

# ***Erlton Community Association***

To: Chris Wolfe (Chris.Wolfe@calgary.ca)  
File Manager  
City of Calgary

From: Andrew Maxwell (erltonpresident@gmail.com)  
President  
Erlton Community Association

Date: December 2, 2020

RE: Development Permit Number DP2020-5250 – Multi-Residential Development (4-plex) located at 69 - 31 Ave SW (the “**Proposed Development**”)

---

The Erlton Community Association Planning Committee (“**ECA PC**” or “**Committee**”) has reviewed the amended plans for the Proposed Development having regard to concerns previously raised by the ECA PC and the City of Calgary Corporate Planning Applications Group Detailed Team Review report dated September 24, 2020 (the “**DTR1**”).

The ECA PC appreciates that many of the issues raised in the DTR1 have been addressed by the developer. However, the ECA PC notes that a number of the issues previously raised by the Committee and/or in DTR1 have not been addressed.

As further described below, the ECA PC therefore requests that the development plans be amended and/or that the developer provide a clear rationale/explanation where amendments are not made.

## **Summary of Position:**

The ECA PC notes that the Proposed Development will benefit the community by replacing a derelict and abandoned building thereby revitalizing the property. The north and west facades of the development are aligned with current design trends.

The ECA PC also notes that there are ways in which the Proposed Development could be improved, particularly with respect to maximizing privacy for the neighbour to the east (e.g. landscaping, fence/wall heights, etc.). A number of community members have also expressed concerns with the relaxation of the west setback and positioning of driveways on Erlton Street as opposed to the laneway.

The ECA PC respectfully requests that the developer amend the development plans to address the issues raised by DTR1, many of which are also issues of concern for the community.

## **Response to City Template:**

### **1. What are the strengths and challenges of the Proposed Development?**

The Proposed Development proposes to replace a derelict/abandoned building with new construction and increased density. Challenges include the fact that the developer has proposed relaxations of some rules expressed within the Land Use Bylaw.

Please see attached table for further information regarding strengths and challenges of the Proposed Development. Some of the relaxations are not supported by a number of members of the community.

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

Some community members would prefer that the developer reduce the building penetration through the depth of the lot. This could enable garages to be located in the lane and the relocation of driveways from the street to the lane, which community members have expressed is preferable. Some community members would also like to see an increase in the setback from Erlton Street to comply with the Land Use Bylaw standard.

3. Provide comments on:
  - a. The use: No comment.
  - b. The site design: A number of community members are concerned that the proposed site design significantly alters the established lot pattern on 31st Avenue.
  - c. The building design: See #2 above for response.
  
4. Has the applicant discussed the development permit application with the Community Association? If yes, what information was provided?

The applicant provided a presentation to the community association and responded to member questions during a community association meeting. The developer has addressed questions and provided additional information to the ECA PC as well.

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

See table below.

**Comments:**

The ECA PC notes that the amended development plans address some, but not all, of the issues previously identified by the community and/or identified in DTR1.

The following table seeks to summarize the comments and concerns expressed by members of the community and the Committee.

Subject	Comment in DTR1	Status in Current Dev. Plan	Community Comment Summary
Visitor Parking	1 visitor parking stall required; 0 indicated on initial plans.	Visitor parking added in Unit 4 garage.	Each unit has an attached garage with visitor parking available therein which may reduce the degree of on-street parking.  However, some community members have expressed concern that there are no independent/stand-alone visitor parking stall available.
Driveways on Erlton Street	No direct vehicular access is permitted to or from Erlton Street SW. Indicate access to the proposed development from the adjacent lane.  Insufficient information about the power pole	No change.	<b>View A:</b> Driveways onto busy Erlton Street raises safety concerns (e.g. additional vehicular traffic; pedestrian and cyclist safety, proximity to S-turn on Erlton Street reduces sightlines).  Laneway access is available and should be used. There is precedent for self-supporting power pole to facilitate laneway access.  Additional sidewalk interruptions limit universal access.

Subject	Comment in DTR1	Status in Current Dev. Plan	Community Comment Summary
	relocation from ENMAX.		<p><b>View B:</b> While the Erlton Street driveways do not comply with the Land Use Bylaw, there are mitigating considerations in support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- two of three driveways are grouped together</li> <li>- driveways have reasonable sightlines to traffic</li> <li>- driveways on a busy street such as Erlton may help to slow traffic</li> </ul>
Development height	N/A	N/A	<p>While the height is less than maximum allowed, some community members consider height to be inconsistent with streetscape and request reduction.</p> <p>The Proposed Development's height steps down from west to east. However, the impact of shadowing on the east neighbor is unknown.</p>
Nature of development	N/A	N/A	<p><b>View A:</b> A number of community members see the Proposed Development is inconsistent with Municipal Development Plan and Erlton Area Redevelopment Plan as it is out of context with surrounding development in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Request for duplex, tri-plex or single-family home rather than proposed 4-plex.</p> <p><b>View B:</b> While development in the neighbourhood has primarily been single-family and duplex in recent years, a number of community members see the proposed multi-family development as consistent with planning documents issued by the Province, the City and the Calgary Metropolitan Board which encourage densification in developed areas.</p>
General appearance of lot / need for redevelopment	N/A	N/A	<p>Overall desire for abandoned house/ dilapidated lot to be redeveloped.</p> <p>Some members of the community have expressed support for the design and appearance of the development.</p>
Landscaping	Landscaped area / number of trees to be increased.	Improvements have been made (e.g. addition of trees for screening)	Supportive of landscaping, especially elements that contribute to screening.
Rooftop patios / second floor windows	N/A	Two rooftop patios instead of one.	<p>General concerns expressed re: privacy for east neighbour.</p> <p>Neither rooftop patio should allow eastward viewing.</p> <p>Second floor windows that overlook backyard to the east should be obscured glass to improve privacy for neighbour.</p>
East wall / fence	Plans do not indicate the height of the wall / fence.	Not addressed.	The east fence/wall should be high enough so that the privacy of outdoor amenity space for the neighbour is maintained.

**Prior Erlton Community Association Submission:**

The ECA PC wishes to ensure that the City of Calgary retains a record of the community comment submitted by the ECA PC on behalf of Erlton Community Association members on September 14, 2020 which stated as follows:

The following motion was made at our September 8th community meeting, and passed with a vast majority:

Moved that the Erlton Community Association send a letter to the file manager stating that we do not support this development based on the fact that it is proposed to be built too close to the property line on Erlton Street, has driveways on Erlton Street, and fails to provide the required visitor parking stall, and thus fails to comply with Sections 583(3), 565(1)(a), and 558(3)(c)(ii) of the Land Use Bylaw.

Furthermore, the design occupies too much of the depth of the lot and thereby shadows and overlooks the adjacent neighbour, thus negatively impacting the use and enjoyment of their property as expressed by Section 35(d) of the Land Use Bylaw.