

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

To: Insia Hassonjee (Insia.Hassonjee@calgary.ca) (587-572-7462)
File Manager, City of Calgary

From: Bill Fischer, Planning Committee Chair (erlton@shaw.ca) (403-233-0644)
Erlton Community Association

Date: August 6th, 2021

DP2021-1384
55 & 57 - 27 Ave SW (6-plex - revised plans)

Our Planning Committee commits to the Planning System core values of innovation, collaboration, transparency, accountability, trust and responsibility.

In response to your community context questionnaire:

1. *What are the strengths and challenges of the proposed development?*

- Our Planning Committee reviewed the revised plans for this proposed discretionary development, including the submitted feedback from the affected neighbours.
- With the exception of waste and recycling, none of the many issues we identified in our April first, 2021 comment have been addressed.
- The non-compliance with multiple statutory policies and rules of the Land Use Bylaw remains, including those identified by the Development Authority's review of the original plan. The developer has ignored the direction to provide amendments. This proposal continues to be out of context and out of scale with the surrounding single family homes. No property on either block face of 27th Avenue or nearby portions of Erlton Street displays this level of massing and lot penetration and negatively impacts adjacent properties to this extent.
- The non-compliant north and west contextual setbacks negatively impact the public realm. The non-compliant east setback negatively impacts the east homeowner. Over-all, portions of the building are present in all proscribed setback areas.
- The building is over-height and has a significant adverse impact on the east homeowner with regard to the fact that land slopes down to the east. As such, the building will appear/feel 4 stories tall when viewed from their backyard. The over-massing present at the top of the building accentuates the out-of-context nature of the design.
- The design creates significant adverse impacts to east neighbours. The building length and height throughout the full depth of the lot shadows the private amenity spaces of homes to the east. The east elevation entrance landings and doors facing the neighbours instead of the avenue, plus the

terraces/balconies and windows create major privacy breaches due to overlooking of multiple homes to the east. Similar overlooking occurs from the balconies on the south elevation towards the private rear yards of the homes across the lane.

2. *Are there changes that could be made to the proposed development to make it more compatible or beneficial to the area?*

Redesign it to removed the non-compliant elements and fit it within the generous building envelope provided by the statutory policies and rules of the land use bylaw,

3. *Provide comments on:*

a. *The use:* N/C

b. *The site design:*

The proposed site design significantly alters the established lot pattern on 27 Avenue.

c. *The building design:*

See the items referenced in point #1.

4. *Has the applicant discussed the development permit application with the Community Association? If yes, what information was provided?*

The developer contacted us twice via email, but refused to provide a copy of the revised plans to enable us to review them in advance of a meeting, and ensure an informed and productive discussion. Ultimately, we asked Councillor Farkas to intervene. The Development Authority then provided a copy of the plans to enable this second review.

5. *Please provide any additional comments or concerns regarding the proposed development.*

The "3 Ps" of redeveloping established streetscape are "Proportion, Parking, and Privacy", none of which were addressed by this development. It is too much building, on too little land. It violates statutory policies and many major sections of the Land Use Bylaw. It exhibits excessive height, mass, and width; overlooks and shadows adjacent development; it is incompatible with the streetscape, scale, and form of surrounding development; and provides no visitor parking. It does not respect the Municipal Development Plan, our ARP, nor the neighbouring homes and properties.

LUB Section 35 states: When making a decision on a *development permit* for a *discretionary use* the *Development Authority* must take into account:

(d) the compatibility and impact of the proposed *development* with respect to *adjacent development* and the neighbourhood;

This discretionary proposal does not meet nor survive that test.

Please provide the Detailed Team Review when it is available.

Please provide a Notice of Decision, and if approved, a set of the approved plans, a complete list of relaxations, and the justification for them. We need this in order to discuss and determine their impact on our community and the neighbouring homes.

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