a time extension to the applicable date is received prior to its expiry.

**ADVISORY NOTES:**

a) It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to comply with all requirements of Land Use Bylaw 01/2004, other municipal regulations, and all provincial and federal legislation, including, but not limited to the Alberta Public Health Act.

b) All permits as required by the Alberta Building Code shall be obtained and the applicant/owner shall remain compliant with the provisions of this code at all times. All building permit applications must be affixed with the seal of a professional architect.

c) Inspections are conducted by the Town of Cochrane Safety Codes Officer.

d) All buildings are to comply with the fire codes and regulations in place at the time of construction.

e) The address for the accessory suite is 144A Quigley Close; please be advised that due to external agency processing times, it may take up to six weeks for your address to be registered at Canada Post.

f) All contractors working on this development shall acquire a valid Cochrane Business Licence prior to the commencement of any work and shall maintain the licence for the full duration of the construction period.

g) The Town of Cochrane encourages the establishment of an additional waste account with the Utilities Service Department at the Town of Cochrane for waste collection at the time of the accessory suite development.

h) Access around and to the water meter must be maintained.

i) It is the responsibility of the applicant to meet all conditions of approval.

Pursuant to the Municipal Government Act (MGA), if the Town of Cochrane does not receive any written notices of appeal from yourself or from a deemed affected party as established in the MGA within twenty-one (21) days of the above advertising date (February 28, 2019), a Development Permit may be issued, unless there are specific conditions which need to be met prior to issuance. An appeal, accompanied by the appeal fee, as established by Town Council, may be filed through the office of the Secretary of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board at the Town Office no later than 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2019.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ADAM NORQUIST
PLANNER II / DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
TOWN OF COCHRANE
P: (403)851-2570
E: planning@cochrane.ca
11. APPLICANT(S) DECLARATION:

I / We (please print), Vern & Lynne Parker and Robert Parker

hereby certify that I am/we are the registered owner(s) or authorized to act on behalf of the registered owner(s) and that the information on this form and on the attached plans and supporting materials is full and complete and is, to the best of my/our knowledge, a true statement of the facts relating to this application.

Date Signed: December 20th, 2018
Signature: Vern - Lynne Parker
Signature: Robert Parker

12. RIGHT OF ENTRY:

I / We (please print),

being the registered owner(s) or person(s) in possession of the herein land and building(s) thereon, hereby consent to an authorized person designated by the Town of Cochrane entering upon the said property for the purpose of inspection during the processing of this application.

Date Signed: December 20th, 2018
Signature: Vern & Lynne Parker
Signature: Robert Parker

Compliance with the requirements of Land Use Bylaw 01/2004 does not afford relief from compliance with the Municipal Government Act, R.S.A. 2000, CHAP M-26, or any other federal, provincial, or municipal legislation, or the conditions of any easement, covenant, building scheme, or agreement affecting the lands or buildings.

NOTE: This personal information is being collected under the authority of the Municipal Government Act and will be used in the processing of this application. It is protected by the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. If you have any questions about the collecting of this information, please contact Planning and Engineering Services, 2nd Floor, Cochrane Ranch House, 101 Ranch House Road, Cochrane, AB, T4C 2K8, 403-851-2570.

INFORMATION REQUIREMENT TO ACCOMPANY THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION FORM

1. Application Form: Be as detailed as possible and fill in all relevant 'blanks'. Use a separate sheet of paper for any additional information that you think is relevant.

2. Application Fee: Fees vary according to the type of development being proposed. Please contact us for the fee that is applicable to your proposal.

3. Site Plan: Two full-size 24" x 36" hardcopies; three 11" x 17" hardcopies; and CD or USB key containing drawings in PDF and AutoCAD (2007 version or newer). To be included on the professionally produced drawing/plan(s):
   a) Property boundaries
   b) Legal description and municipal address of the property
   c) Dimensions, including parcel size, of the site (metric)
   d) Location (sizes and dimensions) of all existing and proposed buildings and their uses, including all setbacks (distances from property lines)
   e) "North" arrow
   f) All access roads (streets, lanes, etc.)
   g) All registered utility rights-of-way and easements
   h) Land uses and buildings on adjacent properties
   i) Existing and proposed: utilities, site drainage, site grades, the grades of the streets and sewer servicing the property, elevations of top of curb or sidewalk and lot corners (not required for simple applications)
   j) The height, dimension, and relationship to property lines of all existing and proposed buildings and structures including retaining walls, trees, landscaping, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and other physical features
   k) Landscaping plan: existing and proposed vegetation, including number, type, and sizes of trees and shrubbery (includes percentage of landscaping that is proposed as natural landscaping)
   l) Loading and parking provisions (layout, number and dimensions)
   m) Access locations to and from the site
   n) Garbage and storage areas and the fencing and screening details of same
   o) Fencing and screening of the development site
   p) Location and approximate dimensions of existing and proposed parks, playgrounds, and other amenities
   q) Where applicable, information describing any noxious, toxic, radioactive, flammable, or explosive material proposed for use or storage
   r) A "title block" showing designer's name, applicant's name, preparation date, revision dates, and drawing numbers
   s) Replica/graphics, dimensions, construction materials, locations, and colours of any proposed signage

4. Elevations and Floor Plans:
   a) Floor plans of all levels of building(s)
   b) Elevations (all four sides) of the building(s) including exterior building materials, colours, and heights

5. Copy of Title: A current copy of a Certificate of Title, including relevant encumbrances, searched and dated within thirty (30) days of application submission.

6. Authorization: Signature(s) of all registered owner(s) on the application form or a letter of authorization from the registered owner(s) authorizing the proposed development.

7. Additional Information: Depending on the scope of the development proposal, additional information (i.e. traffic impact assessment, geotechnical reports, groundwater hydrology study, etc.) may be required. Staff will advise in consultation with you.

Questions? Please do not hesitate to contact planning staff at 403-851-2570
Site Information
Municipal Address of land being developed:
144 Quigley Close (Not Quigley DRIVE)  
Development Permit No.:
DP2018-248
Legal Description of land being developed:
Lot 22, Block32, Plan 971 1154
Proposed Development:
Accessory Suite (Basement)

Appellant Information
Name: [Name Redacted] and Colin T. Fox  
Name of Agent (if applicable):
Colin T. Fox
Mailing Address:
142 Quigley Close
City:
Cochrane  
Province:
Alberta  
Postal Code:
T4C 1S4
Phone No:
403 397-1775  
Email:
tomfox@telus.net

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL Sections 678 and 686 of the Municipal Government Act require that the written Notice of Appeal must contain specific reasons for the appeal.

I/we do hereby appeal the decision of the Development Authority for the following reasons (attach a separate page if required):

Numerous residents adjacent to, and within close proximity of 144 Quigley Close are strongly opposed to it being granted secondary suite approval mainly (but not limited to), for reasons of:
1. Many quality of life considerations negatively impacting residents in the vicinity of the subject property and the community at large - specifically, a history of serious ongoing noise issues.
2. Safety concerns such as parking which impact immediate residents & the community at large.

We outline extensive details backing our views in accompanying documents provided herein. We want to state how disappointed we are that community planners & administration put people like us through this agonizing process, and do not feel well represented by this government.

This notice, accompanied by the appeal fee of $200.00, must be submitted as set out below within twenty-one (21) days of:
(i) the date of the written decision or the date of the deemed refusal, in the case of an appeal by the applicant;
(ii) the date of the order, in the case of an appeal against a section 645 order (a stop order); or
(iii) the date that notice of the decision is issued pursuant to the Land Use Bylaw, in the case of an appeal by an affected person,
in accordance with section 686 of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000 c. M-26:
The Secretary  
Cochrane Subdivision and Development Appeal Board  
Cochrane RancherHouse  
101 RancherHouse Road  
Cochrane, Alberta T4C 2K8

This personal information is collected under the authority of the Municipal Government Act and will be used in the processing of this application. It is protected by the privacy provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. If you have any questions about the collecting of this information, please contact Legislative@cochrane.ca or 2nd Floor, Cochrane RancherHouse, 101 RancherHouse Road, Cochrane, T4C 2K8.

NOTE: THIS INFORMATION WILL FORM PART OF A FILE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

Signature of Appellant/Agent: [Signature]
Date: YYYY  
03  
2019  
03  
21
March 16, 2019

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to appeal the request for a legal suite at 144 Quigley Close. This used to be a nice, clean, quiet, family oriented community. In recent years this cul-de-sac has become loud and busy, with a noticeable decline in outward appearances and socioeconomic standards.

Many of the long term residents of this community are growing tired of the loud parties, and crowded and illegal parking.

I have serious concerns of allowing more of these rental “suites”. It will lower property value, entice more low income renters, increase noise and parties, and increase an already crowded parking situation. I legitimately don’t know where any more cars would park in this cul-de-sac. This is in no way a reflection on the persons requesting the permit.

Please help us keep this a nice, clean family community, and not lower its standards further.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Travis Cox
140 Quigley Close
Dear Town of Cochrane,

To whom it may concern: I am responding to a letter I received regarding a legal suite at 144 Quigley Close. I am writing this letter to appeal the above legal suite. I have concerns because there is already minimal parking spots in our cul de sac. It is often a major problem when people have company over. The traffic is often very fast, noisy, unsafe for the many children that are on or near our road. I feel the idea of suites in our cul de sac and probably in other areas of Cochrane cannot accommodate more parking. This street is maxed out w/ vehicles when everyone is home.

Please give very serious thought regarding the other families that will be negatively affected by parking, extra unnecessary traffic, noise, partying, etc. If one duplex is allowed a suite then other duplexes will be entitled to the same request; it would definitely be a disaster for everyone.

Property values would drop, noise levels and frustration would rise. This is in no way a reflection on the current family living next door to us who have requested this permit. Please help us keep this a nice, clean family community and not lower its standards further on our street and in other Cochrane streets. Thank you for your time consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely

Wendy Shepherd.
146 Quigley Close

March 20/2019
March 14, 2019

Town of Cochrane
Cochrane, AB

Attention: Planning and Development (appeal process)

To Whom It May Concern:

As per my letter of January 27, 2019 with concerns to an additional legal suite 2 doors down from our location of 148 Quigley Close.

I have deep concerns of not only an issue of parking but interruptions to our peaceful and enjoyment of our property.

This suite was rented out illegally not so long ago and we had to deal with continuous unknown people coming in and out of this property at all hours, parties late at night, dogs barking and children screaming and having to fight to find a parking spot at my residence.

As this property is only 2 doors away we were unable to enjoy sitting in our backyard. The continuous stream of people coming and going also affected my dog and she would bark at the continuous number strangers and it was unfair that I had to keep her inside while the people at this property were able to have loud parties that disturbed us continually.

I made a complaint to bylaw however I was threatened by bylaw that I need to deal with my dog. There was never a follow up from bylaw on the continuous noise and parking issue.

I cannot believe that you would even consider another legal suite at this location given the issues that arise from rental units at a dead end cul du sac.

As I previous stated in my last letter I feel that another rental unit in this cul du sac will reflect negatively on our property value and we are not in agreement with another rental suite 2 door down from our property.

Sincerely,

Anita McFeeters
SUB DIVISION AND APPEAL BOARD
ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Regular Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Date:</td>
<td>April 16, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originated By:</td>
<td>Adam Nordquist, Planner II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Number:</td>
<td>DP2018-248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal:</td>
<td>Accessory Suite (Basement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address:</td>
<td>144 Quigley Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Address:</td>
<td>Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation(s):</td>
<td>R-2 Residential Single and Two-Dwelling District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Verna-Lynn Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Verna-Lynn Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authority of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board

As per Section 685(1) of the Municipal Government Act, any person applying for a permit that is affected by a decision made by a Development Authority may appeal to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB).

On February 21, 2019, the Cochrane Planning Commission acting as the Development Authority in accordance with Section 3.1.1 d) of the Land Use Bylaw 01/2004, issued a Notice of Decision to approve Development Permit 2018-248, subject to the conditions found in Appendix One.

The Municipal Government Act provides the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board with the authority to confirm, vary, substitute, or deny the decision of the Development Authority.

Development Permit Application Background

On December 28th, 2018 the Town received a Development Permit application for the development of an accessory suite in the basement of a semi-detached dwelling located at 144 Quigley Close as shown in Appendix Two. The subject property is designated R-2 Residential Single and Two-Dwelling District, where the purpose and intent is to:

"provide for single-detached, semi-detached, duplex, and street-oriented townhome residential development in existing neighbourhoods and new neighbourhoods that are designed to provide for integrated varying lot sizes, and to allow for a blend of different housing forms. These neighbourhoods may contain a limited number of accessory suites or garden suites."

Within the R-2 district, accessory suites are provided for as a Discretionary Use. The application was therefore referred to the Cochrane Planning Commission for a decision.

The Town had received a complaint about the existing basement development was being used as an illegal suite. The property was sold prior to any compliance action being taken by the Town. The new property owner contacted the Town and a site inspection was conducted. The
inspection was conducted by Planning Services in coordination with the Town’s Safety Codes officers, Development Compliance Officer, and the property owner to ensure that basement could be brought into compliance with the Alberta Building Code and the Land Use Bylaw prior to making an application. It was determined that the suite could be brought into compliance and the owner made application for the accessory suite. Photos from the site inspection of the proposed accessory suite are attached in Appendix Three.

Upon submission of the application, the proposal was circulated to both internal and external agencies. In addition to comments received through the circulation, the proposal was then further reviewed by Town Administration for compliance with the Land Use Bylaw. As a result, Administration presented the application to the Cochrane Planning Commission recommending approval at their February 20, 2019 meeting.

**Planning Review**

**Cochrane Sustainability Plan & Municipal Development Plan**

The development of accessory suites in the Town of Cochrane aligns with the guiding statutory planning documents, as well as Pathway 9 and 11 of the Cochrane Sustainability Plan. Pathway 9 of the Cochrane Sustainability Plan (‘Everyone has a roof over their head’) describes success as housing options that are diverse, accessible, safe and affordable for all income levels, for either ownership or rental. Pathway 11 of the Cochrane Sustainability Plan (‘Wherever you are in Cochrane, you are close and connected’) includes a target of increasing density within the existing 2009 footprint. In addition, the Municipal Development Plan states a shared community vision in Section 1.1.8, “Diversity of Housing: Cochrane’s goal is to ensure that housing is available to all, regardless of income, lifestyle or life cycle”.

The purpose of the application for an accessory suite is to develop a legal rental unit within the existing home which creates accessible, safe, affordable rental housing options in the community. Locating accessory suites in appropriate homes is an effective and appropriate way of increasing residential density within an existing community’s footprint. Thus, the guiding planning principles outlined in the Cochrane Sustainability Plan and the Municipal Development Plan are adhered to with this application.

**Land Use Bylaw**

Administration reviewed the application for compliance with the Land Use Bylaw based on the floor plan and the site plan attached in Appendix Four and Five. The regulations specific to Accessory Suites are listed under Section 12.3.0 and administration found that the proposed application did comply with all regulations under the Bylaw, specifically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Bylaw Requirement</th>
<th>DP2018-248 Application</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Accessory Suites</strong></td>
<td>A registered owner of a lot shall be limited to one accessory suite or one garden suite</td>
<td>The application is proposing one accessory suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory to a Principal Residence</strong></td>
<td>All accessory suites shall be accessory to the principal residence.</td>
<td>The principal residence is contained in the main and second floor with direct access from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comply with the Alberta Building Code</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall comply with the Alberta Building Code and all Municipal and Provincial regulations.</td>
<td>An inspection was held prior to the application and the requested changes are reflected in the floor plan. A building permit will be required and is reflected in the conditions of the permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exterior Structure Changes</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall create minimal structural changes to the front exterior of the principal building, which shall appear as a single dwelling unit.</td>
<td>No structural changes to the front exterior were included in the permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Floor Area</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall not exceed 40% of the total gross floor area of the principal building.</td>
<td>The total floor area of the dwelling is 148.8 m². The accessory suite has a floor area of 42.3 m² which is 25.4% of the total dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Floor Area</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall have a minimum floor area of 30m².</td>
<td>The accessory suite has a floor area of 42.3 m².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Servicing</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall have full utility services through service connections from the principal residence.</td>
<td>The accessory suite is fully serviced through the principal building’s utility connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Density</strong></td>
<td>An accessory suite shall not exceed the maximum density prescribed for the neighbourhood in which it is located or a maximum of 10% of the number of existing lots in that neighbourhood, whichever is less.</td>
<td>There are 10 other identified accessory suites in West Terrace and approximately 496 residential lots in the community. This application brings the density of accessory suites in the neighbourhood to 2.0%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Requirements</strong></td>
<td>1 stall per studio or 1-bedroom; 2 stall per 2 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>2 stalls are provided on the driveway and 2 stalls are provided for in the attached garage, for a total of 4 stalls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Circulation of Development Permit Application*

The application was circulated to appropriate internal departments and external agencies for comment. There were no objections to the Accessory Suite any internal departments or external agency. An adjacent resident had submitted a letter of objection to the proposed accessory suite citing concerns of noise control, plumbing, municipal enforcement, emergency services, waste collection, and snow removal.
Administrative Decision

At their February regular meeting, the Cochrane Planning Commission voted to approve the accessory suite with conditions as per Section 3.1.1 d) of the Land Use Bylaw 01/2004 and Schedule C of the Procedural Bylaw 01/2011.

Appendices

1. Notice of Decision
2. Context Map
3. Site Photos
4. Floor Plan
5. Site Plan
APPENDIX ONE: Notice of Decision for DP2018-248

NOTICE OF DECISION

DECISION DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2019

TO: VERA-LYN PARKER
100 WINDGATE CLOSE
AIRKRIE, ALBERTA T4B 3T1

DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NUMBER: DP 2018-248

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVED: ACCESSORY SUITE (BASEMENT)
MUNICIPAL ADDRESS: 144 Quigley Close
LEGAL ADDRESS: LOT 22, BLOCK 32, PLAN 971 1154

This development has been approved by the Cochrane Planning Commission and is subject to the conditions contained herein.

Conditions of Approval:

1. This development is classified as an Accessory Suite (Basement) and is a Discretionary Use in the Single and Two Dwelling (R-2) District, on the lands legally described as Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154.

2. An Accessory Suite (basement) of 42.3 square meters is approved in accordance with the approved plans. Any changes to the design, format, location, orientation, capacity or use of any part of the development must receive the approval of the Development Authority before they may be commenced.

3. There shall be no use or occupancy of the accessory suite unless verification is obtained, by means of a Final Inspection, from the Town of Cochrane Safety Codes Officer that the accessory suite meets the requirements of the Alberta Building Code (2014), to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.

4. In addition to the parking required for the principal dwelling, the applicant shall provide and maintain one (1) off street parking stall at all times for the use of the accessory suite. The parking stall shall be hard-surfaced and have dimensions of 2.75m x 6.0m. On street parking for this development shall not be permitted.

5. The area leading to the parking stall from the entrance of the accessory suite shall consist of hard-surfacing material, including: asphalt, concrete, brick, or interlocking block. The pathway to the parking stall shall be grated and surfaced to ensure conformance with the Surface Drainage Bylaw, as may be amended from time to time.
6. Construction materials, including garbage, shall be stored securely in weather-proof and animal-proof containers to the satisfaction of the Development Authority so as not to create a nuisance to neighbouring properties.

7. The applicant/owner shall be responsible for the clean-up of any garbage, materials or other items that may be unsightly, or disperse beyond the boundaries of the subject property during the construction of this development.

8. In accordance with Section 1.5.1 of Land Use Bylaw 01/2004, a Development Permit, if issued, is valid only if development commences within one year of the date of Development Permit issuance and the development is completed within two years of the date of issuance. A new Development Permit may be required unless a request for a time extension to the applicable date is received prior to its expiry.

ADVISORY NOTES:

a) It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to comply with all requirements of Land Use Bylaw 01/2004, other municipal regulations, and all provincial and federal legislation, including, but not limited to the Alberta Public Health Act.

b) All permits as required by the Alberta Building Code shall be obtained and the applicant/owner shall remain compliant with the provisions of this code at all times. All building permit applications must be affixed with the seal of a professional architect.

c) Inspections are conducted by the Town of Cochrane Safety Codes Officer.

d) All buildings are to comply with the fire codes and regulations in place at the time of construction.

a) The address for the accessory suite is 144A Quigley Close; please be advised that due to external agency processing times, it may take up to six weeks for your address to be registered at Canada Post.

f) All contractors working on this development shall acquire a valid Cochrane Business Licence prior to the commencement of any work and shall maintain the licence for the full duration of the construction period.

g) The Town of Cochrane encourages the establishment of an additional waste account with the Utilities Service Department at the Town of Cochrane for waste collection at the time of the accessory suite development.

h) Access around and to the water meter must be maintained.

i) It is the responsibility of the applicant to meet all conditions of approval.

Pursuant to the Municipal Government Act (MGA), if the Town of Cochrane does not receive any written notices of appeal from yourself or from a deemed affected party as established in the MGA within twenty-one (21) days of the above advertising date (February 28, 2019), a Development Permit may be issued, unless there are specific conditions which need to be met prior to issuance. An appeal, accompanied by the appeal fee, as established by Town Council, may be filed through the office of the Secretary of the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board at the Town Office no later than 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2019.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Adam Hornequist
PLANNER II / DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
TOWN OF COCHRANE
P: (403)851-2570
E: planning@cochrane.ca
APPENDIX TWO: Site Context

- **Subject Property**
- **Other Accessory Suites**
APPENDIX THREE: Site Photos

Figure 1 Front of Property

Figure 2 View of Entrance to Suite (Exterior)
Figure 3 View of Entrance to Suite (Interior)

Figure 4 Fridge and Stairs to Main Floor
Figure 5 Existing Fireplace

Figure 6 Kitchen
Figure 7 View of Driveway from Gate

Figure 8 View of Gate from Rear Yard
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1. Introduction:

N.B. Much of the body of this original report was presented to the CPC, some modification was made to it.

This research report will outline reasons for strongly suggesting against allowing two secondary suites to be approved within two adjoining semi-detached properties, especially when such properties are located in close proximity to the end of a cul-de-sac, and even more so, especially when prior such suites have been previously approved in close proximity to new applicants. Furthermore, community residents strongly advise against approving two adjoining properties within a single semi-detached pair of properties.

2. a) The Subject Property
The subject property is located on municipal address 144 Quigley Close in the Town of Cochrane. The property shares an adjoining wall with 142 Quigley Close. Whereas 142 Quigley Close has applied to the Town of Cochrane and fully complied with all requirements for a legal basement suite, 144 Quigley Close intentionally circumvented the development process and built an illegal basement suite circa 2016 under the previous owner [REDACTED]. 144 Quigley Close was sold to new owners in the winter of 2018 and the new owners are making application to have the illegal suite granted development approval for legal status.

During 144 Quigley Close’s history as an illegally suited property, there has been an ongoing history of negatively impacting the quality of life and safety concerns such as recurring noise issues, fire safety issues, and traffic issues.

To amplify the concerns which this subject property brings as a semi-detached home is the fact that it is located at the bulb of a short curved cul-de-sac street which is populated with existing semi-detached homes which were built in 1998 with the developer’s initial intent on providing the town a quiet but affordable development of higher density semi-detached homes. The layout of this community poses ongoing traffic congestion concerns among community residents as vehicles are often parked on both sides of Quigley Close resulting in a congested and potentially unsafe scenario as far as potential roadway accidents with children are concerned. As the map shows the subject property does not have a laneway as some properties do for alternate access.

Although 144 Quigley Close’s development permit has been advertised by the Town of Cochrane it has been mistakenly identified as 144 Quigley Drive in the Cochrane Eagle. Also, the signage for the Development permit has been pretty well invisible to the community as it has only been placed on the front door of the home and this signage also has the incorrect address identifying the property.
The photos below were taken before the appeal date stating Notice of Development. Again, the stated address is incorrect and the visibility of the signage is pretty well non-existent.

2. b) The Problem of Secondary Suites on Cul-de-sacs with semi-detached homes

The subject of this presentation is that the Town of Cochrane does not up until this point in time in its existence have a logical, standardized planning approach to analyzing highly problematic community planning scenarios which present themselves to the Town, neither on a day to day enforcement basis nor on a wider administrative policy basis. As such, the Town fails to learn from its own past experiences and the experiences of others, within its own community and the best practices of other communities. There is a real lack of consistency of thought, no justified rhyme nor reason as to why the Town might make one planning decision in one case and yet a different decision in another similar situation. The cost to the community is real and tangible. The effects of the Town’s poor decision making are clearly not evident to the Town’s people themselves, especially the public servants who draft and enforce the laws in the communities which we live in. Later in this report, I will communicate various points, (not in any particular order of importance), which will expand on these ideas.

3. Visualization Exercise / Thought Experiment

As you read this report, please imagine yourself in the following scenario. You own a semi-detached property with a walkout basement, (your adjoining neighbor also has a walkout basement). You decide to go on a three month holiday,
traveling around the world and shortly after you return home you notice that your next door neighbor has suited out their basement and rented it out to tenants.

You speak with another neighbor about this and they tell you that they had no idea about this change of use because; they just don’t check the newspapers for that sort of thing and there was nothing visible in the neighborhood to open the subject up for discussion. This other neighbor tells you that they would have objected to the basement being suited out but that in fact it is now too late to do anything about it because the town has changed the title to the property and this nearby neighbor was never given any notice about the change of use effectively converting this single family home into a duplex.

As you roleplay, this exercise consider that at first, there are no problems with this new neighborhood arrangement but imagine that months from now your adjoining neighbor sells their home and that the new purchaser is an investor who rents out the upper floor and basement to two separate families. Imagine that this investor is a miser who does not value a proper property maintenance schedule. Imagine also that the investor has a very low standard when it comes to screening tenants and that the two new groups of tenants are noisy both inside and outside the home.

Inside the home, they often play their televisions loudly when sports games are played, cheering loudly as they enjoy their entertainment at the expense of your peace and quiet. Imagine that the downstairs neighbors have a similar lifestyle and that both families take part in many noisy outdoor parties with backyard fires and barbeques, plenty of alcohol, drugs and lots and lots of loud noise.

Consider that you have asked the neighbors if they’d respect your right to quiet enjoyment of your own home and that these renters and the landlord are indifferent and even antagonistic to your requests.

Consider also that you call the municipal services such as the local police force, fire department, and bylaw but that none of them are useful in responding to your requests to enforce applicable community standards.

As a property owner who shares a common wall with your adjoining semi-detached property, what you once considered to be a definite step up from condominium or townhouse living, your middle-class little castle of a semi-detached home has turned into a private hell, and the town’s services aren’t willing to do anything to rectify the situation.

How would you feel about this having your right to the quiet enjoyment of your property and other property ownership rights violated? Where does the Town of Cochrane draw the line one individual property owner’s rights when they legally open the door to the indiscriminating clustering of secondary suites within already densified semi-detached homes?
• From a planning perspective, a semi-detached home is **not** the same as a detached home
• A post-construction property can almost never be sound-proofed to the extent of a newly constructed home
• Any property along a cul-de-sac posses a unique set of planning challenges over a home on a through street
• Any home at the end (or bulb) of a cul-de-sac posses even greater constraints and congestion issues than further down the cul-de-sac
The subject properties to this appeal are 142 Quigley Close on the left and 144 Quigley Close on the right. Clearly, these are two semi-detached properties. It is important to note that these properties are located at the end of a cul-de-sac with no back lane-way. 142 Quigley Close applied for and a development permit for a legal basement suite in 2016, while the prior owners of 144 Quigley Close intentionally circumvented the development process completing an illegal renovation. New residents of 144 Quigley Close are now looking to legalize their basement suite but surrounding neighbors are opposed to the application because of a long-standing history of complaints among prior residents of quality of life and safety concerns which were never addressed by the Town of Cochrane.

4. **The positive reasons for allowing a secondary suite within most existing developments**

There are basically two reasons for favoring approval of a secondary suite within an existing zoned permitted or discretionary use property, these two reasons are:

1. Financial considerations: the homeowner or investor seeks to bring in an additional monthly income to maximize their investment. This reason does not and should not carry any significant planning merit, especially over and above considerations for safety, quality of life and long term property and community property values.
2. The homeowner wishes to have family members, friends or caregivers occupy their secondary suite. This is a rather weak reason which should not carry much planning merit since there is no need to provide people with a separate self-contained, independent secondary suite. In the vast majority of cases family members can and in fact, do live within regular homes.

Therefore, from the outset, the idea of secondary suite approvals on the basis of planning merit alone is at best a very weak and emotional argument.

5. **We’ll now explore some of the negative reasons for not allowing secondary suites within an existing development of semi-detached homes. Especially when an existing secondary suite exists within a suite. And especially when the semi-detached property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac.**

**Reason 5.1: Horrible Intra-building and Inter-building Noise Control Diminish Quality of Life to ALL Occupants:**

For the purposes of this section, it will be useful to make the important distinction between the terms, sound, and noise.

Sound can be thought of something which we can control such as the volume of your music player, whereas noise can be thought of as acoustics which is out of our control. Examples of noise would be engine retarder brakes as trucks drive through a community, train shunting, or quite simply next door neighbor noise. It makes sense that noise which is intense in volume, prolonged in duration, occurring at all possible hours of the day or night can be initially very annoying and over time a safety hazard to a families health.
Sound is an acoustic property which we can control. Noise is an acoustic property we cannot control.

One person’s passion >>> Can be other people’s pain

Images of people experiencing excessive noise:

https://www.google.com/search?biw=1488&bih=1322&tbm=isch&sa=1&ei=co6wXK_BKoSj8AObt7WwBQ&q=person+experiencing+noise&oq=person+experiencing+noise&gs_l=img.3...112723.122007..122249...0.0..0.76.1691.25......0....1..gws-wiz-img.......0j0i67j0i5i30j0i8i30j0i24.4dT-RLjeWJg

After purchasing 142 Quigley Close, to my disappointment, I soon experienced that the home which I’d recently purchased in 2013 had very poor quality sound attenuation between the walls of the semi-detached partition walls between 142/144 Quigley Close.

For reference purposes, I enclose the following videos:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZlAZsYp2M-U&list=PLSv8XRdwg-RxbE6dIgKS8Ob98JwjUFKpZ

https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=noisy+neighbors

Here is a valid comment made from the above video:

position normal

The most important issue here is WHY ARE DEVELOPERS ALLOWED TO GET AWAY WITH SUB STANDARD WORK. You don't just buy the place. You have to factor the cost of soundproofing. Building regulations in the UK change every year. It's ridiculous.

This was a major oversight which I never considered in this purchase decision – that of sound quality within my property. I had a home inspection performed before purchasing the home but the home inspector never mentioned this as a factor to be considered. After moving into the home I started noticing things which I’d never considered such as:

• I routinely heard the neighbors closing their cupboards in the kitchen
• I often heard the neighbor closing their front door and garage door as if it were happening within my own home
• I could hear loud talking, television, and music in my neighbor’s home such as in the bedrooms, kitchen, living room, basement and of course outside in the backyard. Hearing the neighbors next door was possible on all floors within the home, even in the basement.
• I could hear and feel floor trusses reverberating if the neighbors were walking roughly on the floor, especially when their kids were playing roughly
Summary of Reason 5.1: Horrible Intra-building and Inter-building Noise Control Diminish the Quality of Life to ALL Occupants:

This is a very serious quality of life issue which I’d like the planners to strongly consider. If the building quality in a multifamily home or semi-detached property is so poor from the outset that neighbors can hear themselves from one dwelling to another then quality building code standards should not make for a good basis from which to increase the population density of homes even further by permitting the addition of secondary basement suites. The quality of life for all residents is likely to deteriorate as the number of people within the homes is permitted to increase through the allowance of secondary suites. Furthermore, not only do the quality of life considerations become compromised but safety issues become another serious factor. Everyone relies on a good night’s rest (shift workers rarely have the luxury of sleeping at night) and to suffer the consequences of continual distress because a town has decided to permitted adjoining neighbors to overpopulate a property can only lead to diminished quality of life and safety for many people.

After completing my property renovation at 142 Quigley Close and putting the utmost effort into soundproofing the property to the maximum extent possible, I can honestly say the living experience is really sub-par from an internal noise perspective. As an occupant in the basement suite, I can still hear people walking above me, talking and playing music. The tenants above me, tell me that they can hear when I’m speaking downstairs – this after an over $2,500 investment in the best sound control technology.

In summary, a post-construction renovation will never have the sound control potentially achieved in a quality new construction build. When it comes to the major consideration of sound control within a residence, a post-construction renovation project is not a long term satisfactory solution from a quality of life perspective. It will always result in an inferior quality of living scenario. Not being able to control the sound levels within your own property because of infiltrating noise is a major negative factor against permitting secondary suites within semi-detached homes.

The problem of acoustic quality in building construction is really quite complex because the building code has minimum standards to address this issue. Therefore builders being profit minded enterprises usually make no effort to exceed the minimum requirements within and between semi-detached homes because to do so would reduce their profits.

A number of appellants of this appeal either have worked or still do work in the EMS field are have regularly witnessed traumatic events which, in their traumatic nature, could easily shake most caring people to the core. Yet they have had to put up with the continuous, ignorant excessive noise of the prior residents at 144 Quigley Close with their prior secondary suite and the town never did anything to get those situations under control. This is not fair and it is not right that people should have to live in this kind of community/town. What are residents paying their taxes for in such a small town as Cochrane, if the administrators and their services can not get such noisy quality and safety of life concerns under control?

https://www.cbc.ca/cbcdocspov/episodes/after-the-sirens
Reason 5.2: Serious Inability of the RCMP to Restore Peace and Maintain It Within A Community:

As the reader reads this report it would be most useful to have an understanding in what role the Canadian police have had in the short history of this country since its inception in the 1860s with its first Prime Minister John A. McDonald. The legal system and enforcement of this country is in many ways a travesty of social engineering which we’re still paying for today. This book does a good job of outlining how we all got in this situation in which we’re in today ...
https://www.amazon.ca/dp/0889773408/?coliid=I28Q0KP9RUPHUL&colid=2TL01KH522I3P&psc=0

When my original neighbor moved out of 144 Quigley Close circa 2014 the new neighbors who moved in were initially fine, until the point in time at which they got an acrimonious separation and [redacted] husband [redacted], left her. [redacted] then renovated her home into an illegal basement suite and after bringing in and changing out a number of tenants settled on a boisterous single mother who like [redacted] is a French Canadian. From that point forward [redacted] could most accurately have been described as a slumlord, turning her property into a fraternity-like party dwelling often hosting loud weekly or biweekly parties throughout the year.

It is imperative that I try to attempt to communicate to the Town of Cochrane what transpired over a two year period as [redacted] and her illegal tenant [redacted] inhabited their homes as single mothers, not because I want to drag the reader into seemingly irrelevant particulars, on the contrary, I want to lay to bear how over the years of many given instances which Cochrane By-law, the Fire Department and especially the RCMP failed miserably in maintaining the peace over a long, two year period of time. I want to emphasize that given that these critical services, (in particular the RCMP) had failed over a very long period of time that there is a very serious and inherent problem which has yet to be identified by the planning and administration in Cochrane. Three years of past experience in the Town of Cochrane has proven that these three community services are simply incapable in being relied on to enforce the rule of law in this community according to the MGA – Municipal Government Act and their own duties. All of these services, but in particular the RCMP were grossly deficient in effectively playing their roles in Cochrane regarding the problems associated with the illegal suite at 144 Quigley Close.

This problem here is that if a planner takes a community of already somewhat dense semi-detached homes, specifically at the end of a cul-de-sac and then increases the congestion of the neighborhood by granting secondary suites, especially to adjoining neighbors, then undesirable problems are very likely to result from such decisions. The undesirable problems are going to be either:

- Decreased quality of life for immediate and surrounding residents with potential risks to safety
- Possible tense, vigilante-like behavior between residents as they compete over limited resources and contest right to peace and quiet laws and,
- A drain on public services, with more frequent calls to the police, fire department and by-law services. The question then is, will those three services be able to provide satisfactory remedies or not? In the case of the situation at 142/144, a long pattern of failure has resulted from those three services to restore order to the community. This in itself is a telling sign that increasing the permitted inhabitant density in such situations as the end of a cul-de-sac is to open the door to failed expectations as I have experienced on behalf of other community residents.

I’d like to reference the following Facebook post which [redacted] illegal tenant who was living in [redacted] illegal basement suite made of me after [redacted] had sold her property. The context of this post is that I had advertised my property for rent. Here is [redacted] post:
Again, was an illegal tenant in an illegal basement suite for almost two years with .

I want to state that I am not a pedophile. I’m not a dangerous character. If I’m the worst ‘assel’ that this belligerent individual has ever met then she has definitely had a charmed life. What a disgrace of ‘neighbors’ these French-Canadian people were. Absolutely disgusting. And the RCMP never did anything to protect me over the years.

When I contacted the RCMP and spoke with Constable Racicot regarding this post, he, like other officers was completely ineffective in bringing any restitution to the matter. You’re on your own he told me. This is a civil matter.
Hello Colin,

As per our phone conversation this morning, this file will be concluded as it is not a criminal matter. As I explained to you on the phone, if you want to proceed on this matter, you will have to proceed through civil court.

I know you have other matters involving RCMP Members you are currently dealing with. I trust you are satisfied dealing with me on this particular matter.

Thank you and take care,

Cst JP RACICOT
Cochrane RCMP
403-851-8000 ext 325

No Cst Racicot I’m not at all satisfied dealing with you. You, like other members of the RCMP, especially Constable Garland and Sgt. Kalis failed to do anything to protect me and keep the peace in my own neighborhood when neighbors were causing simple disturbances and later verbally and physically assaulting me. Why would anyone be satisfied with such pitiful representation which you and your RCMP members provide?

Please forgive me for not providing the reader here with more evidence in the form of pictures and videos most of which I’ve deleted from my phone because I never knew that I’d be needing them to communicate with Cochrane planners about all of this, but between the above Facebook post where [redacted] made her unjustified public slandering of me and the time that I’d called the RCMP out to the first Disturbing of the Peace call which I’d made to the RCMP, (almost two years prior to [redacted] post); the RCMP we’re absolutely useless in restoring law and order to our community. Those two years were two more years of Alberta hell with regular loud weekly neighborhood backyard parties, often times with upwards of over 40 people on the premises at 144 Quigley Close with alcohol, drugs, loud & profane language, loud music, unsafe fires, verbal threats of violence to me, physical enactments of violence to myself and always the RCMP were completely ineffective.

There was one single instance where the RCMP were somewhat effective in handling the complaint and that was for the first complaint which I called them out to which would have been early in the year of 2017. On that first of numerous calls was the only time in which the RCMP issued the owner of 144 Quigley Close a ticket for disturbing the peace for a noisy, drug-induced backyard party. One would think that on subsequent similar calls for disturbing the peace, that the fine would have been increased from the original amount, and then increased even further, as doing so would have served as a deterrent to continuing with the loud intoxicated parties. But the RCMP never did this. Not once did they issue a ticket beyond the first ticket which was issued back in early 2017.

On each call that the RCMP came out on I told them that the owner had constructed and occupied an illegal basement suite with tenants and asked them if they could report the matter to the Town of Cochrane but in all instances, they refused to do so citing that it was not in their job description to do this and that was a civil matter to be taken up by myself with the Town.

What did the RCMP expect from me making the calls to them? Did they not want me to make the calls and instead act out like a vigilante dealing with the situation between myself and the problem noisy neighbor? The entire Cochrane RCMP failed miserably in restoring peace and order to a very simple ongoing situation in which they had almost two years of frequent concerned citizen calls to address.

On a number of occasions, the RCMP asked me if; “I was telling them how to do their job?” Well, I never did tell them how to do their job but I should have. I assumed that among the many cops which the community employs from Inspector Weare’s detachment, people who are very well paid, outfitted with imposing bulletproof vests, batons, radio dispatch, guns on their belts, guns sometimes on their thighs; in short decked out to the hilt as if they just come off a
stint in the Iraq war with their threatening gang-like demeanor, that the least that they should have done is issued a first ticket for Disturbing the Peace and then issued a second ticket for a higher amount, a third for an even higher amount, a so fourth for a yet higher amount. Simple. A very simple solution, commonly employed in similar situations such as the issuance of speeding tickets, dog violations, etc. But no; this simple fix failed to occur to the entire RCMP. In fact, not only did it not occur to them and not only did they fail over a two-year period of time to take control of the long-standing disturbing the peace problems situation at 144 Quigley Close but they actually started to show visible signs of frustration in me contacting them. Clearly the RCMP had been building a file on my calls and rather than solve the problems for what they were: i) valid complaints regarding disturbing the peace both outside and within the property, unsupervised child activities on and off property, threats and enactments of violence by family and friends against myself, uttering threats of violence to me, etc. The RCMP especially failed to protect me and the entire community but then to add an element of stupidity to the matter, the RCMP started to utter threats to me with Constable Scobie threatening to charge me with making frivolous complaints to them and charge me with theft for not acting as my neighbor’s soccer ball retriever as they continuously kicked soccer balls into my yard when not pounding it against my fence like a loud bomb going off. There was an occasion in which I phoned the RCMP because the neighbor’s children and illegal tenants were throwing snowballs at me or jabbing me at my front door with this hockey stick:

yet the RCMP failed to ever lay charges against any of my guilty neighbors who were committing these verbal and physical crimes against me. What a useless community police service – paid for with tax payer’s dollars.

At times my neighbors would ridicule me because they were assuming that I didn’t speak French; which I don’t. This was full-scale bullying between the many as a crowd and myself as a single person, a neighboring property owner – all because I didn’t feel comfortable putting up with all of their loud and unruly behavior adjoining my property and phoned the police with an initial complaint. Although the bullying started as my neighbors targeting me personally it gradually morphed into the RCMP targeting me personally too. Threatening to charge me with bogus charges of whatever they could make up just as they had back in 2014. The charges involved no elements of law and were completely unsubstantiated. Totally bogus charges followed up with malicious prosecution. The RCMP can and do wrongfully convict anyone if they want to do so simply because they are the police and they do this each and every day without consequence other than to disturb and possibly ruin people’s lives as they have mine. I now understand the modus operandi by which the police committed genocide on a nation full of indigenous people in this country through the mechanism of the law called the Indian Act they basically one by one corralled an entire nation of people into genocide.
It’s no wonder that so many people dislike and distrust the Canadian and other police; many of them have good reason to do so.

In the end, Constable Garland who’d been out on two prior calls which he’d completely botched up and maliciously accused me of wrongdoing finally on the third call to me fulfilled his personal wish which was to lay a charge against me without actually reading my rights. A charge of mischief for speaking with what appears to be an illegal status visitor to our country - a [redacted], who tried to rent 144 Quigley Close from [redacted].

To date, the RCMP has not investigated the background of [redacted] despite me personally contacting Inspector Weare about him. Yet constable Garland finally fulfilled his personal dream to charge me with mischief for speaking with him and offering to rent my property to what I later learned was an illegal resident. Later the RCMP’s Garland would change his charge to me as an offense of “Breach of privacy” for unintentionally running over my neighbor’s kid’s skateboard ramp which they’d left in front of my car as I was backing out of my property.

For those reading this report, I’m sure that this sounds too bizarre to believe. This is the point of me making the effort to write this factual case out to yourselves because if you do not think that packing in, two legal suites side by side in an already adjoining semi-detached property which is already located on a congested cul-de-sac is a poor idea from a planning perspective, then please think again!

My point is that not only can many bizarre unpleasant and unsafe interpersonal things happen in such situations when the feel of a community is changed for the worse but if and when such unpleasant and unsafe situations do take place, then the police, rather than adding to the stability and civility of the situation are actually very likely to make an already bad situation much, much worse.

With all of the many opportunities which the Cochrane RCMP had to ameliorate the many serious breaches of law at 144 Quigley Close, they did nothing to do so. In their ineptness and frustration, they laid bogus charges on me which were later dropped by the ‘Crown’ as outlined in the letter below:
I want to emphasize in this report, that a person can’t even confidently live in quiet retirement in the community of Cochrane, hoping to live in relative safety with such a useless local police service. I’m currently in the process of filing a complaint with the RCMP Civilian Review and Complaints department and will be taking my concerns public thereafter.

At this point, it may not seem appropriate to mention this matter here, in the body of this report but I feel compelled to do so because what I’m going to disclose is so disturbing: In the fall of 2017, I met an employee at Canadian Tire whose name is [redacted] cell phone number [redacted]. [redacted] told me that a very good female friend of his in her early 20’s was pulled over by the RCMP for driving slightly over the speed limit, around 2013. She was presented a ticket by an officer
after which she asked if there was a way the ticket could be rescinded. She was told to step into the officer’s cruiser and given a proposition to have the ticket canceled if she performed oral sex on the public servant, RCMP officer. Yes, the RCMP officer proposed a blow job in exchange for rescinding the speeding ticket. Confused by his proposition the young lady did as she was proposed. She had understandably felt disgusted by this act and the next day visited the local RCMP detachment in Cochrane where her allegation was dismissed as not being possible. Apparently, the officer came to her home and uttered a threat to her that if she tried to make his life difficult, that he’d make her life a lot more difficult.

[ ] has told me that she has since wanted to put the matter behind her because of the humiliation of going public and intimidation by the RCMP. I want to be explicit that I heard this allegation from what seemed to be a very credible witness in [ ]. Initially at the telling of this [ ] was willing to come forward to the Town but he’s since retracted his willingness to come forward stating that his fears that his firearms license may be compromised if he comes forward. The officer was given a transfer to another district – this all sounds like something out of the playbook of the Catholic Church. If this did, in fact, happen then chalk it up, to another dirty secret in Cochrane’s hidden legacy. For those who question if this sort of thing would even be possible by Canada’s red-coated public servants, please do some research:


RCMP, Strathmore officer sued by woman for sexual misconduct

By Nancy Hixt and Tamara Elliott  Global News


As I say, living in Alberta has been an eye-opening and traumatizing experience for me. I used to be a sucker for the picture postcard, red-coated propaganda which this country has been turning out for over 100 years of the RCMP, but I’m glad that I’ve had an awakening and I now join the millions of other Canadians who distrust all police officers.

Trust is the most valuable asset anyone or any organization could ask for and once shattered trust can never be fully recovered. This is the tragedy of the Canadian police; they have so much blood and misery on their hands and in this country’s collective unconscious that no matter how hard they try, they’ll never be able to be what they are truly meant to be – enforcers of the rule of law. They will always be dirty. The RCMP and our justice system will always be entangled with the dirt of the worst kind, together they comprise a kind of dog and pony circus show.

Although my time in Alberta has repeatedly left me financially devastated, the firsthand experience of the ineptitude and corruption of this province and country has opened my eyes to things which I’ve always been naïve to – trusting the establishment, in particular, the police and justice system.

How can any thinking person honestly be trusting of their homeland after its longstanding genocide against its very own indigenous people which continues until this day? We are all living in this Matrix, this country of vipers, backstabbers, wolves in sheep’s clothing ...
Summary of Problem 5.2: Over-densifying a Developer’s Initial Community Concept with Secondary Suites can easily lead inept and corrupt police gangs to become a serious threat to a community’s safety and quality of life as they become unwilling and/or unable to deal with increasing community tensions.

My advise to Cochrane ‘planners’, in particular the Cochrane Planning Authority is please don’t think of packing more people into an already tight space such as the end of a dead-end street lined with semi-detached homes because people being what they are, they can tend to become very nasty, very quickly and Cochrane’s police ‘services’, despite being a Legal Mafia have demonstrably proven to be very inept and incapable of righting simple situations of disturbing the peace no matter how straightforward it may appear to be and how much time they are given to do it.

The question here is: When policing becomes questionable or fails outright; when accountability becomes substituted by propaganda and public relations ploys.: Then who is watching our watchers?

Always take into consideration Murphy’s First Law: “If it can go wrong; it will go wrong” – therefore, the more trouble planners invite by increasing the congestion within a neighborhood in already unfavorable, overpacked conditions, the more trouble we can all expect.

When police are as conflicted and corrupt as our RCMP, where they need to sign non-disclosure agreements upon being hired that they will never divulge their internal secrets then the fact is that citizens can never truly trust such a broken and dysfunctional gang-like organization. Witness the tragedy of this one individual among thousands of abused employees within the RCMP and other police forces, Krista Carle –

My experience of living in Alberta for a number of decades is that if anyone is fully trusting of the police as I once was is incredibly naïve and lacks a serious dose of life experience. Our police and justice system are a sad attempt at constructing a civil society. Both of these organizations are a legal mafia which more often than not self contradicts themselves.

Please at the very least, skim through all of the links which I’m providing. With regard to the RCMP, anyone will have to admit that this organization has far more messy skeletons in their closet than any one individual can possibly have. The upshot of this is that no decent citizen should fear standing up to this organization which has historically proven to be manipulative and coercive.

https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei=-nuwXNFvJi310wKW76SYCw&q=macleans+rcmp+complaints&btnK=Google+Search&oq=macleans+rcmp+complaints&gs_l=psy-ab.3...1892.13362..13698...0.0.83.1696.24......0....1..gws-wiz.....0..0i131.TolLJrVb5I4


One might ask, “What does this have to do with community planning?” The answer is – “Everything” … If a person thinks that disturbing the peace calls and such will always be dealt with in a professional and competent manner by the police; think again. Police are humans and incredibly fallible, and when they hold some sort of grudge against you don’t expect them to act impartially and professionally.

https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei=mICvXPqTEImN0gKQ8JD4Aw&q=krista+carle&btnK=Google+Search&oq=krista+carle&gs_l=psy-ab.3..0i4j0i10l6.3410.5687..6288...0.0.110.895.11j1......0....1.gws-wiz.....0..0i131.TolLJrVb5I4

I have experienced ongoing unjustified harassment and assaults by the Calgary Police and RCMP with numerous wrongful convictions and malicious prosecutions because of inept and corrupt policing. So if it can happen to me, it can easily happen to anyone else. At the writing of this report, I am on the verge of bankruptcy because of these persistent
police assaults. At the time of the writing of this report, Inspector Lauren Weare is perceiving me to be a threat to the community of Cochrane and to Canada because of the emails which I have had with town’s people and politicians. Sgt. Kalis has informed me that I am under investigation for suspicion of intent to cause harm to bureaucrats. So it is that an illegal resident like me has more rights than a citizen of Canada such as myself.

All RCMP and bylaw officers should be outfitted with modern day technology bodycams because, as it stands now, police are afforded too much discretion which they often breach, even in a criminal way.

**Reason 5.3: Serious Outdoor Noise issues:**

When permanent secondary suite residents are living within the tight quarters within a small 500 sqft. secondary suite it is only natural for them to want to spend a lot of time outdoors in their backyard and perhaps with their back door open. Sounds from within the secondary suite will easily project into the backyard, infiltrating into other people’s spaces. A serious quality of life issue presents itself as such residents potentially create a lot of noise outside with that noise pollution traveling to neighboring properties. And because of the way that sound intensity projects itself at the square of the distance, those located closest to the noise generator have their quality of life most severely affected, especially when two secondary suites are located in immediate proximity of each other.

Loud house parties and uncourteous noisy behavior at all hours of the day and night. Routine noisy parties of up to 40 people at a time and neither the RCMP nor bylaw were ever able to get them under control. Of course bylaw close for the day at around 7 pm which only leaves the RCMP to try to deal with noise complaints – a task which was to difficult to deal with, instead, out of their frustration to deal with the problem they charged me as the person who made the complaints.

**Reason 5.4: Parking Issues and ineffective community bylaw services:**

An official requirement for a legal secondary suite is that the community is concerned that the subject property can provide adequate on-site parking while also satisfying a Transportation Impact Analysis.

Transportation engineers allocate each property to 10 trips per day per household. Increasing the density of a single-family home to allow for a secondary suite makes that traffic flow potentially 20 trips per day. Having two semi-detached homes each with their own secondary suite should accommodate for a potential of 40 trips per day by car. The
question is, ‘where does the town draw the line on secondary suite density, especially within already dense communities which were initially developed for a semi-dense housing scenario.

The Google image at the top of this report is a good indicator of what can be expected at the end of this particular cul-de-sac. However, I’ll enclose a few more recent photos which are representative of what more often than not happens in the immediate vicinity of the property where 144 Quigley Close is currently requesting approval of a secondary suite. There are a number of ideas I’d like to comment on as you view these photos, they are:

- **These parking violations have been taking place in one form or another since I’ve been residing in this community since 2013. That is to say, such sloppy parking violations have been taking place for at least seven years, day and night throughout the year.**

- **Note how some photos clearly reveal vehicles parked deeply into and on the designated green space of the lawns. Other photos display vehicles parked on sidewalks. Other photos reveal vehicles parked side by side, doubled or tripled up on the roadway or at times nosed in as on the Google map image.**

- **I’ve reported violations such as these to:**
  1. On many occasions, I’ve pointed such parking violations out to the RCMP and they were indifferent to my comments. Constable Garland even had the gall to insist to me that there was nothing wrong with such parking!! Garland also sided with children playing with their skateboards on the municipal road at the end of this cul-de-sac and faulted me with ‘running over the kid’s skateboard ramp on purpose’.
  2. I’ve made many appeals to Cochrane By-law officers pointing these specific infractions out to Frank Borsos, constable Muthana, Stan and others and although they’ve all agreed that this is not acceptable and in violation of bylaws but they’ve done nothing to remedy the situation. Many of these photos were taken just days before submitting this initial report in January of 2019.
  3. I’ve spoken with a number of fire captains about these parking problems and they, like the RCMP seem indifferent to the matter, emphasizing that: “It is out of their control because it is a bylaw issue and as such is outside of their sphere of operations and in their opinion if they needed to move vehicles out of the way that their fire engines would have the brawn to manage the task”.

I find the indifference of all of these supposed professionals to be uncomfortably out of touch with reality. If people are given the entitlement to park as they so choose while violating bylaws then we can definitely expect that we’re courting disaster and that one day will come where a fire engine might take much longer than necessary to access and service a severe fire because they’re blocked by a dangerously congested parking scenario – in such a case accessing a fire which is raging out of control and not reaching it in time could make all the difference in the world with vehicles parked in such an inconsiderate manner.

Speaking of inconsideration; sidewalks are made for walking and not for the ignorant to park their vehicles over, as depicted in some of these photos which bylaw, RCMP nor Fire department never did anything about.

One might ask, what does this have to do with an application for a secondary suite? Two things:

1. **As resident density increases, we can naturally conclude that the need for off-site parking will increase and as I’ve been repeating over and over again in this report and will continue to do so, the end of a cul-de-sac is a horrible situation to question how people will deal with their extra parking requirements because, by its very nature, a cul-de-sac invites the kind of trouble scenarios as are naturally presenting themselves in these photos.**

2. **As the saying goes, “A picture is worth a thousand words” add to that, my three points above about who I’ve spoken with; RCMP, Fire & bylaw, what their responses have been, (zilch) and how the problem continues and the Town’s administration and planning, in particular, should have clear validation about what the attitude of the highest up professionals in the RCMP, Fire department and bylaw have traditionally been to such longstanding problems. Their response has been to be indifferent, complacent and laissez-faire. Que sera, Sera!! It’s all good according to our public servants, add to that, it’s not in their job description!!**
In summary, with such real life, practical demonstrations of ignorant human nature I emphatically state that officially changing a community’s ‘feel’ in particular at the end of a cul-de-sac street, already populated with semi-detached homes is a recipe for community decay and possibly worse unsafe disaster by way of loss of life.

What is needed in such communities is not further densification of the population but enforcement of existing community rules which many residents are stretching well beyond the limit.
I’d like now to draw attention to the bylaw ticket and warnings I’ve been issued in the past pertaining to unsightly premises. I never imagined when I purchased this home in 2013 that its poly-B plumbing was an issue at all; or that such plumbing would be bursting in neighboring homes. Therefore because I set out to do all of the renovations on my own and had no prior experience in doing such work and wanted to do a very good job by not only meeting but exceeding all current building and safety codes, my renovation work took me longer than I intended or wanted it to take.

I phoned the current Mayor Genung while he was running for election and stated my dissatisfaction that since I’d moved here in 2013 the Town of Cochrane had not done anything to clean up the unsightly graffiti in the public spaces such as along the pathways. This is more than unsightly, it is a criminal violation and falls under the category of vandalism.

When Marni Fedeyko came to my door knocking at my home looking for support in the upcoming 2017 Cochrane election I mentioned two issues which were of great concern to me: 1. The unsightly graffiti which devalues this entire community and my neighbor’s illegal basement suite at 144 Quigley and how the current owner had turned her property into a regular and continuous bylaw infracting fraternity house with loud wild parties at all hours of the day and night, her unsupervised children running wild on and around my property, ongoing parking issues, and personal concerns I had to my safety because of her building and safety code violations and fraudulent misrepresentation to the
Town and her and her residents personal threats both verbal and physical to myself and how the RCMP, Fire Department nor bylaw had ever done anything to right these wrongs which my neighbor had been committing over a long, (over two year) period of time.

Over a two year period of time, I frequently had bylaw show up at my home warning me to take action to clean up my premises. I should add here that seeing these bylaw characters show up unannounced at a person’s home with bulletproof vests, sporting batons, radio dispatch equipment, handcuffs, etc. can be a very nerve-racking experience. Many of these individuals look as they have done military service in Iraq or are looking to make their mark in the community as the local hero/sheriff and quite honestly both their appearance and demeanor make them look as though they’re expecting the worst in a situation.
As the above letter dated 2018 so clearly states, boldlyed out at the bottom:

**MAINTENANCE IS TO BE CONDUCTED ON A REGULAR BASIS**
The photo’s shown below, (taken at the time of writing this email in 2019) reveal a small sampling of the graffiti which publicly litters the community of Cochrane. These same images have been present since I moved here in 2013. These high traffic pathways, the jewels of the community of Cochrane are frequented by on and off duty bylaw officers, sheriffs, and RCMP on a daily basis with the unsightly problem, literally right in front of their eyes!

Again, I mentioned this issue specifically to Jeff Genung and Marni Fedyko before I voted them for office in 2018 telling them that these same images, and others, have existed at least since 2013. These high traffic pathways, the jewels of the community of Cochrane are frequented by on and off duty bylaw officers, sheriffs, and RCMP on a daily basis with the unsightly problem, literally right in front of their eyes!

Talk about a lost opportunity for positive action. How about having a graffiti program in place and enforcing it judiciously?

I want to make two important points here. Firstly, it's clearly hypocritical for community administrators to have individually and collectively singled me out as they have with bylaw giving me ultimatums to complete my construction project and clean up my yard. And by being threatened by the RCMP and having that threat actioned by laying bogus charges against me, only for the ‘Crown’ to drop all charges, when I was always in clear and transparent compliance with the Town regarding the legal status of my secondary suite renovation. The second point is that there is clearly A LOT WRONG WITH THIS TOWN in not noticing things which it clearly should notice and enforcing rules which should be enforced – as my report is revealing there are a lot of holes in this ship we might call the Town of Cochrane – like a chicken with its head cut off or a person who doesn’t know what either their left hand nor their right hand are doing there are problems galore in this community.

How do all of these problems being presented relate to secondary suite applications submitted by property owners of semi-detached homes, especially ones which populate the end of a cul-de-sac? Simple, this scenario shouldn’t be
permitted because not only is such a situation potentially disastrous from a quality of life and safety perspective, but it is something which this Town is by a historical case history analysis perspective, has already proven itself incapable of managing properly.

I want to end this section with a final thought: When the new manager of Cochrane bylaw come to my home last summer, unannounced with peace officer Muthana, he stood over me with his intimidating large frame decked out with his paramilitary gadgets and uniform and with a very charming disposition told me that I’d have to clean up my yard. I agreed and told him that I was doing my best effort to do so to which he replied that he was giving me a deadline by which to have the project completed and if not, he’d be issuing me a fine. A fine which would increase if not dealt with in a certain period of time. I asked Mr. Borsos about all the violations within my own community, pointing out vehicles such as those shown in this report and asking Mr. Borsos if this kind of parking was acceptable and if not if it were more than unacceptable but an offense. Mr. Borsos looked at the vehicles and said that such parking wasn’t permitted. Yet his entire department failed to do anything about this unruly parking even up until the time of my writing this report.

Let’s see if writing this report helps the community of Cochrane to solve more than the sloppy and dangerous parking issues along my street, I’m hoping that my consulting report to yourselves will help you to make the entire community a better place to live by addressing such sloppy parking. When I pointed to those other vehicles out to Mr. Borsos, his demeanor instantly changed to be threatening and nasty toward me. “OH, NOW YOU’RE GOING TO START POINTING TO THINGS ALL AROUND YOU!! I KNOW WHAT YOU’RE LIKE! THIS MEETING IS OVER! CLEAN UP YOUR MESSY YARD! WE’LL BE COMING BACK IN TWO WEEKS AND IF YOUR PROPERTY ISN’T CLEANED UP WE’LL BE ISSUING YOU A TICKET!!”

Yes, sir Mr. Borsos! And when will you start doing your job and clean up your mess?

**Suggestion:**

I’d like to make a suggestion for the Town Councilors to hire a few summer students and outfit them with electric bicycles so that they can drive up and down every single street, alleyway and pathway twice a year and do a full accounting of the condition of the community. So many times bylaw has told me, “We’re TOO BUSY to take care of the whole Town!!” Seriously people, if Google maps can do street view images of every street on the planet then certainly a small community like Cochrane can do the similar within the Town of Cochrane. Can it not? I encourage the Town to do an accounting of the entire Town twice a year, spring and summer and then get back to property owners by letter or phone telling them they need to bring and keep their property up to standards. This will protect everyone’s investment in the Town and prevent it from spiraling into decay.

By the way, CPC, the unsightly photo on the left shows a property affected by an owner’s leaking oil pan gasket. A problem which been in existence for years posing a clear environmental hazard to the community as oil is spread onto the sidewalk and roadway. This problem has been years in the making, Cochrane’s bylaw and RCMP have been totally ignorant of this and other similar problems.

The property on the right is a similar tragedy in the making with my next door neighbor who is seeking permission to add density to his newly acquired property with an application for a legal basement suite – this is not a water stain, it also is an oil leak on what used to be a pristine driveway before they took possession of the property in December 2018.
Summary Reason 5.4: Ineffective community bylaw services resulting in lower standards of living for all residents:

With respect to the application for a secondary suite at 144 Quigley Close, the point which I wish to make is that it is easy for this Town to mindlessly grant approval for any suite on a property, but there are tangible real-life consequences to doing so. As far as this Town is concerned it clearly has a long history of failure in properly upkeeping its existing infrastructure, safety, and esthetic ambiance. So officially adding to the densification to communities in high problem areas such as at the end of cul-de-sacs, populated with semi-detached homes is doing nothing but courting problems and making an already bad situation worse.

Reason 5.5: Serious Fire Risk and Safety Issues:
Photographs showing continued calls for illegal backyard fires and disturbing the peace calls at 144 Quigley Close, these photos reveal what a drain on community resources can result from over-densification of neighborhoods through just one secondary suite.

The photos above show numerous Fire and RCMP responses to problems at 144 Quigley Close, which my prior slumlord neighbor presented at the semi-detached home adjoining my property. Not only were the Fire department and RCMP totally useless in dealing with the situations presented to them but in their frustration, the RCMP began to target me as a source of the problem.

The backyard fire pit which was throwing sparks high into the air and was too close to the common property line. The fire department never required the firepit to be moved and the property owner was never fined. What a waste of
community resources to have the RCMP and Fire Department come out and do nothing other than to get frustrated with me for making a valid call to the community as opposed to acting out as a vigilante.

Professionals like yourselves shouldn’t need a layperson like me to tell you that **when you increase the inhabitant density in a community, the risk of deadly fires increases.** What I want to share with yourselves is the two years of frustration I personally experienced communicating with the Cochrane Fire Department regarding a bylaw contravening backyard fire pit and trying to communicate the associated facts that there was an illegal basement suite within the property which the Fire Department called on numerous times. Please note all of the illegally parked vehicles in within the vicinity of the home. The answer from the Fire Captain was discouraging on all occasions. Regarding the inappropriate backyard fireplace which should have been at least 9 feet from the fence, the fire department never had the residents properly reposition the fireplace, (they did get the residents to put a lame spark arrestor on top of the chimney – lame, because it served no purpose, and they did get them to increase the patio stone coverage area under surrounding the fireplace).

When I requested that the fire department issue the residents of 144 Quigley Close a fine for their fire violations, the acting safety person insisted that he wouldn’t do so. How bizarre that Cochrane fire department will come out on a call where residents are making multiple safety violations on multiple occasions and not enforce any of the safety violations.

When I raised the issue of the illegally parked vehicles dangerously restricting access to the home the fire captain told me that, that was not a matter which he could deal with because it was a bylaw violation and had nothing to do with him. He was also unquestionably confident that he and his brawny fire truck could move any vehicles out of the way if it was needed – I beg to differ because assuming that a fire engine was not blocked by vehicles on both sides, it would still take vitally critical minutes to move vehicles out of the way. Minutes which could make the difference between a successful call and a disaster.

In response to the RCMP’s frequent thin skinned comments of “Are you telling me how to do my job?!” Yes, I am certainly making common sense suggestions for all of you to do your jobs because I feel that you definitely need the input and that your lack of action has cost me dearly in living in this community both in contributing to my financial ruin and lack of safety and compromised quality of life which you’ve all contributed to.

When I raised the concern that 144 Quigley Close had an illegal basement suite, not done to code with heavy smoking, heavy drinking, illegal resident, this also did not stir any interest on the part of the fire captains nor their fire safety representative who came out on the calls. They appeared genuinely interested in countering every concern which I was presenting them with rather than taking any kind of constructive action or entering into dialogue with the Town’s safety and planning personnel about all of the problems associated with 144 Quigley Close.

Oh well if even the fire department doesn’t really care enough to fully immerse themselves in vital situations as they arise then that speaks volumes for the apathy of the community at large.

Again, this is another reason not to increase the population density of semi-detached homes in a community with secondary suites, especially in close proximity to adjoining properties located at the end of dead-end road.

I cannot afford to move to purchase a detached home because living in this community has been a nerve-racking experience which has contributed to my financial ruin. I try to look on the bright side of things and say better to be financially ruined by my community than to be burned alive in a house fire, although I don’t think that something like this is far off in Cochrane.

When things get serious like this, you come asking for help from the public ...

Summary Reason 5.5: Serious Fire Risk and Safety Issues:

When the Town’s services such as Fire Department, Bylaw and RCMP receive valid concerns from an upstanding community member like myself and they continually discount those concerns as they did, this is a sad situation indeed. None of these departments had an appreciation for my efforts to communicate the many wrongs being perpetrated by my neighbor – in fact, these ‘service providers’ were dismissive of my concerns and as far as the RCMP showed signs of frustration and aggression toward me.

Who wants to live in a community like this with such neighborly ignorance and drama which is so draining on vital community resources which in turn are themselves inept in handling these situations?

The last point here is, don’t count on increasing population density in a tight access community at the end of a dead-end street as being a wise decision from either a safety perspective or a quality of life perspective for anyone.

In 1995 Cochrane’s planning strategy was to limit growth by restricting access within communities. As a result of this, if you want to enter into the community of West Terrace, the only way to do so is through Quigley Drive. The implications of this planning strategy are serious on many levels. Consider a three-alarm fire at West Point Manor and then just one kilometer away if another serious fire were to occur on Morgan Street which is only 1 kilometer away this would require a fire truck to travel for 10 minutes in non-rush hour traffic. Because the network of single access feeder roads into
Reasons 5.6 and 5.7: Waste Disposal and Snow Removal are often problematic at end of Cul-de-sac:

Waste disposal and snow removal at the end of a cul-de-sac are always going to be challenging and problematic but even more so when the homes on the street are already of a higher density nature such as semi-detached homes. The challenges and problems will be magnified as the density of the local community will be officially increased by allowing for secondary suites, thereby increasing the congestion within the local community.

communities is so predominant in Cochrane the potential for serious safety hazards will only increase if indiscriminate approval of secondary suites is granted over time.
Properties with secondary suite are encouraged to acquire an additional set of waste disposal bins, but there is far too much congestion at the end of cul-de-sacs and a shortage of storage space for spare bins.

The picture below shows the challenges which waste disposal drivers routinely go through at the end of cul-de-sacs.

Three-point turns are necessary to negotiate these large 18-ton vehicles at the end of cul-de-sacs and the task becomes increasingly challenging when increased bin density and parking congestion are permitted to take place.

The email below is a correspondence between me and Becky Pearson from the Town of Cochrane. Becky states that when secondary suites have been approved by the town, it is encouraged that they are outfitted with extra bins. However, the idea of further congesting with an already inherently restricted scenario where the frontage in front of a cul-de-sac with more waste bins is not a good idea. Simple egress and entry of vehicles are very challenging when pie-shaped lots have minimal property frontage dimensions to place a minimal amount of waste bins.
Thank you Becky as I mentioned in our conversation I believe that because the ongoing requirements for disposal capacity at this property will be low and the congested nature of this end of the cul-de-sac location is very restricting to vehicular traffic; (especially for the waste disposal trucks), therefore I am choosing to opt out of any additional bins at this time. Should things change and we require extra bin capacity in the future which cannot be satisfied with the existing bins we’ll contact the town in the future.

Thanks again,
Tom

From: Waste and Recycling <wasteandrecycling@cochrane.ca>
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 12:34 PM
To: tomfox@telus.net
Subject: Additional collection bins

Good afternoon Tom,

After our telephone conversation yesterday I investigated further with utilities and planning and engineering. According to your development permit you are encouraged to establish an additional waste account but are not required to. Should you wish to add carts to your address after your tenants move in please contact us. Thank you,

Becky Pearson
Administrative Assistant
Direct: 403-851-2277 ext. 3

Town of Cochrane
101 Ranchahouse Rd, Cochrane, AB, Canada T4C 2K3
Becky.Pearson@cochrane.ca  www.cochrane.ca

No wonder Becky Pearson is recommending secondary suites get extra bins, this photo shows how my neighbor often dumped their garbage into my bins after their weekly rowdy get-togethers because they lacked the space to put trash in their own bins:
Problems 5.6 & 5.7, Waste and Snow removal become quality of life issues when already crowded cul-de-sacs become overcrowded.

Reason 5.8: Building Code Issue of Banned Plumbing:

The homes on Quigley Close are approximately 21 years old and have all been originally outfitted with Poly-B plumbing which is by today’s building code standards banned. Poly-B plumbing is not to code, it has been replaced with PEX tubing. Many homes in this district (I know of 7 such properties) have had their water pipes burst to result in significant property damage. 144 Quigley Close had major property damage in 2014 causing the owners to have to move out while insurance companies restored the damage. Unfortunately, the insurance company DID NOT refurbish the entire plumbing piping in the home, only a small portion where the problem originated was changed out. The probability is highly likely that 144 Quigley Close which is seeking approval for a legal basement suite will have more problems with their plumbing failing on them in the future. If and when that plumbing fails it would potentially be affecting two families within its single property AND also potentially affect its adjoining property at 142 Quigley Close. When I renovated my property I changed all of the plumbing out completely ensuring a safe environment for myself, my neighbor and our community.

Summary of Reason 5.8: Plumbing Problems Specific to 144 Quigley Close relating to Safety and Quality of Life Issues:

Adjoining semi-detached homes which are outfitted with obsolete, building code banned plumbing such as 144 Quigley Close pose potential problems not just for individual property owners but for the adjoining owners putting their well-being and property investment at risk. Therefore, officially increasing the density in such semi-detached dwellings to triplexes or fourplexes is not a good idea from a quality of life perspective.

Reason 5.9: From the standpoint of avoidance of clustering of secondary suites properties, it simply does not make sense to place secondary suites in adjoining semi-detached homes. The neighboring communities of Calgary, Airdrie, Okotoks, Strathmore, and Rockview realize this:

How do other communities consider secondary suites with semi-detached properties along cul-de-sacs?

Calgary:

The City of Calgary does not permit secondary suites within semi-detached homes unless the zoning is re-designated for R-G or R-CG by developers who are clearly intending to change the original feel of the entire development.
**Suites in semi-detached dwellings**

- Only in the R-CG, R-G, or R-Gm district can a secondary suite exist in a semi-detached or contextual semi-detached dwelling.
- In multi-residential districts (M-CG, M-C1, and M-C2), secondary suites are ONLY allowed in single-detached dwellings. Even though a secondary suite is a permitted use in these districts, for a suite to exist in a semi-detached dwelling, it must comply with the rules of R-CG AND be physically located in one of the three districts.
- Two options exist for customers wanting a secondary suite in a semi-detached dwelling:
  1. Re-designate to R-CG and apply for the appropriate permits.
  2. Maintain the district but apply for a change of use DP to a multi-residential development.

Cliff.dejong@calgary.ca  Tel #403 268-5232

Calgary’s view is that to allow secondary suites in semi-detached homes would be to change the feel of a neighborhood completely. Although they clearly realize that there are problems associated with cul-de-sacs; especially at the bulb/end of the property, they do not make restrictions to secondary suites within those scenarios. Calgary only considers semi-detached homes to be unfavorable for secondary suites.

**Okotoks:**

The Town of Okotoks has a similar stance on not permitting secondary suites within semi-detached homes. They do not single out cul-de-sacs in any particular way but, again, as a blanket policy they do not permit secondary suites within any semi-detached dwellings:

Hi Tom,

As per our discussion, the Town of Okotoks does not allow “studio suites” (how we call secondary suites in our bylaws) within duplex dwellings. Studio suites are only allowed within our single-family residential districts [known as R1, R1N, R1AR etc]. Studio suites are not an allowable use within any of our multi-residential land use districts. The Town of Okotoks does not make a distinction between duplex owners on a cul-de-sac, collector or other type of road – it is simply not an allowed option within the Town’s bylaws to have studio suites in a duplex.

As I was not around when the bylaw was drafted in this regard to only allow suites within single-family dwellings, I cannot speak to the rationale at the time of the planners; however typical concerns that are addressed by the planning department through studio suite applications are ensuring the appropriate parking is available and consideration for impacts on neighbors.


Sincerely,

Colton

Colton Nickel M Plan
Development Planner
Tel. 403.995.6310
cnickel@okotoks.ca
Airdrie:

The Town of Airdrie does not permit secondary suites within semi-detached properties. They also have subjective criteria which include taking into consideration the ‘cumulative impact’ of proximal properties with secondary suites. In order to avoid the problem of clustering of secondary suites too closely to one and other, they do not permit a secondary suite to be located within less than 400 meters, (0.4 km) of an existing secondary suite. Also, they do not allow for secondary suites where the property frontage is less than 13 meters.

Q1. Would the City of Airdrie accept an application for approval of a secondary suite in a situation where the property was not designated R1, or within a duplex (Semi-detached) home?

There are a number of land use districts that allow secondary suites. This includes Airdrie’s R2 District which allows for Single Detached Dwellings with Secondary Suites, Duplexes, AND Semi Detached Dwellings within the same district. This is intended to provide better flexibility and diversity in housing forms in our R2 areas. However, a Secondary Suite cannot be developed as an accessory use to a Duplex or Semi Detached Dwelling. This is embedded by definition in our LUB which we recognize is very restrictive compared to some other Municipalities or the provisions of the Safety Codes Act and Alberta Building Code, but represented the best decision for Airdrie when our latest Land Use Bylaw was adopted by Council in June 2016.

Q2. Can we confirm that Airdrie’s requirements are for secondary suites to be developed on properties at least 13m wide, and that this is specified as a minimum adequate requirement for roadway access and parking?

I can confirm that Airdrie’s Land Use Bylaw requires a minimum lot size of 400m² in area and minimum lot width of 13.0 metres to support a Secondary Suite. The specific intent of these regulations are not articulated in the Bylaw but served several purposes that were raised during the drafting of the Bylaw, which included:
- The limits on lot size and area would provide adequate amenity for both dwelling units, as well as all structures and parking that must be located on the site.
- The minimum requirements would allow for approximately 24% of all Airdrie’s Single-Detached lots to be eligible for a Secondary Suite to ensure that we would not overload any individual neighbourhood or community.
- The minimum width specifically was chosen to ensure that street parking (where available) would not be affected or reduced in the surrounding neighbourhood, and that this could be supported even with a relaxation to this requirement as long as it was maintained at or above 11 metres.

Q3. Can we confirm a separation distance between approved secondary suites - so that if one is approved that another could not be approved within a certain distance (e.g. 400m) as well as the rationale for such a distance and how the distance would be measured?

A specific separation distance is not cited in the Land Use Bylaw itself, but staff typically look at an area approx. 400m around the subject property (measured ‘as the crow flies’ from the centre point) when doing our evaluation. However, this is not the only factor as we also look at the site’s location near commercial and recreational areas and traffic routing (i.e. whether the site is buried within a residential neighbourhood or very close to the collector and arterial road network). We also coordinate frequently with our Engineering and Fire Departments to look at the specifics that apply to each individual application, and any supporting documentation (such as an established Traffic Impact Assessment prepared for the neighbourhood) where the City has such information on-file.

As always in these reviews, context is key and we rely on the Land Use Bylaw standards that allow us to consider cumulative impact of other approved suites, and the compatibility of the development (which our Bylaw defines) when making these assessments.

I hope this helps provide the clarification you were looking for and that the format above is a bit easier to follow than my last email.

As always, please let me know if you have any additional questions, and best of luck with the rest of your work in this subject area.

Sincerely,

William Czaban
Senior Planner
The Town of Strathmore does not allow for any secondary suites at all, even on detached lots because they have a volunteer fire department and do not want to burden it with calls which they recognize would most likely be associated with secondary suites.

**Rocky View Does NOT Allow secondary suites within semi-detached homes:**

**Subject:** Accessory Dwelling Unit Information -- Rocky View County

Hi Tom,

Thanks for your call earlier. In regards to your request for information on how Rocky View County approaches to land use for districts with higher-density zoning, specifically within the context of accessory dwelling units, I can provide the following information:

- The full text of our Land Use Bylaw is found here: [https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/Government/Bylaws/RVC-Land-Use-Bylaw.pdf](https://www.rockyview.ca/Portals/0/Files/Government/Bylaws/RVC-Land-Use-Bylaw.pdf)
- Section 60 HR-2: Hamlet Residential Two zoning may be of specific interest and I can confirm this zoning lists Dwelling, duplex; Dwelling, semi-detached; and Dwelling, single detached as permitted uses and does not list Accessory Dwelling Unit as a permitted or discretionary use.
- I can confirm that presently no Hamlet Residential-type Zoning (HR-1, HR-2, HR-3, HR-4) lists Accessory Dwelling Unit as either a permitted or discretionary use, with the exception of those lots located within the Hamlet of Bragg Creek.

I can also advise that as per Land Use Bylaw section 12.3(a): “The Development Authority shall not accept a Development Permit application where the proposed use is neither permitted nor discretionary;”.

Please note that this information would not apply to parcels located within Direct Control (DC) districts – and it is possible that such districts may allow higher-density zoning under certain circumstances. A full list of all direct control districts within Rocky View County can be found here: [https://www.rockyview.ca/Government/Bylaws/DirectControlBylaws.aspx](https://www.rockyview.ca/Government/Bylaws/DirectControlBylaws.aspx)

As a final note, be please advised that these bylaws would only be applicable/enforceable within the boundaries of Rocky View County and would not be applicable to parcels located outside of our municipal boundaries.

I hope this helps and please feel free to reach out if we can be of further assistance.

Best regards,

Evan Neilson
Planning Call Representative | Planning Services
**Strathmore:**

Strathmore does not allow any secondary suites, mainly for the reason that they have a limited volunteer fire department and do not want to over-stretch their resources.

**From:** Chuck Procter <cprocter@strathmore.ca>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 3:30 PM

**To:** 'tomfox@telus.net' <tomfox@telus.net>

**Subject:** RE: Attention Planning Department: Does the Town of Strathmore allow basement suites in semi-detached homes?

Hi Tom,

Thanks for the question & inquiry.

Currently, “Secondary Suite” is not a listed Use in the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) in Strathmore. Secondary Suites were removed from the LUB in 2015, primarily due to complaints and safety concerns at the time. We are a small Town and have a volunteer Fire Department.

It’s not impossible to apply for a Secondary Suite today, but the homeowner/applicant will need a Land Use Bylaw Amendment first (it’s a bylaw that is publically advertised & circulated and requires 3 readings from Town Council), followed by a Development Permit. It’s a lengthy public process. We do have some grandfathered secondary suites in Town, which were done so years ago under a different LUB.
**Reason 5.10 Many Neighbours just don’t want a clustered, side by side adjoining secondary suite scenario:**

This first letter to the Cochrane Planning Commission was completely ignored by the panel of councilors. Sadly, the CPC said that although they saw much truth in the points raised by the appellant in the letter below, they as the CPC felt compelled to grant the discretionary secondary suite application, approval for a go ahead.
January 27, 2019

Town of Cochrane
Cochrane, AB

Attention: Planning and Development

To Whom it May Concern:

We reside at 148 Quigley Close. When we purchased our property 5 years ago we chose this quiet dead end cul-de-sac as it offered a life of peace and quiet.

After our first few months of residing at our residence we noticed parking issues. One duplex alone has 7 vehicles, which is 3 vehicles over and above what the property can accommodate. Therefore there is illegal parking and crowding issues which in turn makes it almost impossible for emergency vehicles to get to residences in the event of an emergency.

Not so long ago there was an illegal suite 2 doors east of us and they had 4 vehicles (2 vehicles over and above what the property can accommodate. This created additional parking issues within the cul-de-sac. As this property was recently sold the parking issues have lessened, however it has now been brought to my attention that you are proposing a legal suite at this same location. These homeowners have 2 vehicles and cannot accommodate additional vehicles and the issue of parking will be out of control once again.

There are already several rental homes in this cul-de-sac and we feel that another will cause more issues and reflect negatively on our property value and we are not in agreement with another rental suite in this cul-de-sac.

Sincerely,

Anita McFeeters
These following letters are presented to the SDAB, opposing the granting of a secondary suite at 144 Quigley Close.

March 16, 2019

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to appeal the request for a legal suite at 144 Quigley Close. This used to be a nice, clean, quiet, family oriented community. In recent years this cul-de-sac has become loud and busy, with a noticeable decline in outward appearances and socioeconomic standards.

Many of the long term residents of this community are growing tired of the loud parties, and crowded and illegal parking.

I have serious concerns of allowing more of these rental “suites”. It will lower property value, entice more low income renters, increase noise and parties, and increase an already crowded parking situation. I legitimately don’t know where any more cars would park in this cul-de-sac. This is in no way a reflection on the persons requesting the permit.

Please help us keep this a nice, clean family community, and not lower its standards further.

Sincerely,

Travis Cox
140 Quigley Close
NOTICE TO APPEAL

COCHRANE SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD

Site Information
Municipal Address of land being developed: 144 Quigley CLOSE (Not Drive)
Legal Description of land being developed: Lot 22, Block 32, Plan 971 1154
Proposed Development: Accessory Suite (Basement)
Development Permit No.: DP2018-248

Appellant Information
Name: [Redacted] and Tom Fox
Mailing Address: 142 Quigley Close
City: Cochrane Province: Alberta
Postal Code: T4C 1S4
Phone No: 403 397 1775
Email: tomfox@telus.net
Name of Agent (if applicable): Tom Fox

REASON(S) FOR APPEAL
Sections 678 and 686 of the Municipal Government Act require that the written Notice of Appeal must contain specific reasons for the appeal.

I/we do hereby appeal the decision of the Development Authority for the following reasons (attach a separate page if required):

Multiple residents adjacent to, and within close proximity of 144 Quigley Close are strongly opposed to it being granted secondary suite approval mainly (but not limited to), on the grounds of:
1. Safety Concerns - both to residents, community members and EMS staff.
2. Numerous negative Quality of Life considerations to occupants adjacent to the subject property, its immediate residents and the community at large.

We outline more details for these views in accompanying documents herein provided.

We want to state how disappointed we are that the CPC is putting citizens such as us through this agonizing process, and in general do not feel well represented by government.

This notice, accompanied by the appeal fee of $200.00, must be submitted as set out below within twenty-one (21) days of:
(i) the date of the written decision or the date of the deemed refusal, in the case of an appeal by the applicant;
(ii) the date of the order, in the case of an appeal against a section 645 order (a stop order); or
(iii) the date that notice of the decision is issued pursuant to the Land Use Bylaw, in the case of an appeal by an affected person,
in accordance with section 686 of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000 c. M-26:
The Secretary
Cochrane Subdivision and Development Appeal Board
Cochrane Ranchetouse
101 Ranchetouse Road
Cochrane, Alberta T4C 2K8
March 14, 2019

Town of Cochrane
Cochrane, AB

Attention: Planning and Development (appeal process)

To Whom It May Concern:

As per my letter of January 27, 2019 with concerns to an additional legal suite 2 doors down from our location of 148 Quigley Close.

I have deep concerns of not only an issue of parking but interruptions to our peaceful and enjoyment of our property.

This suite was rented out illegally not so long ago and we had to deal with continuous unknown people coming in and out of this property at all hours, parties late at night, dogs barking and children screaming and having to fight to find a parking spot at my residence.

As this property is only 2 doors away we were unable to enjoy sitting in our backyard. The continuous stream of people coming and going also affected my dog and she would bark at the continuous number strangers and it was unfair that I had to keep her inside while the people at this property were able to have loud parties that disturbed us continually.

I made a complaint to bylaw however I was threatened by bylaw that I need to deal with my dog. There was never a follow up from bylaw on the continuous noise and parking issue.

I cannot believe that you would even consider another legal suite at this location given the issues that arise from rental units at a dead end cul du sac.

As I previous stated in my last letter I feel that another rental unit in this cul du sac will reflect negatively on our property value and we are not in agreement with another rental suite 2 door down from our property.

Sincerely,

Anita McFeeters
Dear Town of Cochrane,

To whom it may concern: I am responding to a letter I received regarding a legal suite at 144 Quigley Close. I am writing this letter to appeal the above legal suite. I have concerns because there is already minimal parking spots in our cul de sac. It is often a major problem when people have company over. The traffic is often very fast, noisy, unsafe for the many children that are on or near our road. I feel the idea of suites in our cul de sac and probably in other areas of Cochrane cannot accommodate more parking. This street is maxed out with vehicles when everyone is home.

Please give very serious thought regarding the other families that will be negatively affected by parking, extra unnecessary traffic, noise, partying, etc. If one duplex is allowed a suite then other duplexes will be entitled to the same request; it would definitely be a disaster for everyone. Property values would drop, noise levels and frustration would rise. This is in no way a reflection on the current family living next door to us who have requested this permit. Please help us keep this a nice, clean family community and not lower it's standards further on our street and in other Cochrane streets. Thank you for your time consideration regarding this matter.

Sincerely

Wendy Shepherd.
116 Quigley Close
March 20/2019
Reason 5.11 A loss of Cochrane’s Small Town Feel:

As the Town of Cochrane continues to grow, the struggle to preserve what was once a small town feel will become ever more challenging. If the Town’s individual communities continue to expand and increase in density through the indiscriminate implementation of secondary suite approvals then more and more residents will become disenchanted with the town and see it’s downtown façade as nothing more than a false veneer of overcrowded and lawless shanty town communities.

Reason 5.12 An Uncooperative Town Administration and Planning Department

It bears repeating that the particular application for secondary suite approval of 144 Quigley Close falls under the classification of a discretionary use and not permitted use. The appellants who oppose the granting of this secondary suite have been met with the most unprofessional level of stonewalling and footdragging by the administration. For example, repeated requests to Cochrane’s planning manager, Riley Weldon have been met with repeated procrastination, stonewalling and plain ignorance of the appellant’s needs. How can first-time appellants who are laypersons in this appeal process possibly make sense of such a non-transparent appeal process when they are repeatedly denied requests for information and when they have no idea what is even meant by the vague term: ‘planning merits’ and they are refused an explanation. One example of the lack of cooperation faced by the appellants is that when they requested a complete list of addresses for all semi-detached properties in the town of Cochrane which have within them two adjoining secondary suites, their request was, as many others completely ignored. The appellants have had to scramble for information from various sources as in the list of properties listed below which was obtained through a real estate company.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Ridge</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bow Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Chinook Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinook</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Cochrane Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Bard Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bencroft Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Carolina Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Carolina Crescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Carolina Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Carolina Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Carolina Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Caroline Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>First Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Mountain Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Mountain Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Pope Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Sibbald Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East End</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>William Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireside</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Fireside Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireside</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Fireside Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireside</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Fireside Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireside</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Fireside Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cascade Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Glendale Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Glendale Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Glendale Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Glenhill Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Glenpatrick Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenbow</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Glenpatrick Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen/Eagles</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Glen Eagles Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen/Eagles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Glen Eagles Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen/Eagles</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Glen Eagles View</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **My personal reasons for purchasing 142 Quigley Close:**

When I moved to Cochrane from Calgary it was to get away from the harassment and assaults of the Calgary Police. I could not believe that after 30 years of never communicating to anyone in Calgary about a bus accident that my high school was involved in 1979, that after meeting with a photography instructor at Mount Royal University named [REDACTED] and briefly mentioning it to her that she would call the Calgary Police to my home and that this would set off a chain of events where the police were harassing and assaulting me on an ongoing basis.

I’m a person who avoids crowds, I keep to myself and seek out genuine friends. When I moved to Cochrane I was seeking to get away from the hustle and bustle of the stress of Calgary. To get closer to nature. I purchased 142 Quigley Close because it was a pre-existing home in an established community, a quiet home at the end of a cul-de-sac. I bought 142 Quigley Close because I was seeking my own personal space of peace and quiet, to focus productively on starting a business. Instead, this property and the past 6 years in Cochrane have been an on-going experience of harassment and assault by the RCMP and a hell hole of next door neighbor noise and verbal and physical assaults. The RCMP hold some strange sort of deep grudge that I did and do not conform to their wishes. But what the RCMP do not understand is that I am not under contract to them. I am a citizen of Canada, I live under natural law, and I am not an employee of the RCMP. I also do not need to be the RCMP’s nor anyone else’s cheerleader. Not only have the RCMP failed to protect me when I repeatedly called for their assistance with numerous valid concerns of prolonged, excessive disturbances at 144 Quigley Close but they actually assaulted me and wrongfully charged me on numerous occasions.

Today, I’m on the verge of filing for bankruptcy and have a stained vulnerable sector check due to the RCMP’s ineptitude and harassment. My mother is very worried that I’m living in such a dangerous community, and the anguish which the RCMP has caused me is stressing my mother and small family horribly. You’ll have not read about any of us in the newspapers but I can assure you that we are all concerned about what this town, it’s administrator and services such as the RCMP are really all about. All that I asked of the RCMP was that while I lived in Cochrane to give me my right to a safe and quiet place to call home but they failed miserably to do this. I never acted as a vigilante in any way and always relied on the RCMP to solve these neighborhood issues but they failed and so did the town administration, bylaw, and fire. The whole community has failed.

So, if they intentionally failed to do good for me, they can intentionally fail to do it for anyone, including you.
7. **Final Summary:**

A discretionary use is not the same as a permitted use.

The Town’s administration should not feel compelled to grant discretionary use applications approval simply because in this particular case of 144 Quigley Close, a prior owner did everything that she could to deceive the town with her illegitimate renovations.

Applications for secondary suite approval need to be based on some logical framework of sound merits of planning for the benefit of immediate and surrounding residents and the community and Town at large.

Planning decisions need to be based not on sound principles and not on weak emotional appeals.

At the beginning of this report, I asked the development appeal board members to visualize a situation where they personally owned a semi-detached property and the town had without the member’s consent gone ahead and allowed for the approval of a secondary suite at their adjoining property. I asked them to visualize the many ways that this seemingly simple scenario could go wrong in many ways. Like the photo of the Siamese twins, where one twin’s actions have a very high probability to cause significant deleterious effects to his partner, I asked you to imagine the many ways in which your life could be negatively shaped by not only your neighbors actions but the license which the Town had legally given your adjoining property owner to expose you to this new Pandora’s box which was now sharing a common wall with your property.

To make this report real and meaningful I even gave twelve real-life practice examples of just some ways in which my life has been negatively affected by having a secondary suite right next door to my property sharing that common wall between our properties of 142 & 144 Quigley Close. One Pandora’s box at 144 Quigley Close sharing a common wall with 142 Quigley Close has in effect ruined the lives of many people living within and outside of 142 Quigley Close.

The appellants and their families who are opposing the granting of a secondary suite at 144 Quigley Close have had many ongoing discussions about what various levels of the Town of Cochrane are thinking about as they’ve approved what by simple common sense and historical record has proven to be a horrible decision; the allowing of too many secondary suites within an already dense planning scenario of tightly clustered semi-detached homes at the end of a twisted cul-de-sac. The question we as appellants have asked is: “Who is running this show?” “Who if anyone is in charge?”

Socrates criticized democracy on the same grounds as the appellants are doing, please watch this short 4 min. video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fLJBzhcSWTk

As appellants, we felt that it was the job of the professionally trained planners in the town of Cochrane to look out for the common interest of all residents and guide them through their individual and collective knowledge. Clearly, we the appellants were mistaken with this assumption.

Then we thought that the CPC – Cochrane Planning Commission would see the points that we as freehold property owners were trying to make to them, with regard to our individual rights. This was our next frustrating attempt as appellants to this application. Again, we were mistaken in thinking that we were being heard and understood. The CPC stated that they felt compelled to approve the application because the planners were pushing for it. After all, the application is a ‘discretionary use’.
But a discretionary use and a permitted use are not the same things. That is why the appellants have brought this matter forward to the SDAB for their review.

However, there is more at stake here than one simple application for a secondary suite. The appellants to this application have tried to demonstrate the many concerns that the Town should have with this entire process regarding approval of secondary suites; especially under the circumstances which have come under review in this report:

- Semi-detached secondary suite scenarios
- Semi-detached secondary suite scenarios where an adjoining suite already has a secondary suite
- Cul-de-sac scenarios
- End of the road cul-de-sac scenarios
- Noise issues both intra-property and inter-property noise, parking, fire, etc. etc. etc.

We all want the Town of Cochrane to be a thriving community which is enjoyable for everyone to live in.

The appellants have demonstrated to the SDAB members two positive arguments for why some properties should, in general, be considered for secondary suite approval and at least twelve reasons in particular why 144 Quigley Close should not be considered for approval for a secondary suite.

It is now up to the SDAB to make their final decision and to clarify their thinking in what has until now been a very illogical, emotional and unfounded approval process.

The appellants also hope that much good will come from their efforts and that this report will help the Town to refine their thinking process to one in which is much more rational and consistent, as a template on a future case by case scenarios.

Thank you for the opportunity of presenting to yourselves,

Colin T. Fox
8. **Sample survey result to Cochrane Online Survey:**

**PROVIDE YOUR INPUT**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with the proposed increase?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently, accessory suites and garden suites are allowed on lots with either a single detached dwelling or a semi-detached dwelling (also known as a duplex). This is proposed to remain the same. However, it is proposed that the minimum lot width change for semi-detached lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, the minimum lot width for semi-detached homes is 6.0m. It is proposed that the minimum lot width for a semi-detached home with a suite be increased to 9m to accommodate additional parking.

Do you agree with the proposed increase?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No

Currently accessory suites and garden suites are allowed on lots with either a single detached dwelling or a semi-detached dwelling (also known as a duplex). This is proposed to remain the same. However, it is proposed that the minimum lot width change for semi-detached lots.

Do you agree with accessory suites and garden suite being allowed in semi-detached homes?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
1. Semi’s are already, by nature of sharing a common wall, of higher density. If semi-detached are permitted then why not consider townhouse complexes with ample parking? The reason should be because of noise considerations. If already dense semi-detached homes are given legal permission to densify further then community standards are given the open door to deteriorate. Imagine a cheap investor renting out the upstairs and downstairs to separate tenants. In a detached home scenario at least there is some separation between adjoining neighbors but in the case of semi’s, they share a common wall and the next door peaceful occupants will have to deal with the mayhem penetrating directly through their neighbor’s wall into their home. I have personally experienced this situation and it has been totally horrific. Today I’m on the verge of bankruptcy because of this scenario. Town services such as RCMP, bylaw and Fire were incapable of dealing with my valid concerns, in fact the RCMP out of their frustration charged me with mischief for calling them too often regarding noise complaints. This noisy neighbor experience has been financially devastating for me as a community member. The important thing for the town’s decision makers to understand here is that allowing secondary suites in semi-detached properties very easily opens the door to 1. frivolous/wasteful use of vital community services such as RCMP, EMS and bylaw 2. potentially devalues the specific properties, their immediate neighbors and the community and even town at large.

Please think very deeply about the many negative ramifications of allowing secondary suites within semi’s compared with the relatively few benefits. And by all means DO NOT allow two adjoining semi’s to each have their own secondary suite, thus turning two semi-detached homes into a fourplex! This makes a bad situation from tri-plex to four-plex go from bad to infinitely worse. The big consideration with most semi’s is that because of the shared wall and normally lower build quality, noise control between the two dwellings is already often quite poor. No body enjoys hearing their neighbor’s closing their kitchen cupboards and watching the television especially with loud parties, or their kids playing in the bedrooms in the next home.

And of course having a shared fence line means you each get to have the unpleasant experience of hearing each other’s daily living, such as talking on the speaker phone, playing the radio, talking to each other, parties etc. Considering allowing secondary suites with semi-detached homes starts to seriously affect and impinge on occupant’s Bundle of Property rights >>> should your neighbor’s right to enjoyment of making noise take precedent over your rights to peace and quiet on your own property?? I don’t think so. The more the town permits an irreversible legal change of use which ends up allowing for the densification of property from already relatively dense scenarios (such as semi’s) which were initially proposed by developers, the more of a Pandora’s box of unforeseen problems can develop in the future for ALL people.
How many suites are allowed in a neighbourhood?

Currently, the bylaw allows a maximum of 10% of lots within a neighbourhood to have an accessory or garden suite. To help avoid the clustering of suites within each neighbourhood it is proposed that the maximum number of suites allowed be 10% per block face.

Please note that a block face is a stretch of adjoining properties on one side of a street not separated by streets, lanes, pathways, parks etc. An example is provided below.

![Diagram of block faces and suites](image)

Do you agree with a maximum of 10% per block face?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

If no, why not?

Write Here

The block face approach does not seem like a practical way to address the problem of clustering. What is the technical definition of a block face along a curved street? What is the technical definition of a block face along a cul-de-sac? What is the technical definition of a block face at the end of a cul-de-sac? The town of Airdrie adopts a much better way of addressing the problem of clustering of secondary suites which is, as a general guideline, they do not permit adjacent secondary suites to be within less than 0.4 km of each other. Such an approach is a true solution to the issue of ‘clustering’, because it truly addresses the problem of clustering head on. Without adequate space between adjoining secondary suites people start to very easily negatively impinge on one and other’s lives - one of the most insidious of ways in which this happens is through the negative affects of noise for which, yes there are noise bylaws but oftentimes the noise can be deemed just below the threshold for the town to see fit to take action, problems start to fester and eventually disputes begin to unfold. The real solution to avoid the negative effects of clustering of secondary suites is to limit the physical space between secondary suites by a certain minimum, (as is done in Airdrie); and absolutely not to permit two adjoining semi-detached homes to each have their own secondary suites because by definition this would be intentional clustering of the secondary suites and be an ongoing/long term invitation by the town to community problems and conflicts.
Parking Requirements/Regulations

Currently, the only requirement regarding parking is the minimum number of parking stalls that must be provided on the property.

The bylaw requires a minimum of two parking stalls for all residential properties in town. If the landowner wants to build a one-bedroom suite they must provide one (1) additional parking stall on-site; one for the suite and two for the house.

If the landowner wants to build a suite with two or more bedrooms, they must provide two (2) additional parking stalls on-site; two for the suite and two for the house.

There are no proposed changes to the required number of parking stalls for an accessory or garden suite. Do you agree with not changing the required number of parking stalls?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do you think that a walkway should be required from the parking area to the entrance of the suite?

☑ Yes ☐ No

NOTE: the following questions are about tandem parking. Tandem parking stalls are designed so that one stall is located behind the other.
It is proposed that tandem parking will no longer be allowed in the rear yard of a lot to accommodate parking for an accessory or garden suite. Do you agree with this proposed change?

☑ Yes ☐ No

It is proposed that a maximum of two (2) tandem parking stalls be allowed for front and side accessed properties to accommodate an accessory or garden suite. This would allow parking in a garage and driveway. Do you agree with this proposed change?

☐ Yes ☑ No

If no, why not?

Write Here

In theory the idea of allowing tandem parking with a garage and driveway scenario sounds fine but the fact of the matter is that many home owners use their garages as storage or hobby areas which will naturally spill parking requirements onto the public roads. If a property wants to have a secondary suite they should have enough onsite driveway space which does not include garage space which as I say is often allocated for discretionary uses other then parking.

---

It is proposed that a parking pad in the front or side yard should not be widened to accommodate parking for an accessory or garden suite. Do you agree with this proposed change?

NOTE: a parking pad is a parking area on-site that does not lead to a garage.

☑ Yes ☐ No
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This is an amendment to the original submission to the SDAB

The Google image below reveals 144 Quigley Close, (green arrow) in Cochrane, Alberta which has new owners which recently purchased the property in the winter of 2018 with an illegal basement suite. The previous property owners were very problematic for the longstanding surrounding residents, inflicting much community dissatisfaction in the way of ongoing noise disturbances, street parking upheavals, and ongoing safety issues. The red arrows depict four long-standing families and one new community member, (a total of five families) who have experienced the deteriorated quality of living in this community due to inferior noise control, (both from a construction standpoint and a poor enforcement standpoint) – these surrounding five families are all strongly opposed to granting of a legal secondary suite status to 144 Quigley Close, not on any personal grounds to the existing residents (who are very decent and considerate people), but rather on the grounds of: 1. poor building construction, 2. the problematic location of the property at end of the dead-end road and 3. repeated failures of the community services to rectify many past problematic issues when called on – those services being: the RCMP, bylaw and fire department.

After the close of the prior SDAB meeting in January for this application, a meeting which was adjourned because the subject property was improperly identified by Town administration, Cochrane’s Senior Manager of Development Services stated to myself that the Town has a strong bias for approving 144 Quigley Close for secondary suite approval on the grounds that it satisfies all of the conditions on a ‘checklist’ or requirements. The surrounding residents, who know their community much better than Drew Hyndman ever did are very disappointed with this imposing and disconnected viewpoint from a public official who they feel should take a far more neutral point of view.

Drew Hyndman stated that Cochrane is in need of “Affordable housing”. The fact is that senior planners such a Mr. Hyndman have a skewed definition of “Affordability” because if affordability is correlated with “Quality of Living” then the quality of living on this particular dead-end street with this inferior 1998 build quality for noise attenuation is very low quality indeed.

Below is another letter from an experienced resident advocating against permitting another secondary suite on this specific neighborhood for the reasons stated:
Attention: Town of Cochrane Planning and Development

My name is Arthur C. and my wife and I have been residing on the upper floors of 142 Quigley Close since April of 2019. Despite the owners having assured us that they soundproofed this property to the maximum extent possible during renovations, we are writing to inform yourselves that the level of sound control between 142 Quigley Close and the adjoining semi-detached home 144 Quigley Close; and also, the sound control within 142 Quigley Close itself, between the basement and the main floor, is really very poor – we can hear quite a bit of sound transferring between and within the property and properties.

Although all of the residents within the adjoining two semi-detached homes are very respectful of each other, the quality of life at this property would be severely diminished if there were inconsiderate, noisy occupants anywhere within these properties.

Town Developers should be aware that officially permitting the density of these semidetached homes to be increased from what the developer initially intended, is not a good decision to providing affordable housing. On the contrary; when quiet enjoyment of one’s property is the consideration, it is at best a very diminished quality of housing.

As an individual with considerable experience in the building and construction field, I see two practical solutions to the Town’s desire to accommodate quality alternative housing solutions. 1. Require developers to adopt higher quality noise suppression standards at the time of initial construction – this is because renovated modifications for acoustic control can never be achieved to the same level of standard which can be achieved with new construction and 2. Semi-detached homes are by nature already densely populated, don’t add to this density within poorly acoustically constructed properties by allowing secondary suites. Because our building codes with regard to noise control are quite lax, such homes do not lend themselves to enjoyable, quality living. In other words, secondary suites are better suited to lots with detached homes rather than semi-detached or townhouses.

In summary, if the Town really feels the need to accommodate secondary suites then the best approach without inadvertently compromising the enjoyment and quality of current and future residents is to allow secondary suites only within detached homes, or build the homes from the outset to a certified higher level of acoustic control.

Artur Guraj
142 Quigley Close
According to the “Checklist” of which Drew Hyndman told me, there is nothing specific which the Town has provided for the appellants. On the contrary, the Town really has no criteria whatsoever for satisfactory minimum construction specifications with regard to noise control between homes and within homes. Sadly, this opens the door to build now and regret later when it comes to hasty decisions which bureaucrats are making on behalf of property residents. The idea of some sort of “Checklist” is a vague and ambiguous concept indeed.

Home occupants; be they owners, or tenants are looking for deeper insight from supposed industry experts and public officials when it comes to ‘affordable’ housing; they want safe, quality housing. And there is a direct correlation between the quality of housing and the level of noise control between and within properties – especially when a neighborhood which developers initially envisioned has its standard of lifestyle seriously compromised for its residents.

With regard to property complying with the Alberta Building Code as outlined in 12.3.2 b), 144 Quigley Close is outfitted with inferior, banned poly-B plumbing which is prone to failure and bursting. Industry experts have stated that it’s not a matter of ‘if the plumbing will eventually fail, but “when” it will fail’.

Please skim through some of these articles because 144 Quigley Close, like many homes in the neighborhood, has already had a major plumbing failure in 2014 and the insurance company left the majority of the banned plumbing intact within the home, only changing out the parts of the plumbing which burst:

https://www.google.com/search?q=poly+b+plumbing+it+isn%27t+a+matter+of+if+but+when++it+will+fail&source=hp&ei=xmrjXJnkMmbau0PEEP6ZCIgA0&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjCn934xZDEAhXYhIQKHVnRCf0Q_AUICjAM....0..0i131j0jo22i30j33i160j33i21j33i22i29i30.lqZVz3P1b1U

Local Calgary plumbing company discusses the dangers of banned poly B plumbing which is throughout 144 Quigley Close ...

https://lonestarplumbing.ca/plumbing/poly-b/
Problems with Poly-B Piping

Poly-b piping was discontinued many years ago and there is a reason for this. It has been discovered that over time this type of piping begins to leak and burst. As homes with poly-b piping in Calgary continue to get older we are beginning to see more and more cases of this type of pipe failing and causing damage to homes. Sometimes it is the fittings that fail and sometimes the pipes themselves develop leaks. With poly-b it is not a matter of if the pipe is going to fail it is a matter of when.

Request for SDAB to Research Noise Control Issues In this 1998 Built Community:

I’m asking the SDAB members to give serious consideration to what the building code and Town developers and planners have failed to acknowledge, that is that the noise control in this community of semi-detached homes is very poor. Here are some useful reference articles I ask the SDAB members to at least skim through and consider:

http://www.noise.org/library/smj/smj.htm

7. Negative Social Behavior and Annoyance Reactions: Annoyance is defined as a feeling of displeasure associated with any agent or condition believed by an individual to adversely affect him or her. Perhaps a better description of this response would be aversion or distress. Noise has been used as a noxious stimulus in a variety of studies because it produces the same kinds of effects as other stressors. Annoyance increases significantly when noise is accompanied by vibration or by low frequency components. The term annoyance does not begin to cover the wide range of negative reactions associated with noise pollution; these include anger, disappointment, dissatisfaction, withdrawal, helplessness, depression, anxiety, distraction, agitation, or exhaustion. Lack of perceived control over the noise intensifies these effects.

The results of annoyance are privately felt dissatisfaction, publicly expressed complaints to authorities (although underreporting is probably significant), and the adverse health effects already noted. Given that annoyance can connote more than slight irritation, it describes a significant degradation in the quality of life, which corresponds to degradation in health and well-being. In this regard, it is important to note that annoyance does not abate over time despite continuing exposure to noise.
Conclusions and Recommendations

As a society, our history is filled with failures to recognize the agents that cause disease; once the causes have been recognized, we have responded reluctantly, slowly, and often inadequately. The case with tobacco is an instructive one. It took many years of lobbying by dedicated individuals before legislators and the general public recognized the links between the hazards of tobacco smoke and disease; as a result laws were finally enacted and behaviors changed accordingly.

Despite the evidence about the many medical, social, and economic effects of noise, as a society, we continue to suffer from the same inertia, the same reluctance to change, and the same denial of the obvious that the anti-tobacco lobby faced a couple of decades ago. This inertia and denial are similar to those that delayed appropriate action on lead, mercury, and asbestos. Now we seem unable to make the connection between noise and disease, despite the evidence, and despite the fact, which we all recognize, that our cities are becoming increasingly more polluted with noise.

Noise makers and the businesses that support them are as reluctant as smokers to give up their bad habits. Legislators at all levels should protect us from noise pollution the same way they protected us from tobacco smoke and other forms of pollution. It is clear that laws can change behaviors in ways that benefit society as a whole.

Noise represents an important public health problem that can lead to hearing loss, sleep disruption, cardiovascular disease, social handicaps, reduced productivity, impaired teaching and learning, absenteeism, increased drug use, and accidents. It can impair the ability to enjoy one's property and leisure time and increases the frequency of antisocial behavior. Noise adversely affects general health and well-being in the same way as does chronic stress. It adversely affects future generations by degrading residential, social, and learning environments with corresponding economic losses. Local control of noise has not been successful in most places. This points out the need for improved methods of local control that should include public education, enlightened legislation, and active enforcement of noise ordinances by local law enforcement officials. Part of the solution may require federal or state legislation aimed at supporting local efforts or the restoration of federal funding for the Office of Noise Abatement and Control.
Please skim through this excellent article. It echoes so many others which stress the importance of people’s ability to experience peace and quiet as a basic right of property ownership:

Decibel Hell: The effects of living in a noisy world...

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1253729/

The above articles were taken from the following collection:
https://www.google.com/search?source=hp&ei= TG7jXPrqDreS0PEPtfCkkAY&q=the+problem+of+sound+control+in+modern+homes&oq=the+problem+of+sound+control+in+modern+homes&gs_l=psy-ab.12...1607.12237..13197...0...0.123.3723.38j6......0....1..gws-wiz.....0..0i131j0i22i30j33i22i29i30j33i21j33i160.aDxPgSuSwIU

The Sad Reality of Low Threshold Noise Standards:

The sad reality is that quality noise control between properties costs money, quite a bit of money and the fact is that these build quality improvements are hidden from the purchaser’s vision. Because developers have a fairly low threshold to meet for building construction noise control, they almost never choose to exceed the minimum building code standards and instead budget their costs into visible eye-catching enhancements such as granite countertops, fireplaces, etc.

Mark Norman and Colin T. Fox

News about Mark Norman RCMP

RCMP hasn’t seen evidence that led to demise of Mark Norman case
OTTAWA—RCMP investigators say they’re not sure why the Mark Norman case collapsed because they haven’t seen the new evidence that led to the stay of a...
Toronto Star - 6d

As of the writing of this report, many Canadians are familiar of the story of how the RCMP took a warrant out on Vice-Admiral Mark Norman’s home and charged with a breach of trust by the RCMP. The charges stayed on May 8, 2019. Other than the SDAB council members reading this appeal, very few Canadians are aware of the appellant Colin Tom Fox, like Mark Norman I have twice been wrongfully arrested by the RCMP, once in 2014 and then in 2018. The first case was regarding a bus accident which happened at my bus accident back in 1979. The latter arrest was because of a vendetta which the RCMP harbors against me regarding their wrongful arrest of me in 2014. Both charges were stayed and the RCMP absolutely unrepentant about having arrested me; their even quite mocking about the incident.

For the past two years, I was contacting the RCMP to assist me in the noise disturbances at my neighbor’s home a situation in which the prior owner, after moving into the home in 2015, soon after got a divorce and then turned her home into a noisy illegal rooming house. Practical considerations being taken into account, the RCMP were completely ineffective in enforcing simple noise complaints by myself and a series of phone calls by myself to them decided to charge me for speaking with my neighbor’s tenant at 144 Quigley Close who turned out to be an illegal status alien from Europe in Canada. As I say, the RCMP’s charges were stayed, but today, May 20, 2019, as I write this report, I’m on
the verge of filing for bankruptcy because of our vindictive RCMP. I trusted the RCMP to do a simple job of maintaining the peace, rather than myself trying to negotiate with a problematic neighbor who was acting like a vigilante toward me and yet our RCMP never did anything to protect me against verbal and physical assaults by my neighbor and instead targeted and continue to this day to target me with intimidation and threats, telling me that I’m under continuous investigation.

RCMP have a grudge against me and continue to let it cloud their judgment. I cannot find a lawyer to challenge them and can only find solace in the fact that many people share experiences of having their lives ruined by this Legal Mafia. Mine is not the first and will not be the last casualty of our government’s thuggish impunity to crimes. In hindsight; it was a mistake for me to come to Alberta; my family never
experienced the pester ing harassment which I have been exposed to by our policing organizations here in western Canada. In my original appeal submission, I provided many references which are evidence of our organization’s, such as the RCMP incompetence. Once again, from a planning perspective, the point here is that we should not accept on face value that our service organizations such as the police, fire or bylaw will satisfactorily deal with community problems. As Cochrane continues to grow in population social problems will continue to fester and cases like mine will, for the most part, go completely off the radar; they won’t be covered by the media, nobody will know about them.

I’ll never have the financial clout of Vice-Admiral Mark Norman and at my age, to be totally financially destroyed by those who I always thought were entrusted in our care leaves me not only financially destroyed but emotionally broken. This is what living in Cochrane, Alberta has given me. For anyone who has ever experienced any wrong from the RCMP, I have some advice: Do not expect any apologies or acknowledgment of wrongdoing on their part – they see themselves as infallible.

**Poorly crafted surveys will result in poorly crafted legislation and enforcement policies:**

Although it is commendable that the Town planners are open to feedback from town residents, this is really a textbook example of what Socrates described as the failure of democracy. More leadership by planners is what is really needed. Planners are university educated specialist and they shouldn’t be misleading the public with poorly worded surveys; surveys which overemphasize issues of vehicles and do not address noise considerations in the least:

Modern Day Community Stressors in the immediate vicinity of the subject property 144 Quigley Close:
The above photos are within minutes of the subject property 144 Quigley Close, they exhibit the modern day disregard which both youth and adults have for our planet. The photos clearly demonstrate that we have failed to legislate and enforce individual people’s actions with regard to the common good of everyone.

Please watch this informative 4-minute video about why Socrates hated democracy: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fJJBzhcSWTk

The point I want to make is that we should rely on our planners, legislators and enforcement officials to take a lead in shaping our communities. The photos above and within this report show the disregard which so many people have for their communities – sadly these are not isolated cases within Cochrane alone.

By running these survey’s and looking at the enclosed photos in this report, one can easily get a sense that the town council is asking to be led by the ignorant in society rather than take the lead in matters of importance.

Results of Accessory Suite Surveys:

WHAT WE HEARD REPORT
Accessory Suite Survey #1

Monday June 18, 2018

Town Administration is currently in the process of updating the regulations for accessory suites and garden suites. Accessory suites (also known as secondary suites) are located in the basement of a home, and garden suites are located in a separate building on-site; for example, above the detached garage. The Town posted a survey on the Let’s Talk webpage from Thursday, May 10, 2018 to Monday, June 11, 2018 to gather feedback from the public regarding suites in town. The survey received a total of 79
responses. A summary of the responses received are outlined below. The survey results will be taken into consideration while drafting the revised regulations for suites.

Question 1: Do you think accessory suites (suites in the basement of a house) should be allowed in semi-detached dwellings? • 43 residents said yes; and • 35 residents responded no.

Below is a summary of the comments received regarding suites in the basement of a semi-detached dwelling. • There is not enough parking on existing semi-detached lots especially in the newer areas. • Parking is already a nightmare on streets with semi-detached homes without suites • If there is such a housing shortage to require suites why not look into some other affordable housing options • They will provide an affordable housing option as it is expensive to live here • Extra unnecessary demand on infrastructure • Too much density you lose the small-town appeal • Too high of density in relation to what was planned • If it has a suite then it is no longer a ‘semi-detached’ situation • If both sides of a semi-detached homes have suites in them then the building becomes a four-plex. • It is nobody’s business but the homeowner what they do with their property • Not enough garbage bins • Visual landscape is terrible with garbage bins lined up outside • Lowers the purchase price of the home In order to accommodate all on-site parking requirements, there will likely be no room for a backyard which does not make for a livable neighbourhood. This issue could likely be mitigated if the lot is large enough to accommodate all the parking and also have a yard. • Noise control

Question 2: Do you think that garden suites (suites in a separate building) should be allowed on properties with demi-detached dwellings? • 39 answered yes; and • 39 answered no.

Below is a summary of the comments received regarding garden suites (ex. above a detached garage) on a lot with a semi-detached dwelling. • Offers residents a mix of housing options which enriches our community and our neighbourhood • Provides another form of affordable housing • Only allow if there is still enough yard space and private greenspace • There wouldn’t be enough yard space; the yards are too small • Size and setbacks should be regulated • \textit{Consent of neighbours should be considered} • \textit{Not enough parking on their property or on the street} • Should be allowed if the suite has the required amenities and follows the bylaw for parking on the property. • Too many structures on one property • Not enough garbage bins • They are ugly • New neighbourhoods are already very dense we don’t need more • \textit{Depends on how considerate people are} • Creates a separate space for renters and home owners • Would lack appropriate separation

Question 3: Do you think that accessory or garden suites should be allowed in townhomes/rowhouses? • 21 people responded yes; and • 27 responded no

Below is a summary of the comments received regarding accessory/garden suites on properties with townhomes/rowhouses: • Not enough space for parking on-site which will create a parking problem on
the street. • Already modified living to accommodate several families or persons • By offering and encouraging different zoning and accessory suite options, the Town is helping build a community today for tomorrow. • The basement and garages are too small in townhomes • Not enough space • Let’s look at affordable housing options vs. over populating streets in the subdivisions • Extra unnecessary demand on infrastructure • Too much density; allowing suites would degrade the lifestyle of the immediate neighbours and the townhome community • Already cramped enough • As long as everything is properly hooked up and safe I do not see why not • Way too many structures on one property • Would lower the purchase price of the property/area • Townhomes may not have the yard space to add more building without taking away the little bit of green space the residents need for enjoyment • If there is space I do not see why they shouldn’t be allowed. However, they shouldn’t be allowed in connected garages

Question 4: What is the maximum percentage of accessory or garden suites that the Town should allow in each block? A block is a stretch of adjoining residential lots on one side of a street not separated by streets, lanes, pathways or parks. • 5% - 27 responses • 10-19% - 12 responses • 20-29% - 15 responses • 30-39% - 4 responses • 40-49% - 3 responses • 50-59% - 11 responses • 60-99% - 0 responses • 100% - 6 responses

Question 5: Every residential property in the Town of Cochrane requires a minimum of two on-site parking stalls. How many additional parking spaces should property owners be required to provide on-site for an accessory or garden suite? • 39 residents chose A - One designated stall should be required for a one bedroom suite • 7 chose B - Two designated stalls should be required for a two bedroom or more suite • 16 chose C One designated stalls should be required for EACH bedroom in the suite • 10 chose D - Two designated stalls should be required for EACH bedroom in the suite • 6 chose E - None: people living in a suite should look for parking elsewhere in the neighbourhood.

Question 6: What are your main concerns regarding accessory or garden suites? • 50 responded with A - There is not enough on-site parking • 6 responded with B - There are too many in my neighbourhood • 4 people commented that it would lower property values • The following is a summary of other concerns: o There are not enough and current costs are high o Provides much needed low-cost housing o Density is too high o The Town will have to allow front yard parking to be expended to accommodate the parking requirement and should except on-street parking to increase. Some may find expanded concrete offensive. o The areas are cramped as it is o Many duplexes and townhomes have inadequate soundproofing and increasing density can degrade quality of life as can associated problems such as backyard noise and parking o They’re needed but they are best suited on bigger lots in mature neighbourhoods o Garden suites affect out view and the look and feel of the neighbourhood. Main concern is the size and look of garden suites o Single family homes should stay that way o They need to be spaced out o Believe having a maximum of one parking spot for a suite would mitigate the problem of requiring too many stalls per lot. o I don’t have any concerns with them

Sadly the bulk of the comments in the above survey address parking issues. People do not live in cars. They live in homes. More emphasis needs to be placed in regards to the building code and quality of life
considerations such as **noise** which especially result in properties which have deviated away from what the developers initially proposed in their presentation to the community.

**In all of Cochrane there are only 5 semi-detached properties with adjoining secondary suites – none of them have as poor a location as 144 Quigley Close.**

There are no worthy comparable properties to the inherently poor location of 144 Quigley Close with its end of a dead end street location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>57</th>
<th>BENCHLANDS DRIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>BOW RIDGE DRIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>BOW RIDGE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>BOW RIDGE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>BOW RIDGE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>BOW RIDGE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>GLENPATRICK CRESCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>GLENPATRICK DRIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>QUIGLEY CLOSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>SUNDOWN VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>SUNRISE VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>SUNSET COMMON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WEST AARSBY ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WEST CALLAWAY PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WEST CALLAWAY PLACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>WEST TERRACE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>WEST TERRACE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>WEST TERRACE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>WEST TERRACE ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>WILLOW MEWS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grey highlighted properties are the ones which are adjoining secondary suites within the same semi-detached properties. None of the existing five such scenarios have as poor a location as 142 & 144 Quigley Close.
Below is a photo of 69 & 71 West Terrace Road it is close to Quigley Close but a poor comparable because of its superior street location.

In all of Cochrane, there are only 5 semi-detached homes which have adjoining secondary suites and none of them are as poorly situated as the subject property 144 Quigley Close at the end of the dead-end street at Quigley Close. The above photo of 69 & 71 West Terrace Road is a poor comparable with Quigley Close because the West Terrace properties are located on a through street.
Results of the second survey by the Town regarding secondary suites. Please note that the majority of questions are addressing parking considerations. The only real quality of life considerations addressed are the topics of suggesting a maximum of 10% density along a block face – an excellent recommendation which I suggest should be used in conjunction with a minimum criteria of no adjacent properties to avoid the problem of clustering.

Question 1: Do you think accessory suites and garden suites should be allowed in semi-detached dwellings?

- 30 responded yes; and
- 26 responded no.

Below is a summary of the comments received from the people who responded no.

- The density is already increased with duplex/semi-detached homes
- Adding an accessory suite to these homes will increase problems with traffic
- Would like to restrict suites to the wider lots with lane access for the additional parking
- Too many people too close together; creates a parking problem regardless of the minimum lot width

- Semi-detached homes are crowded enough already
- There is simply no room on the lots and parking is insufficient
- Has potential to dramatically increase volumes of residents in an area not designed for this
- Don’t agree in any circumstance
- Not enough parking on these lots
- On-street parking will be an issue, especially if there are more than two cars per residence and an accessory suite
- Should not be allowed if they don’t have room for a designated spot for the suite
- Turning a neighbourhood into a rental area will decrease property values, increase already limited parking, increase noise and invite low-income renters which decrease the socio-economic status of a community with negative impacts
Question 3: Currently, the bylaw allows a maximum of 10% of lots within a neighbourhood to have an accessory or garden suite. To help avoid the clustering of suites within each neighbourhood it is proposed that the maximum number of suites allowed be 10% per block face. Please note that a block face is a stretch or adjoining properties on one side of a street not separated by streets, lanes, pathways, parks etc. Do you agree with the maximum of 10% per block face?

- 25 responded yes; and
- 29 responded no.

Below is a summary of the comments received from people who disagreed with the proposed change.

- Will greatly reduce the number of suites that can be built-in well-suited blocks/areas
- Non-legal suites will continue to be rented because people won’t have an option to make them legal
- It will create more illegal suites
- Could result in very few legal suites and our communities would not be able to provide sufficient/ enough affordable housing
- Not necessary, leave the bylaw as it is
- Limiting opportunity and providing unfair resale advantage to those who capitalize on limited suite permits
- Should be 0%
- It penalizes residents who want a suite if a neighbour already has one

Sadly this report is preoccupied with the issue of parking! Whoever designed this survey should be reminded that people who own and rent properties do not live on streets but in homes – there is absolutely no regard to the critical matter of noise control within homes. That is left for the poor residents to experience for themselves.

For the time being though, if the Town wishes to focus on the traffic element of community living then please note that Quigley Close has a longstanding history of traffic infractions for which neither bylaw, the fire department nor the RCMP has demonstrated any action whatsoever in resolving. Here are some photos which were taken just before submitting this report which demonstrates this fact, all of the photos are on Quigley Close, close to the subject property:
Vehicles parked deep into yards for over 8 months at the end of Quigley Close. Clear bylaw infractions never actioned by Bylaw.
Summary:

Unfortunately for the new purchasers of 144 Quigley Close, they should have exercised more caution as in the common saying, Caveat Emptor, or ‘Buyer Beware’. Rewarding the one applicant in this file against the many long-time existing residents who hold no personal ill will whatsoever against the applicant but only want to protect their own and the community’s quality of life and well being on many tangible points should not be ignored by an impartial SDAB committee.

Far too often we experience the failure of systems around which occur because of failures of judgment on behalf of those in positions of power. As the picture below clearly illustrates, poor decisions often lead to poor outcomes.

For the sake of the entire community, the appellants ask that the SDAB do not sacrifice the long-term quality of housing of the current and future residents who purchased homes on what the original developer originally intended as a safe and peaceful cul-de-sac along Quigley Close. Please do not allow your decision among the SDAB to be the long term failure of this community's housing and set a negative example and precedent for the Town of Cochrane.

The five appellants to the application hope that the SDAB will help guide the Town of Cochrane administrators to learn from its mistakes and not repeat them.

Thank you,

Colin T. Fox
Dear members of the Cochrane Subdivision and Development Appeal Board,

I would like to bring some important information to your attention regarding our application for a legal suite. We purchased this property for our son and his young family as he attends bible college and trains to be a Christian pastor. We specifically chose this property because it was zoned R2 and has a basement suite, and the neighboring unit in the duplex has a legal basement suite as well. The suite layout is a small 1-bedroom, and our intention is to rent it out to a quiet tenant to help pay our expenses. My son and his wife have an infant daughter, and we would never tolerate having a noisy or disturbing presence on-site. My son and his family have lived very quietly in our residence for 5 months now, giving us a chance to demonstrate our behavior as good neighbors.

The behavior of past owners and tenants is regrettable, but it has nothing to do with us. Those people are gone. The behavior of people we have never met should not be a reason to deny a development permit to us. There is no chance that we would ever accept a noisy tenant disturbing my young granddaughter. Indeed, there is a risk to us that a future tenant in our neighbor Mr. Fox’s rental suite will be noisy and disruptive. Parking, noise, and alleged safety concerns would apply equally to Mr. Fox’s own basement suite and his future tenants as to our own.

Why should Mr. Fox, our neighbor in the same duplex, be allowed to rent out a basement suite while we should not? The duplex is zoned R2, shouldn’t the same rules for legal suites apply to both sides of the duplex? We plan to invest in improving our property, renovating the interior and landscaping the exterior. This will positively affect property values not just for our own residence, but for the immediate area by association as well. For all of these reasons, we feel that our suite would be a benefit to the community and deserves to be approved.

Thank you,

Robert Parker
RE: SDAB Hearing 19-004

The Benefits of Having a Secondary Suite

Dear Board Members,

I would like to add the to my husband’s arguments. Please consider them before ruling on our right to have the right to have a secondary suite in our home.

Why a secondary suite is an asset to our aging community?

Nursing homes and assisted living facilities are extremely expensive, and many families are searching for alternative solutions, especially in Alberta’s struggling economy. Younger families are choosing to remodel their home and create an in-law suite for their parents. Having parents or grandparents live within the same home as the next generation’s family is beneficial financially and emotionally. An Assisted Living facility can cost over $12,000 per month; a hefty amount of money to be saving monthly. It also gives the elderly family members ability to see and know their grand children. Many adult children also wish to have their parents live near them so that they can make sure they are properly fed and treated well. Should anything health related happen to their parents, the adult children would be close enough to help give them any care they may need.

By having this secondary suite pass code, should the family require the secondary unit to become inhabited by a family member in the future, we would know that it has passed code and is a safe place for them to reside. A benefit of creating this addition to our home is that it can be used as an income suite now to help out our children and an In-Law Suite in the future. It can also be a place for family and friends to stay and visit in the future.

In-law suites increase property value [http://homeownership.ca/homeownership/top-five-home-renovations-that-increase-property-value/](http://homeownership.ca/homeownership/top-five-home-renovations-that-increase-property-value/)

Thank you