

2334 Erlton Place
Erlton
Calgary SW
28 May 2014

The City Clerk,
City of Calgary,

Dear sir,

Policy Amendment & Land Use Amendment Erlton – Ward 9

Our submission on the proposed changes to the Erlton Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and the Direct Control District(DC) follows. Attachments as Appendix 1 to 3 are also included.

In particular we wish to address;

1. The inclusion of Custodial care in the list of discretionary uses in the proposed DC bylaw
2. The proposal to increase the size of the grocery store to 3800m2
3. The proposed changes to subsection 2.1.3.2 (v) of the Erlton ARP allowing commercial patron traffic access to the development from/to Erlton Road.

Note: All bold and/or capitalized text is my addition. All highlighting in attachments is my addition.

Proposed changes to bylaws or the ARP currently in place are required to be evaluated against all existing planning instruments, including the MDP, CTP, ARP in place, DC bylaw, Complete Streets 2011.

Background.

In a significant over-sight, the Administration Report presented to the Planning Committee fails to adequately present the full background, history and context of community discussion and comment with respect to concerns surrounding this development.

The background is as follows;

The residential buildings immediately to the west of the development are townhouses of 5 storeys (Erlton Rd), 4 storeys (plus basement Erlton street) reducing to 3 storeys (plus basement west side of erlton st) and in Erlton Place.

The development is bounded by Macleod trail (Urban Boulevard 50,000 vpd - 60kph), 25th Ave (Collector Street 6000 vpd – 50kph), Erlton Road (residential street 1300 vpd - 50kph) and 22nd Ave (cul de sac). The intersection of Erlton Road and 25th ave is located approximately 85m west of Macleod Trail.

The neighborhood of Erlton consists of two areas separated by 25th Ave (Erlton North and South). Erlton south is predominantly residential dwellings on individual titles.

1. 2007. The owner of the development site (Anthem Properties) applied to change the designation of the development site from medium density to high density.

The city consulted with the community over changes including conducting an open house forum. The major concerns identified by the community revolved around the amount of traffic the development would generate and how this might affect their neighborhood.

To alleviate community concerns and to protect the community from possible negative impacts of the change to high density and a potentially large increase of traffic in Erlton, changes were made by the city to the Erlton Area Revopement Plan (ARP). The changes were specifically designed and crafted to protect the residential streets of Erlton from inundation by commercial patron vehicles and non-local traffic, including changes to transportation facilities, by limiting access for commercial patrons of the development from/to Erlton Road.

The specific and most relevant clause in the current Erlton ARP providing this protection says;

2.3.1.2 (v) “to minimize the impact of the retail traffic on the residential area, **private vehicle access to retail and office development shall be principally from Macleod Trail.**

Other clauses in the Erlton ARP support this direction and provide further protection and certainty for the community. Quoting from the ARP

“The Plan also endeavors to **minimize the impact of non-local traffic on residential streets in the community.**”

“The key objective of the transportation strategy for Erlton is to **minimize through traffic** in the Erlton area and to **protect the community from potential impacts** related to the upgrading of transportation facilities”.

“Access and site circulation designed to minimize the impact on the adjacent buildings, reduce conflict with pedestrians and **reduce the traffic impact in the community**”.

“27th and 28th Avenues S.E. and the related lanes at Macleod Trail should be closed to **minimize the infiltration of through traffic in the residential community**”

“Should 24th Avenue be closed for the purpose of a private road, the road re-design, subject to existing utility right-of-ways and flood channels, **shall discourage through traffic from Macleod Trail to Erlton Road**”.

The DC bylaw(118Z2007) at the time (2007)said;

“each retail use shall have its own separate entrance from any residential component of the building”

and;

“access to parking structures on the closed portion of 24th avenue shall not be permitted”

and;

“shared commercial/residential parking may be permitted where supported by an appropriate parking study.”

2. June 2012(approximately). Anthem submitted a land use amendment application to amend the DC bylaw. The Erlton Community Association (ECA) were supportive of the changes with minor adjustment to some of the language. There was no change to access provisions.

3. 6 Dec 2012. A draft of the new DC bylaw dated 6 Dec 2012 included the following regarding vehicle access;

“Access to parking structures on the closed portion of 24th Avenue SW shall not be permitted.”

4. 28 April 2013. The ECA sent a letter to the city and ward Councilor

Their major concern was traffic within Erlton, created as a result of the development.

5. July 9 2013. The ECA sent a letter supplemental to their April 28 letter approving the removal of custodial care from the DC bylaw.

6. July 2013. Following discussion between the ECA and city a new DC bylaw was drafted by the city. A new Erlton ARP was also drafted by the city.

The draft ARP said;

In Section 2.1.3.2 Development Guidelines, delete the text in Subsection 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.**”

The draft DC bylaw said;

“Vehicular access to parking structures for non-residential uses must not be provided from Erlton Road SW”. (See attachment 1)

7. July 15 (week of) 2013. The ECA received a phone call from Anthem, who wished to change both draft clauses to allow commercial patron traffic to access the development from Erlton Road.

8. July 22 2013. Letter from the ECA to the community, informing them of the anthem plan and that there may be significant lobbying to remove the vehicle access protections for residents in North Erlton.

9. July 30 2013. Letter from the President of Waterford Condo Board, with concerns about the size of the development, and opposing vehicle access to the development from Erlton road.

10. Sept 18 2013. Letter from the President of Waterford Condo Board, following the Waterford AB AGM expressing concern about potential problems caused by increase in population, traffic and parking.

11. Nov 25 2013. Letter from ECA to the city providing solutions that would protect the neighborhood of Erlton from short cutting of traffic through Erlton from Macleod Trail and alerting the city to the congestion and short cutting that will occur if signals are installed at 25th and Erlton Road.

12. Jan 21 2014. Sobeys (the planned grocery store) write Anthem concerning commercial access from Erlton Road. **They confirmed they require full commercial access from Erlton Road for the store to be successful.**

Their letter also confirmed that if parkade entry off Erlton Road were entry only, the store would be compromised to a level they would not accept (see attachment 2).

13. April 2014. The ECA received a new draft DC and ARP removing all restrictions to commercial patron vehicle access from/to Erlton road and therefore all protections provided by the existing ARP.

The April 2014 changes made to the draft ARP and DC bylaw of July 2013 were;

DC bylaw

Vehicular Access – removal of the July 2013 draft that **“Vehicular access to parking structures for non-residential uses must not be provided from Erlton Road SW”** and replace with;

19 (1) Vehicular access to parking structures must not be provided from the private road (24th Ave).

(2) Vehicular access for commercial loading and waste and recycling collection must not be provided from Erlton Road SW.

Erlton ARP

Removal of the clause inserted in the July 2013 draft “To minimize the impact of the commercial traffic on the residential area, vehicle access to commercial development shall be from Macleod Trail.”

A new substitute clause saying;

“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 should be considered at the Development Permit stage. Appropriate mitigation measures include, but are not limited to:

- Maximizing accessibility to commercial development from Macleod Trail;
- Installation of or modification to traffic control devices;
- Road and sidewalk improvements; and,
- Traffic calming measures.”

14. April 10 2014. letter from ECA objecting to the changes made in the ARP from the July 2013 draft including traffic short cutting concerns and the inclusion of custodial care in the new bylaw.

15. April 11 2014. letter from LPCA supporting the development and DC/ARP changes but affirming that their primary concern is traffic issues.

1. The inclusion of Custodial care in the list of discretionary uses in the proposed DC bylaw

The existing DC bylaw does not have custodial care as a discretionary use. The city and community have been in discussion regarding the Anthem development since 2006. Discussions resulted in a new DC bylaw drafted in July 2013. It was recommended for approval by Council by city planning and only required ratification by Council.

This draft bylaw **Excluded Custodial Care** as a discretionary use.

However, the report says that “it is part of a group of discretionary residential uses found in all multi residential districts and most low density residential districts”.

The report writer obviously does not know Erlton North. It is a quiet, family friendly residential area with apartments and townhouses, mostly privately owned, bounded by park, river, Talisman centre and soon to be high rise, high density apartment and commercial development fronting Erlton Road. The proposed discretionary use would not be permitted within the current neighborhood but we are told that it must be permitted metres further away from the neighborhood.

Community character and context must be taken into account. There a number of clauses in the MDP that say so, one of which says;

“The City promotes infilling that is sensitive, compatible and complementary to the existing physical patterns and character of neighborhoods”.

Some low density districts do not include this discretionary use. Due to the proximity of the new development to the neighborhood and in acknowledgement of the unique situation of Erlton **we request that this discretionary use be removed from the proposed DC bylaw because;**

It is not in keeping with the family friendly context of the neighborhood.

The use potentially could result in reduced safety and security in future for children in a family oriented neighborhood.

The proximity of the development for all intents and purposes places the use within the residential neighborhood, action that would otherwise not be allowed.

Referencing the MDP, It is not sensitive, compatible nor complementary to the existing character of the neighborhood.

2. The proposal to increase the size of the grocery store to 3800m2

Opposition to this change is subject to allowance of commercial patrons to use Erlton Road as principal access to the development.

Grocery stores are high traffic generators.

Safeway in Mission is 25,000 sq. ft and serves surrounding communities. The proposed new grocery store at Erlton is 40,900 sq. ft. It too will serve surrounding communities and due to size will attract patrons from even further afield, as well as a significant number of passby traffic on Macleod trail who will attend to shopping during peak traffic times to escape the peak hour congestion on Macleod Trail.

A 2800 sq. m store (30,100 sq. ft), currently permitted, will generate 3070 vehicle trips per day according to the ITE trip generation manual. A 40,900 sq. ft store will generate a further 1100 vehicle trips per day. This extra traffic will be permitted to use Erlton Road if the current ARP is changed.

The Erlton ARP says;

“Commercial uses are intended to primarily serve the local population “(policy 2.1.3.1) and;

“One of the primary objectives is a range of local (neighborhood) commercial uses to serve the needs of the immediate communities”.

A 40,900 sq. ft grocery store, 160% larger than mission safeway is obviously not intended to primarily serve the local population or just the immediate communities.

The change to grocery store size from 2800m2 to 3800m2 is opposed because this use is a high traffic generating use and does not comply with the Erlton ARP.

3. The proposed changes to subsection 2.1.3.2 (v) of the Erlton ARP allowing commercial patron traffic access to the development from/to Erlton Road and other local roads in Erlton.

Administration Report “Reasons for Recommendation of the proposed changes to the DC and ARP.”

1. “The adjustments are minor in nature and do not divert substantially from the original version and goals of the Erlton ARP and DC District.”

This cover-all statement is simply incorrect and misleading, sweeping all “adjustments” into the “minor” category. Not all of the adjustments are minor. The adjustment to the vehicle access provisions in the existing Erlton ARP are of “paramount importance” (ECA letter) to the Erlton community and are therefore a major adjustment and absolutely do divert from the goals of the existing Erlton ARP as a simple reading will confirm (see background above, paragraph 1).

The planning report fails dismally with regard to informing planning committee members and Council of the importance of, and true extent of community concern about commercial patron access from and to Erlton Road, including cut through traffic, congestion/grid lock at Erlton/25th and 25th /Macleod trail intersections, the type of traffic calming measures planned, safety of pedestrians and cyclists in Erlton road, parking issues and the possible use of Erlton road by construction vehicles/equipment for 5 years of construction works.

Page 12 of the planning report lists 3 “citizen comments”, none of which mention any concerns about traffic issues in Erlton.

This is frankly negligent. In fact there have been 22 citizen comments regarding the development. 21 comments expressed varying degrees of concern about traffic/noise/commercial access from Erlton Road/congestion at intersections from this development.

These comments can be found both on the city website and the ECA website.

The 21 comments exclude LPCA and a substantial number of ECA comments expressing concern about traffic.

The report also misrepresents ECA comments.

The report says (pg. 10). “Both community associations expressed general support for the proposed development”.....”The Erlton Community association is in support of the proposed adjustments to the Erlton ARP and DC District”.....

"Although initially objecting against motor vehicle access and egress to/from Erlton Road SW for the purpose of visiting commercial uses in the proposed development, the community association is now accepting these commercial access points to and from the underground parking structures:"

There is some truth to this but only in part. The report is therefore misleading.

Both Community associations have expressed general support for the development.

The LPCA, in a letter dated April 11 2014, set forth objectives to be applied at DP stage to address traffic concerns, which were eliminating cut through traffic, improve and protect the ability of residents to get in and out of the neighborhood and focus delivery/service vehicles to the Macleod Trail side.

From the ECA ,3 letters are included in the report.

Letter 1, dated April 28 2013 says; "Our community has reviewed this application, with its most recent changes, and supports the Land Use and ARP amendments proposed by Anthem properties".

Importantly, and what the report does **NOT** say is that this statement refers to the provisions that were included in the July 3 2013 draft DC and ARP, both of which **prohibit commercial patron access from/to Erlton Road.**

This ECA letter also says; "**the current plan offers many options for traffic to enter and leave the proposed development site without entering directly into our community**".

Letter 2 dated July 9 2013 also refers to the July 3 2013 draft DC bylaw which removed custodial care and special function Class 1 and 2 uses according to community wishes. The city is now back tracking and wish to include custodial care in the new bylaw under discussion.

Letter 3, dated April 10 2014. Contrary to what the report would have us believe the letter says that "the ECA accept that **SOME** commercial access will be required from Erlton Road" and offered solutions that would minimize circulation of commercial traffic in the neighborhood, one being maximising commercial vehicle access from Macleod Trail.

And the current ARP says similar, that principal access shall be from Macleod Trail.

The ECA and community concerns and comments have not been reflected in the new bylaw wording which is a generalised, non specific, non mandatory statement saying the developer "should" consider mitigation measures to minimise traffic circulation in the community. In fact there is no future protection for the community against Erlton Road becoming the principal access point for commercial patron vehicles and non-local traffic.

The ECA letter further says; "**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 subdivision and Appeal board**".

The Admin report , totally out of context, says "the community association is now accepting these commercial access points to and from the underground parking structures".

This clearly is **NOT** the case and recent discussion with community members at an Anthem sponsored meeting (May 21) confirms the community is still concerned about traffic issues.

2. The adjustments will allow for the potential of a mixed use project at the Erlton LRT station to come to fruition.

The project was moving forward even up to the July 2013 draft ARP and DC changes prohibiting commercial patron access from Erlton Road. The “potential” of any development site to reach “fruition” is never open ended. It is dependent on the site constraints and limitations, City laws and plans, ARP/DC in place and developer planning, design and construction skills. Developers must design to suit the variances of the site, not design first then try and change laws to suit tenants access requirements as is the case with this development.

The fact is the development site has significant access and egress limitations. The current ARP has “**specific policies and design guidelines**”(MDP) **that govern development and protect the community from developer excesses.** The community should not be the sacrificial lamb to accommodate this developer and their tenants wishes for unlimited commercial patron access to the quiet Erlton neighborhood roads. The developer and the city must work with the community to solve the complicated vehicle access issues surrounding this development. There has been no real consensus to date and discussions with the city and developer have only yielded confusion, stonewalling and one sided results in favor of the developer. The City is now pressing on with haste to change legislation before the traffic issues are resolved.

The bylaw and ARP should remain as is until a comprehensive traffic plan with real solutions to the traffic issues is formulated and accepted by all stakeholders. This plan should be included in the DC bylaw to give certainty and direction to all going forward.

The letter from Sobeys possibly explains the sudden reversals to the July 2013 drafts that were accepted by the Erlton community.

“more recently there have been some specific concerns around traffic and access to the site, specifically related to commercial customer access to and from erlton road.....**we would require full movement access to the parkade from Erlton road.....**If the parkade access at Erlton Road was restricted to allow entry only, the convenience and accessibility to **our store would comprised (sic) to a level that we would not accept.**”(see attachment 2).

The available evidence indicates that following the proposed July 3 2013 drafts that prohibited access from Erlton Road, Sobeys stated they would not accept limited patron access from Erlton Road. The obviously meaning is that they would not tenant the store if full movement access were not permitted. Anthem would therefore lose their anchor tenant, a Sobeys store tenaning 54% of the retail space. The bylaw is now being changed, in part to satisfy the requirements of a grocery store owner.

3. The proposal is in keeping with the direction provided in the Erlton Area Redevelopment plan for the Erlton station as a transit oriented development site; and,

4. The proposal is in keeping with the Municipal Development Plan(MDP) for Macleod Trail S as an Urban Corridor.”

The Calgary Municipal Development Plan(MDP) says that ARPs are “recognized by the MDP as policies providing **specific direction** relative to the local context”.

This “**specific direction**” says that commercial traffic should be principally from Macleod trail and was negotiated and agreed upon in 2007 by the City in partnership with the community, to provide guidance for decisions and protection from possible negative effects of the expected future redevelopment in Erlton. These protections were endorsed by Council in the current ARP.

This specific direction was re-affirmed and reinforced by city planning and policy in the proposed July 2013 changes to the DC and ARP.

Municipal Development Plan

The MDP says;

“Future reviews of, and amendments to, (those) ARPs and ASPs will be required to align with the policies of the MDP.”

The MDP also says in section 1.4; “ASPs direct the future land use patterns, transportation and utility networks and sequence of development in new communities. The MGA requires that all ASPs and ARPs must be consistent with the MDP”.

“In areas where an approved ASP or ARP is in effect when making land use decisions, the **specific policies and design guidelines** of that plan will continue to provide direction”.

The city is therefore required to ensure that any amendments to an ARP align with the MDP and other planning instruments which support, supplement, or expand on the MDP. The policies and guidelines of an ARP should also provide “**specific direction**”.

A Key direction of the MDP is to create “Complete Streets”

MDP 2.5.3(a) “Ensure that land use strategies complement the Complete Streets policies contained in Part 3 of the CTP.”

The CTP says “appropriate Complete Streets handbooks and guidelines will provide design information in detail “(3.7).

This detail is found in the Interim Complete Streets Guide 2011

Complete Streets 2011 says;

“The complete streets guide has been created to foster an understanding of the application of the Calgary Transportation Plan and Municipal Development Plan. Its purpose is to supplement the policies contained in the plans and facilitate the implementation of their concepts”.

“While the new Guide is being completed City staff continue to use the 2011 Interim Guide for City-built transportation projects. The development industry is also strongly encouraged to use the 2011 Interim Guide for developer-built roads”.

and;

Complete Streets guide Pg 25. “Residential Streets provide direct access to abutting low and medium density residential properties. **Access is not permitted to commercial properties because they are high traffic generators.**

Residential Streets are low speed, low volume (less than 1,500 vehicles per day), two-lane streets, typically designed to provide on-street parking on both sides,” and;

Pg 99 (Local Street Design Sheets) **“Access is not permitted to commercial properties”**.

This is unequivocal and self explanatory. NO ACCESS TO COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES FROM RESIDENTIAL STREETS.

Anthem provided a plan in the TIA showing planned widening of Erlton Road to accommodate a left turn bay into the southern parking garage. This conflicts with one of the principles of right of way variance in Complete Streets 2011 (pg. 3)

1.3 Principles of right of way Variance

“In 2010, Council approved the following Principles of Road Right-of-Way Variance. The Principles guide decisions regarding the protection and allocation of Road Right of Way which may differ from current standards. All Principles align with CTP policies and Transportation Goals.

“8. Street design should promote slower automobile speeds, not increased automobile capacity on all streets (except Skeletal Roads) in TOD areas”.....

The proposed change to allow unrestricted commercial patron vehicle access from a residential street to a commercial property with a high traffic generating use (40,000sq ft grocery store plus 35,000sq ft retail), with widening of a residential street to allow for increased automobile capacity (commercial patron traffic) does not align with the Interim Complete Streets Guide 2011 nor the CTP, nor the MDP which is supported by these documents.

CTP.

Key directions of the MDP and CTP is to create complete streets.

The CTP says that residential roads are intended to accommodate relatively low traffic volumes (CTP 3.32). “Residential (local) roads are roads with traffic volumes of 1500 vpd or less”.

The Anthem TIA states that 1372 vpd currently use erlton Road, placing it within the local road category.

The Anthem TIA states that 5500 will use Erlton road when the development is complete, including an estimated 2300 commercial vehicle patrons.

This is Collector Road volumes (>5000 vpd) similar to the current volumes on 25th Ave (6000 vpd).

Commercial Patron vehicle access to the development from and to Erlton road is not what the CTP intends for a local (residential) street.

TOD Guidelines

Clause 8.2 of the TOD guidelines clarifies and confirms that the development parking areas should be accessed from Macleod Trail;

“Major parking areas should be accessed from collector and arterial roads around the station areas, WITHOUT IMPACTING EXISTING COMMUNITIES”.

The developer wishes full and unrestricted (delivery/service vehicles excepted) commercial patron access to two major parking garages containing 800 car parks, from a residential road (Erlton Road).

The current ARP specifically requires that principal(primary) access shall be from Macleod Trail as follows;

“to minimize the impact of the retail traffic on the residential area, private vehicle access to retail and office development shall be principally from Macleod Trail”.

It is clear that, contrary to the Administration report claims, the proposal to allow or enable an unrestricted number of commercial patron vehicles to access and egress the development parking garages from/to Erlton Road does not align with Calgary city planning documents, NOR is it “in keeping with the direction provided in the Erlton Area Redevelopment plan for the Erlton station as a transit oriented development site”.

In fact it is in total opposition to the direction the city, along with the community has been moving towards from 2006 to July 2013, removes all commercial vehicle access protections for the community currently in place in the ARP, is contrary to the spirit and intent of the existing ARP to minimise commercial and non local traffic within Erlton, and opposes the wishes of the neighborhood of Erlton for “infilling that is sensitive, compatible and complementary to the existing physical patterns and character of neighborhoods” (MDP2.2.5), and....”more significant portion of future growth being directed to the Developed Areas of the city requires a heightened focus on higher quality standards of urban design and construction that ensures that development builds upon and adds value to the existing character of communities”.

We request an acceptable traffic plan be formulated before any DC/ARP changes are made incorporating these “higher quality standards” in a way that “adds value to the existing character “ of Erlton and protects this character. This traffic plan to be included in any new DC bylaw document.

The CTP says; Planning studies for Urban Boulevards and neighborhoods “Neighborhood Boulevards should seek to mitigate operational impacts on adjacent communities by including streets and connections at least one-and-a-half blocks to either side of the Boulevard.”(CTP 3-36).

Erlton road is one block from the Urban Boulevard. Contrary to mitigating operational effects on the adjacent community, the change to vehicle access provisions in the ARP seeks to exacerbate these effects by allowing unrestricted commercial patron vehicle access from/to Erlton Road.

To further complicate the problems, **grocery peak access and egress times are 4-5pm weekdays (Time Use Institute) and coincide with peak traffic volume times**, so the highest traffic densities from both Erlton Road and 25th Ave will converge at once. The perfect storm.

The TIA talks of strategies for the 10 days of Stampede, but do not say what these might be. The development will be a focal point for stampede patrons and pedestrians. If Erlton road becomes the primary access/egress point for the development there will be no logistical way of keeping huge numbers of commercial patron stampede traffic out of Erlton streets.

Unfortunately the minor changes planned to 25th Ave (new signals at Erlton road, road widening east of Erlton Road, lane re striping, adjustments to signal timing) will do little to alleviate the congestion that will occur in 2019 when the development is complete, in fact the signals will exacerbate the problems.

Anthem wish to widen Erlton Road to accommodate a left turn bay, remove around 45 car parks and install traffic calming measures.

These upgrading of transportation facilities however contravene the current Erlton ARP which says;

“The key objective of the transportation strategy for Erlton is “To minimize through traffic in the Erlton area and **to protect the community from potential impacts related to the upgrading of transportation facilities**” and;

“A key principle of this Plan is that **25th Avenue, west of Macleod Trail, should remain essentially “as is” so as to control the extent of through traffic at this location.**”

It is obvious that the proposed upgrading works on 25 ave and installation of signals will not result in 25th ave remaining essentially “as is” and through traffic will multiply with an additional 4000 or more vehicles solely from the development using 25th ave and Erlton Road. The changes to transportation facilities are designed to accommodate the significantly higher traffic volumes expected in Erlton Road in total contradiction to the Erlton ARP.

Transit oriented development guidelines.

The guidelines say;

“Where Area Structure Plans (ASP) and Area Redevelopment Plans (ARP) are in place, this

document will supplement the evaluation and monitoring of these existing statutory policies.”

“Where amendments to an ARP or ASP are proposed, TOD Policy Guidelines should help to

define new land use objectives for that plan and provide guidance to evaluate the merits of the

amendment from a Transit Oriented Development perspective.”

Policy Objective 8.0 is “Manage Parking Bus and Vehicular Traffic”.

Policy 8.2 says;

“Parking areas should be designed appropriately in order to maintain the pedestrian comfort in the TOD station area. **Major parking areas should be accessed from collector and arterial roads around the station areas, without impacting existing communities** or the pedestrian environment closest to the station.”

Access to the 800 capacity development car parks from a residential street by commercial patrons contravenes TOD policy guidelines.

The addition of several thousand commercial vehicles into a quiet residential street will significantly impact the existing community and therefore also contravenes TOD policy.

The MDP says;

“Future reviews of, and amendments to, (those) ARPs and ASPs will be required to align with the policies of the MDP.”

The proposed change to allow commercial patrons to enter the parking garages from Erlton Road does not align with the MDP, CTP, Interim Complete streets guide 2011 or TOD guidelines.

THE CURRENT ARP CLAUSE REGARDING VEHICLE ACCESS TO RETAIL AND OFFICE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED AS PROPOSED.

The Administration report says that adjustments to the existing Erlton ARP are as follows;

“Allowing for access and egress from/to Erlton road SW for commercial passenger vehicles based on a Transportation Impact Assessment completed for the Erlton Station Area(requested by the applicant) “(Pg 8)

“removal of restrictions limiting orientation of commercial uses towards Macleod Trail S (Administration) (Pg 7).

The TIA presented by Anthem is based upon;

Retail of 69,600 sq. ft and office 3659 sq. ft (pg. 3). However the Anthem website says they will have “approximately 75,000 sf of grocery anchored commercial space.”(Anthem website) This is a 10% increase in commercial space which is a traffic generating use. The 3650 sq. ft of office space proposed in the TIA will be removed (not commercially viable). Offices are a strong transit oriented use with only 11 trips per day per 1000 sq. ft (ITE manual). Commercial use is traffic generating (40 – 150 trips per 1000 sq.ft per day) which equates to more traffic than the TIA has estimated.

Right in right out onto Macleod Trail. Sobeys have said they are concerned about “the potential for traffic congestion as a result of forcing all vehicles to exit the parkade to the service road to the east/Macleod trail” and this “would not reinforce a positive retail experience for (our) customers” (see Sobeys letter attachment 2).

Several visits to the intersection of 24th ave and Macleod trail at peak hours reveals why they are concerned. Traffic is backed up past the right out exit point to the development for most of the peak grocery store times (4pm to 6pm). Both commercial and residential traffic simply cannot get out during these times. In fact traffic sometimes backs up to the Talisman driveways thus blocking the right turn into the development. The change to the DC/ARP transfers this traffic problem to Erlton Road, Erlton streets, the Erlton/25th intersection, and to the Erlton neighborhood, wholly to the detriment of the residents of Erlton and in contravention of the MDP and current ARP. The TIA says “Vehicular access is proposed from Macleod Trail via a north-south service (frontage) road and also from Erlton Road. All driveways will serve commercial and non-commercial (residential) traffic”.

However Sobeys requires full in and out vehicle access from Erlton road and they do not want customers exiting onto Macleod Trail (Sobeys letter attachment 2).

This transfer of right out traffic from Macleod trail to Erlton Road has not been accounted for in the 2013 TIA.

C train barrier down times (3 car trains). These were measured for 28 barrier down times (May 18th between 4.30pm to 5.45pm). 12 of these (42%) were two car trains entering at once. Delays ranged from 35 to 45 seconds for one C train crossing and between 40 and 90 seconds when 2 C trains coincide. The Anthem TIA (pg. 6) has allowed only a 30 second barrier down time (pg. 6), significantly underestimating the delay by trains. These delays will further increase with 4 car trains due for service in 2015.

The TIA also says that proposed new signal timings to accommodate existing traffic “penalizes east-west movements on 25th Avenue”(TIA pg. 27), which means even longer delays in future on 25th Ave.

Also the TIA (pg. 6) says; “SimTraffic is unable to simulate precisely the LRT impact due to a signal pre-emption, therefore several assumptions have been applied based on the collected data, and information available from appropriate agencies”. One of these “assumptions” is the incorrect C train 30 second barrier down time.

Commercial traffic volumes.

The TIA states that only 2300 commercial patron vehicles will use Erlton road.

The TIA also uses Institute of Traffic Engineers(ITE) methodology for the calculation of pedestrian demands.

The CTP also quotes data from the ITE trip generation manual (CTP 3-24).

ITE trip generation rates differ depending on use. Office is 11 trips per 1000 sq. ft. A bank is 156 trips per 1000 sq. ft. A coffee shop 407 trips. Quality restaurant 90 trips. Dental 36 trips per 1000 sq. ft.

Using ITE trip generation figures for calculation of traffic generated by this development;

Grocery store (40,900 sq. ft) ITE rate 102 trips generated per 1000 sq. ft = 4181 trips

And using a low rate for the additional 35,000 sq. ft of retail of 43 trips(ITE shopping centre rate) per 1000 sq. ft = 1505

The modest total is 5686 commercial patron trips generated by the development.

The TIA has “assumed” 15 % of trips are internal trips. Applying this “assumed” figure, a total of 4800 trips per day would occur to this development from Commercial patrons alone. If Erlton Road becomes the principal access this volume, more than twice the TIA traffic estimate will be permitted to access and/or egress via Erlton road and into the neighborhood of Erlton.

Adding residential traffic of 3200 vpd(TIA), it is possible that over 8000 trips per day will be permitted on Erlton Road if the ARP is changed as proposed.

The community are therefore naturally concerned that;

Primary commercial patron vehicle access and excessive non local traffic will be permitted on Erlton Road.

Traffic will cut through Erlton neighborhood streets from the two parking garages on Erlton road to avoid the new traffic signals at Erlton road and 25 ave and the existing signals at Macleod trail and 25th ave (**see Attachment 3**)

Westbound traffic will cut through 24 ave from the proposed new slip road off Macleod trail to access 25th ave via 24th ave and Erlton street thus avoiding two sets of traffic signals.

Traffic will cut through Erlton north, cross 25 ave and cut through Erlton south to access Macleod trail via 27th ave to avoid the long delays at traffic signals. This is already occurring.

The significantly increased volume of traffic in Erlton road (50kph) will act as a barrier discouraging cyclists and pedestrians from using Erlton road and compromise safety.

The nature, extent and effect of intended traffic calming measures is not being made known to the community, nor how these measures may affect the residents currently unimpeded movement within local streets in Erlton.

Commercial construction traffic, contractors vehicles, materials delivery vehicles, vehicles delivering machinery, consultants vehicles, city inspectors, Utility vehicles etc will use Erlton road during the 5 years of construction of the development, with an associated significant increase in noise pollution, emissions, dust pollution, and obstruction to Erlton road.

Traffic Queues on 25th.

The TIA says, based on optimised signal timings that the peak hour queuing analysis shows the following:

“Eastbound queues do not spill back into the 25th Avenue/ Erlton Rd intersection”.

and;

For the eastbound movements, “a maximum queue length of 50m extends beyond the driveway to the Humpty’s Family Restaurant located west of Macleod Trail”.

The intersection of Macleod and 25th allows a total of around 9-11 vehicles per lane to queue in two lanes for through and right turn traffic. The intersection was observed on several fine days at PM peak times in May 2014 in fine conditions. It was observed that on 25th Ave;

At the times measured (4.30pm – 5.30pm) eastbound traffic approaching Macleod trail backs up to and/or past Erlton road 74% of the time. 36% of that time Erlton Road was completely blocked during the peak PM period, and back up was sometimes beyond the 25th ave bridge, also blocking the erlton street intersection.

The green signal time for eastbound traffic on 25th at Macleod is 11-12 seconds. In peak periods all traffic is not able to pass through the first green phase. The waiting time for the next green phase was timed at 4 minutes 34. Because all traffic cannot make the green, vehicles back up into the lanes that left turning traffic would use to exit Erlton road on a green light (when signals are installed). The green time is also severely affected by the C Train barrier down times.

Two vehicles frustrated by the delays avoided the red at Macleod by cutting through Humptys car park.

2 vehicles made u turns near the Macleod trail intersection and headed west.

Traffic heading west on 25th past Erlton road slows to almost a stop as they merge from two lanes to one on 25th ave and stop to allow traffic out of Erlton Street. Buses and trucks also use 25th ave (7739, 1823).

Pedestrian crossing signals for north/south pedestrians crossing 25th cause further delays when crossings are activated.

The intersection of Erlton Road with 25th is only 85m from Macleod Trail. Current design requirements for streets adjoining arterial roads are that intersections must be located at least 120m from an arterial road. With only 85m between Macleod and Erlton, backup and congestion on 25th in this area is unavoidable as per the current situation.

The TIA says that proposed new signal timings to accommodate existing traffic “penalizes east-west movements on 25th Avenue”(TIA pg. 27), which means even longer delays in future on 25th Ave.

If it is not bad enough now, the 2019 scenario is that Erlton road be turned into another 25th ave, a primary collector road with at least 5500 vpd competing with the already 6000+ vpd currently using 25 ave, at a new signalised intersection only 85m from one of Calgarys highest delay, signalised intersections that will in future penalise east west movements with longer red signal times.

Macleod Trail

The TIA says;

“For the southbound movements, maximum queue length of 180m extends beyond the driveway to the purple Nenshi Campaign building located south of 24th Avenue.”

The purple Nenshi building is only 15m south of 24th ave. Macleod Trail is a 60kph road carrying 50,000 vpd. The TIA does not say that during peak traffic times the intersection of 24th ave and Macleod trail is continuously blocked on Macleod trail by queuing vehicles.

The proposed changes to signal timing will do little to alleviate this traffic issue, which will significantly increase when the development is completed, from patrons visiting the grocery store and retail uses during peak times.

Conclusions;

The reason for recommendation that the traffic provisions of the ARP be changed are;

1. The adjustments are minor and do not divert substantially from the goals of the Erlton ARP.

It is not correct that all of the adjustments are minor. The change to access provisions in the ARP are of paramount importance to the community and therefore not minor. The report minimises community concerns and ignores the numerous references in the existing ARP regarding minimisation of traffic within Erlton. Contrary to the assertions of the report, it is clear that the adjustment to commercial traffic provisions substantially divert from the goals of the Erlton ARP.

2. The adjustments will allow for the potential of the development to come to fruition.

This subjective statement ignores the fact that all developments are subject to restraints and the potential for fruition depends on how these restraints are successfully managed to benefit all.

The statement cannot be used as justification to change the vehicle access provisions in the current ARP.

3. The proposal is in keeping with the Erlton ARP for the Erlton station as a TOD site.

Yes, for the Erlton Station as a TOD site, but the proposal is NOT in keeping with the ARP concerning vehicle access to transit oriented development. TOD guidelines policy 8.2 says Major parking areas should be accessed from collector and arterial roads around the station areas, without impacting existing communities.

4. The proposal is in keeping with the MDP for Macleod Trail as an urban corridor.

The proposal seeks the “removal of restrictions limiting orientation of commercial uses towards Macleod Trail S.” (pg. 7)

The New community Planning Guidebook (Volume 2 of MDP) says; □“Each UC should provide a well-designed public realm lined by street oriented buildings with **primary entrances facing the Urban Boulevard.**”

The proposal is not in keeping with this MDP statement.

Also, as has been demonstrated the proposal to change the access provisions of the ARP to allow commercial patrons and non local development traffic access from Erlton road is not in keeping with, nor does it align with the MDP, CTP, Interim Complete Streets 2011 or TOD guidelines.

The administration report also bases its recommendations for access/egress for commercial patrons from Erlton Road on the Anthem TIA (pg. 8)

However the TIA is not an entirely reliable reference document.

Onsite observation has shown the TIA has significantly underestimated the queuing that is occurring at 25th and Macleod Trail and north of Macleod Trail.

The TIA C train barrier down times are wildly incorrect and synchro Sim traffic was unable to simulate accurately the LRT impact. This impact significantly affects east and westbound traffic on 25th and traffic exiting Erlton road travelling east.

Modest ITE trip generation rates applied demonstrate that the TIA estimates of commercial patron traffic on Erlton road have been considerably underestimated.

Right turn traffic onto Macleod is planned to exit onto Erlton Road as requested by Sobeys.

The TIA says repeatedly that based on its assessment signals are not warranted at the intersection of Erlton Road and 25th ave. The City has directed that there WILL be traffic signals at this location. This is a contradiction. Evidence from onsite observations suggests the city is expecting far more traffic than the TIA is suggesting and that signals are warranted at this location.

Only one traffic count by Anthem was undertaken on Sept 11 2012 for Erlton road/25th, 24th and 22nd Ave (TIA). An older City count taken on Sept 2 2010 for the Macleod Trail/25th ave intersection was also used. That is the extent of the onsite traffic count data contributing to the TIA.

The TIA also bases conclusions on 2006 TIA data (TIA pg. 33).

There are simply too many anomalies in the TIA to give any weight to this document.

There are no justifiable reasons given in the Administration Report to change the existing vehicle access provisions in the ARP. Therefore these provisions should remain as is.

Furthermore the Administration Report minimises the traffic issues as “minor”, glosses over the history surrounding these traffic issues, ignores the substantial citizen comment highlighting traffic concerns, takes ECA comments out of context making them appear fully supportive when they are not, and claims there are NO mobility issues when in fact there are serious mobility issues.

The report removes wording in the DC bylaw access clause presented to the community for comment and substitutes additional wording in the Administration report after the fact. The intent may be innocuous but the question is, where else have substitutions been made? This casts doubt on the integrity of the report.

The report also provides no factual justification for the many assertions it makes that supposedly back-up the reasons for the recommendations.

The report should be scrapped, reviewed and redrafted in an impartial, fair, factual and professional presentation enabling Council members to apply the democratic process in a fair, impartial and informed manner.

As a former senior development engineer/Area Engineer for Councils in NZ and Australia for the past 20 years, and having written engineering reports to Council, I am frankly surprised that this report has been permitted to go further than the doors of the City planning and policy department.

Finishing with the words of our Alderman, Gian-Carlo Carra's January 31, 2011 at the Mission Road World Cafe, who said “citizens must have an intimate role in shaping the future of the communities they live in.”

And Mayor Nenshi's welcoming remarks regarding a Charette in June of 2011, “This is a really important process not just for the future of this community but the entire city....this charette process...you've got a serious responsibility.. think hard about what a community can mean, what kind of a community you want to live in, and work in, and build because that's what a community is...it's about the people who live there and the common dream that they have.”

To date the community have spoken but have had no real say. The sudden changes proposed to the ARP and DC from the July 3 2013 drafts and all previous understanding with the city back to 2006 is evidence enough of that. ECA suggestions to address traffic concerns have been ignored. Recent emails to the city asking specifically how the traffic will be managed in Erlton did not even receive the courtesy of a reply.

We know what kind of community we want, and it does not include thousands of commercial and non-local vehicles free to roam our quiet residential streets and congesting our intersections.

We want what our politicians say we should have; acknowledgement of what our community means to us, the hearing of the wishes of the people who live in the neighborhood, the maintenance and improvement of the quality of life of residents, and the safety and accessibility of our car, cycle and pedestrian travel maintained.

We simply want an “intimate role” in shaping our future.

Graham Hall / Liane White, Erlton property owners

20200

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.

CORPORATE PLANNING APPLICATIONS GROUP RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Recommend that Council **ADOPT**, by bylaw, the proposed redesignation of 2.19 hectares \pm (5.40 acres \pm) 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.

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

POLICY AMENDMENT & LAND USE AMENDMENT
ERLTON - WARD 9
NORTHWEST CORNER OF 25 AVENUE SW AND MACLEOD
TRAIL S

MAP 10C

APPENDIX V

Letter from Sobeys



January 21, 2014

Anthem Properties Ltd
#300 – 550 Burrard Street
Vancouver, B. C.
V6C 2B5

Attention: Ms. Alexa Baughen, Vice President

Dear Alexa:

Re: Erlton Project, Calgary Alberta

As discussed, we confirm that Sobeys has been working with Anthem Properties on the Erlton redevelopment project since 2012.

We understand there has been considerable community support for the overall development. We also understand from Anthem that more recently, there have been some specific concerns around traffic and access to the site, specifically related to commercial customer access to and from Erlton Road.

I would like to confirm on behalf of Sobeys that based on our experience in other store locations, we would require full movement access to the parkade from Erlton Road for a grocery store to be successful. If the parkade access at Erlton Road was restricted to allow entry only, the convenience and accessibility to our store would be comprised to a level that we would not accept. I would also like to point out that this limited access would be a concern for our company with any size of store.

Additional concerns over this limited access include the potential for traffic congestion as a result of forcing all vehicles to exit the parkade to the service road on the east/MacLeod Trail side of the site and the resulting traffic congestion in this area, which would not reinforce a positive retail experience for our customers. Also, directing this additional traffic onto 24th Avenue/High Street would negatively impact the pedestrian-orientation of this unique area, which is the front door of our store, and a key component of the overall development. In our experience, providing all turn access from the parkade onto Erlton Road would reduce congestion at grade, as the vehicles would circulate below grade, within the parkade.

We have worked with Anthem Properties on other stores in Alberta and BC and have confidence in their ability as a developer of commercial and mixed-use projects. We understand that Anthem has conducted extensive community engagement and feel that the support for the development should outweigh the concerns over access.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Best regards,

SOBEYS CAPITAL INC.


Glen Carlberg
Director, Real Estate

Exhibit 4-1: Proposed Vehicle Access Plan

