

***Erlton Community Association***  
Planning and Development Committee  
65 – 31 Avenue SW, Calgary, Alberta, T2S 2Y7

To: Giyan Brenkman (403-268-2678)  
File Manager  
City of Calgary

From: Bill Fischer (403-266-2842)  
Chairman, Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association

Date: April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014

LOC2012-0040  
Amendment to the Erlton ARP  
(Anthem property)

We've been reviewing and commenting on this file since June 2012. Our April 28th and July 9th comments in 2013 are attached.

In June 2013, you provided us with a finalized draft of the DC Guidelines and amendments to the Erlton Area Redevelopment Plan. They are attached for reference.

Subsequent to that, Anthem submitted a Transportation Impact Assessment. This required changes to both the DC Guidelines and our ARP. You provided us with those drafts on April 2nd, 2014.

As a result, we have three concerns that we would like resolved:

1. Section 5(1)(b)(i) of the draft 2013 DC Guidelines excluded Custodial Care. We negotiated this exclusion. The latest DC Bylaw includes Custodial Care in Section 4(c)(iii). Please delete it.
2. We accept that some commercial access will be required from Erlton Road. We are concerned that a portion of this traffic will choose to use Erlton Road to access the businesses via 24th Avenue SW, thus bypassing the Site 1 parkade access point on Erlton Road, located approximately 60m North of 25th Avenue. We are also concerned that traffic will use 24th Avenue and either Erlton Road or Erlton Street as a short cut between Macleod Trail and westbound 25th Avenue. The solution to both concerns is to terminate 24th Avenue at a cul-de-sac at Erlton Road. The cul-de-sac could be replaced with gates or other traffic barrier devices designed to open for emergency vehicles such as fire trucks, etc. We ask that you add a new DC Bylaw Section 19 (3), to read as follows:

“Terminate 24th Avenue SW at Erlton Road as a cul-de-sac or other traffic barrier construct to prevent traffic access from Erlton Road, and traffic short-cutting between Macleod Trail and Erlton Road.”

3. Modify ARP Section 2.1.3.2, to read as follows:

“Vehicle access to residential and commercial development is permitted from Macleod Trail and Erlton Road. In order to minimize circulation of commercial traffic in the adjacent residential area, appropriate mitigation measures, such as maximising vehicle access to commercial development from Macleod Trail, should be considered at Development Permit stage, including the prevention of all traffic entering or leaving 24 Ave SW at Erlton Road.”

Not one resident who commented on the use of Erlton Road - a quiet residential road - for commercial traffic, favours it, especially since it contemplates 2300 commercial vehicles per day. You can read their comments at <http://calgary.ca/erltonroad>.

You're probably aware of the recent epic failure of the Mission Road project due to the poorly crafted wording in the DC and ARP, and the failure to account for the wishes of the residents. If not, you can review it here:

<http://erltoncommunity.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/SDAB2013-0151-decision.pdf>

You have the opportunity to pull the weeds of defeat from this file before it reaches the Calgary Planning Commission, the public hearing at City Council, a DP application, and a potential trip to the Sub Division and Appeal Board. We believe that our recommendations will accomplish this, and result in smooth sailing for our residents, the City, and the developer - thus everyone benefits.

Please do not hesitate to call or email should you have any concerns or require further information.

Sincerely,

Bill Fischer, Chairman  
Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association  
<http://erltoncommunity.com/>

cc: Gian-Carlo Carra, Ward 9 Councillor

***Erlton Community Association***  
Planning and Development Committee  
65 – 31 Avenue SW, Calgary, Alberta, T2S 2Y7

To: Giyan Brenkman (403-268-2678)  
File Manager  
City of Calgary

From: Bill Fischer (403-266-2842)  
Chairman, Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association

Date: April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2013

LOC2012-0040  
Amendment to the Erlton ARP  
(Anthem property)

Our community has reviewed this application, with its most recent changes, and supports the Land Use and ARP amendments proposed by Anthem Properties for this site in North Erlton.

Since 2006, we have been involved in numerous consultation meetings with Anthem and their representatives. We believe the current amendments to the Land Use and ARP are in keeping with the overall intent and vision of the development - as established through significant discussions with our community representatives through the years. We are eager to see the project move forward.

As community stakeholders, we acknowledge and support the following changes to the DC Land Use Bylaw:

- The increased in grocery store size to support the requirements of a potential tenant to 3655m<sup>2</sup> from 2800m<sup>2</sup>;
- Removing the minimum FAR requirement for the office space. It is our understanding, however, that office use is still an allowed discretionary use. The mandatory inclusion of office space is immaterial to our community, and the potential for higher traffic generation from office uses continues to remain a concern for us;
- The current density, building form, step backs and height provisions in the Land Use are all key parameters determined through extensive consultation with Anthem and City staff. We would be very concerned if densities above 5.0 FAR or 90m building height were to be considered. This would require much further community discussion and consultation. We have been committed to balancing density and intensification objectives on this site with the needs of our community, and we feel the proposed development does this. Any increase beyond the current thresholds would be a major concern to our residents due to increased effects on traffic and shadowing;

- The “High Street” on 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue has always been a key part of this development and we support the changes to protect the character and animation of this unique area. The additional benefit to this is it keeps major pedestrian and commercial uses separated from Erlton Road, which we consider to be a quiet residential street.

Our major concern continues to be traffic created as a result of this development. We have seen Anthem’s proposed traffic/site circulation plans - and must see this more fully developed. Although the design details are a Development Permit issue, the current plan offers many options for traffic to enter and leave the proposed development without entering directly into our community. This is of paramount importance to us. Directing non-local and non- residential traffic away from Erlton Road and onto Macleod Trail is by far preferred. We applaud Anthem’s approach to ensure the design achieves this. We trust that this will be followed through during the Development Permit stage.

In a similar vein, the City / Transportation must finally step up to the plate and resolve the dysfunctional east bound traffic flow at the intersection of Macleod Trail and 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue. In an ideal world they will do it before this new development is occupied.

We also believe the architecture of the project to be well thought out in addressing the integration of this project into our community. We would like to be involved in the final design of the project, and have asked the developer to hold at least one additional meeting with our association to ensure our input is heard relative to the Development Permit and final design.

We ask City staff and council to work with Anthem to move this development forward. We understand that Anthem would like to start construction next year and we are excited at this prospect. The development of this site is long overdue and we ask you to work diligently to bring this project to fruition.

Please do not hesitate to call or email should you have any concerns or require further information.

Sincerely,

Bill Fischer, Chairman  
Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association  
[erltoncommunity.com](http://erltoncommunity.com)

cc: Gian-Carlo Carra, Ward 9 Alderman  
cc: Ben Lee, IBI Group

***Erlton Community Association***  
Planning and Development Committee  
65 – 31 Avenue SW, Calgary, Alberta, T2S 2Y7

To: Giyan Brenkman (403-268-2678)  
File Manager  
City of Calgary

From: Bill Fischer (403-266-2842)  
Chairman, Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association

Date: July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2013

LOC2012-0040  
Amendment to the Erlton ARP  
(Anthem property)

This is supplemental to our April 28th comment on this DC Bylaw and Erlton ARP amendment.

We have reviewed the draft of the DC Bylaw wherein Custodial Care, Special Function - Class 1, and Special Function - Class 2 uses are excluded or prohibited. We find that the DC Bylaw now fully resolves all concerns we expressed with respect to these uses.

The social disorder resulting from the Special Function use emanates from patron activity - and the evidence the following morning - due to the serving, and over-serving of alcohol, the loud music, and the late hours of operation. It will severely impact the right to quiet enjoyment of a large number of nearby residents - both current and future. This use is presently available across Macleod Trail in Stampede Park, and its presence here in Erlton is not conducive to our objective of being a complete, mixed-use, family-friendly community.

Please do not hesitate to call or email should you have any concerns or require further information.

Sincerely,

Bill Fischer, Chairman  
Planning and Development Committee  
Erlton Community Association  
[erltoncommunity.com](http://erltoncommunity.com)

cc: Gian-Carlo Carra, Ward 9 Alderman  
cc: Ben Lee, IBI Group

**CORPORATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS GROUP RECOMMENDATION:      Approval**

Recommend that Council **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation of 2.19 hectares ± (5.40 acres ±) located at 2327, 2328, 2399, 2418 and 2425 Macleod Trail SW (Plan 0813116, Block 3, Lots 37 to 39; Plan 0813116, Block 8, Lots 37 and 38) from DC Direct Control District to DC Direct Control District to accommodate a transit oriented mixed use development, with the following guidelines:

**Purpose**

- 1 This Direct Control District is intended to:
  - (a) provide for a pedestrian and transit oriented mixed use development;
  - (b) provide for a range of commercial uses with some restrictions on size and location within **buildings**;
  - (c) provide for a range of multi-residential uses with a variety of built forms;
  - (d) provide for flexibility in the mix and intensity of uses, built form and size; and
  - (e) provide for **building** locations, **setback areas**, and **landscaping** that create sensitive interface treatment with adjacent residential developments.

**Compliance with Bylaw 1P2007**

- 2 Unless otherwise specified, the rules and provisions of Parts 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Bylaw 1P2007 apply to this Direct Control District.

**Reference to Bylaw 1P2007**

- 3 Within this Direct Control District, a reference to a section of Bylaw 1P2007 is deemed to be a reference to the section as amended from time to time.

**Permitted Uses**

- 4 (1) The **permitted uses** of the Commercial - Corridor 1 (C-COR1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the **permitted uses** in this Direct Control District.
  - (2) Despite the **uses** deemed to be **permitted uses** in Subsection 21(1) of Bylaw 1P2007 on all areas designated as Direct Control, the following **use** is prohibited in this Direct Control District:
    - (a) Special Function – Class 1.

**Discretionary Uses**

- 5 (1) The **discretionary uses** of the Commercial - Corridor 1 (C-COR1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the **discretionary uses** in this Direct Control District:
  - (a) with the addition of:
    - (i) **Multi-Residential Development**;
    - (ii) **Parking Lot – Grade (temporary)**.

- (b) with the exclusion of:
  - (i) **Custodial Care;**
  - (ii) **Parking Lot – Grade;** and
  - (iii) **Parking Lot – Structure.**
- (2) Despite the **uses** deemed to be **discretionary uses** in Subsection 21(2) of Bylaw 1P2007 on all areas designated as Direct Control, the following **use** is prohibited in this Direct Control District:
  - (a) Special Function – Class 2.

### **Bylaw 1P2007 District Rules**

**6** Unless otherwise specified, the General Rules for Commercial Land Use Districts of Bylaw 1P2007 apply in this Direct Control District.

### **Floor Area Ratio**

- 7**
- (1) The maximum total **floor area ratio** over the entire site is 5.0.
  - (2) The maximum total **floor area ratio** over the entire site is 1.0 for commercial uses.
  - (3) The minimum total **floor area ratio** over the entire site is 1.0. for residential uses.

### **Building Height**

- 8**
- (1) Unless otherwise referenced in subsection (2), the maximum **building height** is 90.0 metres.
  - (2) Where a **parcel** shares a **property line** with Erlton Road, the maximum **building height** is:
    - a) 24.0 metres measured from **grade** within 10.0 metres of that **property line**; and
    - b) 48.0 metres measured from **grade** at a distance between 10.0 metres and 22.0 metres from that **property line**.

### **Use Area**

- 9**
- (1) Unless otherwise referenced in subsection (2) and (3), there is no maximum **use area** requirement for commercial **uses**.
  - (2)
    - (a) Unless otherwise referenced in subsection (b), the maximum **use area** for commercial **uses** on the ground floor of **buildings** in this Direct Control District is 465.0 square metres.
    - (b) One (1) **retail and consumer service use** may have a maximum **use area** of 1115 square metres on the ground floor of **buildings**, subject to the use area width requirements in section 11 of this Direct Control District.

- (3) The maximum **use area** for a **supermarket** is 3800 square metres on the ground floor of **buildings**.

#### Location of Uses within Buildings

- 10 (1) No **Retail and Consumer Service uses** are to be located above residential **uses** and must have its own separate entrance from any residential component of the **building**.
- (2) Only **Retail and Consumer Service uses** must be oriented towards the 25 Avenue SW frontage and the private road, legally described as Lot 39, Block 3, Plan 0813116 (previously a part of 24 AV SW).
- (3) **Retail and Consumer Service uses** must not be oriented towards the Erlton Road SW frontage, except at the following locations:
- (a) at either corners of the intersection of Erlton Road SW with the private road, legally described as Lot 39, Block 3, Plan 0813116 (previously a part of 24 AV SW) for a maximum distance of 20.0 metres from the corner of the intersection; and,
- (b) at the intersection of Erlton Road SW with 25 Avenue SW for a maximum distance of 25.0 metres from the corner of the intersection.
- (4) A **supermarket** must not be developed as a stand-alone **use** on the site, but must form part of a comprehensively designed development.

#### Use Area Width

- 11 (1) Unless otherwise referenced in subsection (2) and (3), the maximum width of a **use area** on the ground floor fronting the private road, legally described as Lot 39, Block 3, Plan 0813116 (previously a part of 24 AV SW), is 15.0 metres.
- (2) The **use area** width may be relaxed by the **Development Authority** for the following **uses** where the test for relaxation set out in section 31 or 36 of Bylaw 1P2007 is met.
- (a) **Restaurant: Food Service Only - Large;**
- (b) **Restaurant: Food Service Only - Medium;**
- (c) **Restaurants Licensed - Large;** and
- (d) **Restaurants Licensed - Medium.**
- (3) There is no **use area** width requirement for a **supermarket**.

#### Front Setback Area

- 12 (1) Unless otherwise referenced in subsection (2), there is no minimum requirement for a **front setback area**;
- (2) For all development along Erlton Road, the **front setback area** must have a minimum depth of 2.0 metres.



### Rear Setback Area

13 There is no minimum requirement for a **rear setback area**.

### Side Setback Area

14 There is no minimum requirement for a **side setback area**.

### Building Design

15 (1) **Multi-Residential Development** above the podium must have a maximum floor plate size of 700.0 square metres **gross floor area**, which may be relaxed by the **Development Authority** to a maximum of 750.0 square metres where the test for relaxation set out in section 31 or 36 of Bylaw 1P2007 is met

(2) The separation distance between **buildings** above the podium must be a minimum of 24.0 metres.

### Landscaping in Setback Area

16 The landscape requirements of the Commercial - Corridor 1 (C-COR1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the landscape requirements in this Direct Control District.

### Vehicular Access

17 (1) Vehicular access to parking structures must not be provided from the private road, legally described as Lot 39, Block 3, Plan 0813116 (previously a part of 24 AV SW).

(2) Vehicular access to parking structures for non-residential uses must not be provided from Erlton Road SW.

(3) Vehicular access for commercial loading/unloading and waste and recycling pick up must not be provided from Erlton Road SW.

### Minimum Required Motor Vehicle Parking Stalls

18 (1) Unless otherwise referenced in subsections (2), (3) and (4) below, the minimum required motor vehicle parking stalls of the Commercial – Corridor 1 (C-COR1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the minimum required **motor vehicle parking stalls** in this Direct Control District.

(2) The minimum required **motor vehicle parking stalls** for a supermarket is 3.5 stalls per 100 square metres of **gross usable floor area**.

(3) The minimum **motor vehicle parking stall** requirements for each **use** is the maximum **motor vehicle parking** stall requirement provided for each **use**.

(4) The minimum number of **motor vehicle parking stalls** is reduced by 10.0 per cent where a **building** that generates the parking requirement is located within 400.0 metres of an existing or approved Capital funded **LRT platform**.

(5) The **Development Authority** may consider a further relaxation of the required **motor vehicle parking stalls** for a development where a parking study submitted as part of a development permit application demonstrates that the **motor vehicle parking stalls** requirement should vary from the requirements of this Direct Control District, and the test for the relaxations set out in section 31

and 36 of Bylaw 1P2007 is met.

**Required Bicycle Parking Stalls**

**19** The minimum required bicycle parking stalls of the Commercial - Corridor 1 (C-COR1) District of Bylaw 1P2007 are the minimum required bicycle parking stalls in this Direct Control District.

**Phasing**

- 20**
- (1)** A phasing plan must be submitted with the first Development Permit application providing development sequencing information.
  - (2)** The private road, legally described as Lot 39, Block 3, Plan 0813116 (previously a part of 24 AV SW), must be constructed as part of phase 1 of the development.
  - (3)** The overhead pedestrian bridge must be constructed as part of phase 1 of the development,

Draft Amendments to the Erlton Area Redevelopment Plan  
2013 June 20

1. In Section 2.1.2 Erlton Station Area, insert the text “(see Site 17 on Map 2)” at the end of the heading.
2. In Section 2.1.3.1 Policies, add the following text to the end of Subsection 2.1.3.1.1:  
“To ensure transit supportive uses and discourage stand alone uses, developments should achieve a minimum density of 1 FAR.”
3. In Section 2.1.3.1 Policies, delete Subsections 2.1.3.1.4 and 2.1.3.1.5 in their entirety.
4. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, add the following text to the end of Subsection 2.1.3.2.b:  
“Where roof areas of more than 700 square metres occur on at grade retail buildings, the building shall contain a green roof covering at least 75% of the roof area.”
5. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, add the following text to the end of the last sentence in Subsection 2.1.3.2.d:  
“, at the intersection with 24th Avenue and 25 meters at the intersection with 25th Avenue.”
6. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, delete Subsection 2.1.3.2.e and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.
7. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, insert the following text as a new bullet point between existing Subsections 2.1.3.2.l and 2.1.3.2.m:  
“Commercial uses larger than 300 square metres should be discouraged, except for supermarkets and other similar uses which provide various daily goods and services for residents.”
8. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, in Subsection 2.1.3.2.m, delete the text “9” and replace with “15”, and add the following text to the end of the Subsection:  
“The remainder of the business should locate on a second floor or wrap behind adjacent uses.”
9. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, in Subsection 2.1.3.2.n, delete the text “Individual business fronts that are greater than 30” and replace with “Supermarkets and individual business fronts that are greater than 15”.
10. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, delete the text in Subsection 2.1.3.2.v and replace with:  
“To minimize the impact of the commercial traffic on the residential area, vehicle access to commercial development shall be from Macleod Trail.”
11. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, delete Subsections 2.1.3.2.x and 2.1.3.2.y in their entirety and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

12. In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, in Subsection 2.1.3.2.z, insert the text “for residential uses” after the text “Parking access points”.
13. In Section 2.1.3.3 Implementation, delete Subsection 2.1.3.3.bb in its entirety and replace with the following:
  - a. Any development permits for new structures within the Erlton Station Area shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Panel given the prominent location of the site.
  - b. A phasing plan must be submitted with the first Development Permit application providing development sequencing information. The portion of 24th Avenue between Erlton Road and Macleod Trail must be developed as part of the first phase of the development.
  - c. A pedestrian overpass over Macleod Trail should be considered in conjunction with the first phase of the development, in order to provide direct pedestrian access from the Erlton Station Area to the LRT station. Contributions from development within the Erlton Station Area should be considered to finance a portion of the bridge.”

