

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	January 9, 2019	
Time	1:00	
Panel Members	Present Chad Russill (Co-Chair) Jack Vanstone Ben Bailey Michael Sydenham Eric Toker	Absent Janice Liebe (Chair) Gary Mundy Terry Klassen Chris Hardwicke Glen Pardoe Beverly Sandalack
Advisor	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number	DP2018-5551	
Municipal address	2436 22 St NW	
Community	Banff Trail	
Project description	New: Assisted Living (1 building) including a 4-storey north wing & 3-storey south wing, 45 units (340 square feet in size), underground parkade. Rezoning - LOC2017-0097 - is required to allow for this development	
Review	first	
File Manager	Martin Beck / Kelsey Cohen	
City Wide Urban Design	Angela Kiu	
Applicant	Abanoub Architecture Ltd	

Summary

The Panel finds the proposed density increase and massing in consideration of the context to be generally suitable for this location. In particular, the breaking up of the building into two separate volumes helps create a contextually sensitive development in relation to the residential character of the street. There are a couple areas of concern with the project, however, where some further design assessment could dramatically improve the overall project design. These are outlined below, which support the rated urban design elements to follow:

- 1) Improved at-grade interface along 22nd Street NW is strongly suggested. Currently, the edge is encompassed with two separate stairs accessing below grade areas plus a fenced area enclosing the courtyard. This will result in a sterile condition at-grade along this edge. Applicant to consider design to unite the functional circulation requirements along this location for an improved pedestrian realm. The presentation package included 3D images that did not fully depict this condition, which was evident upon review of the site/landscape plan.
- 2) The vehicular parking area located at the intersection of 24th Ave NE and the lane appears likely to be unsightly and unsafe. This interface exposes a substantial extent of vehicular based functions at the corner, which would highly visible from 24th Ave for westbound traffic/pedestrians. Furthermore, the vehicle area shows conflict with pedestrian movements, articulated by the painted yellow lines through the drive aisle. Redesign should be considered to increase landscape, screening along these edges, and improve pedestrian safety at this location. Strategies may include reorientation and reduction of parking or potentially complete removal of these functions due to perceived difficulties with the current arrangement.
- 3) The Panel questions legitimacy of the proposed green roof. Through the presentation, the applicant suggested this area to be accessible by residents. Due to the technical requirements of green roofs in combination with typical roof penetrations, the Panel suggests further investigation to ensure the proposed design can be achieved. This design is supported as a sustainable principle, however executing the built condition will be a challenge and the resulting impact may affect the desired massing. Considering the Roof Garden is set back from the façade edges, maintaining positive sight lines should be possible.

Applicant Response
2020 June 17

Urban Design Element	
<p>Creativity <i>Encourage innovation; model best practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall project approach as it relates to original ideas or innovation 	
UDRP Commentary	The project presents itself as an interesting and creative application. The courtyard is a critical component to the overall design and some minor adjustments will improve effectiveness of this feature.
Applicant Response	Redesign the courtyard, fenced area, additional glass and doors to the courtyard
<p>Context <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass and spacing of buildings, placement on site, response to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massing relationship to context, distribution on site, and orientation to street edges Shade impact on public realm and adjacent sites 	
UDRP Commentary	The proposed development fits generally well into its context, making positive gestures such as the increased setback of 3m (opposed to 1.2m minimum) on the south property line, and the building division into two separate volumes. Overall streetscape elevations would be useful to further evaluate.
Applicant Response	Revised street scape and landscape
<p>Human Scale <i>Defines street edges, ensures height and mass respect context; pay attention to scale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massing contribution to public realm at grade 	
UDRP Commentary	Human scale meets expectations, relating the massing to the intended use.
Applicant Response	Revised exterior elevations at the west and north facades
<p>Integration <i>The conjunction of land-use, built form, landscaping and public realm design</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking entrances and at-grade parking areas are concealed Weather protection at entrances and solar exposure for outdoor public areas Winter city response 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>The parkade entrance off the lane is adequate, however the surface parking in the NE corner requires further review. This interface exposes a substantial extent of vehicular based functions at the corner, which would highly visible from 24th Ave for westbound traffic/pedestrians. Conflict with pedestrian movements are articulated by the painted yellow lines through the drive aisle. Redesign should be considered to increase landscape, screening along these edges, and improve pedestrian safety. Edge condition along the lane should also be improved.</p> <p>Additional entries and greater glazing are suggested in the interior courtyard. Active edges and greater integration with the rest of the development would improve this design as a viable shared space for residents.</p>
Applicant Response	Revised drawings to the back surface parking, sidewalks, fence and landscape, and more glazing areas to the main floor windows from the north west facades and the inner courtyard.
<p>Connectivity <i>Achieve visual and functional connections between buildings and places; ensure connection to existing and future networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian first design, walkability, pathways through site Connections to LRT stations, regional pathways and cycle paths 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian pathway materials extend across driveways and lanes 	
UDRP Commentary	Improved at-grade interface along 22 nd Street NW is strongly encouraged. This edge is currently showing two separate stairs to below grade areas and the fenced courtyard. Applicant to consider design that unites the functional circulation requirements along this location for an improved pedestrian realm.
Applicant Response	Exterior stairs removed and revised landscape along 22 nd street
<p>Animation <i>Incorporate active uses; pay attention to details; add colour, wit and fun</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building form contributes to an active pedestrian realm • Residential units provided at-grade • Elevations are interesting and enhance the streetscape 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>The building design is suitable and creates a well-balanced approach between the context and scale. Some Panel considerations to positioning the 2nd floor 'Shared Balcony' directly to grade (reducing the footprint) occurred and may be suitable. This gesture would help animate the pedestrian realm but requires user evaluation to fully determine acceptability.</p> <p>The Panel strongly recommends the applicant revise the design to include window glazing that offers full transparency. The proposed reflective 'blue tint' windows work against best practices in urban design, creating a sterile street environment that obscures visibility.</p>
Applicant Response	Exterior elevations revised to accommodate all the above comments
<p>Accessibility <i>Ensure clear and simple access for all types of users</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier free design • Entry definition, legibility, and natural wayfinding 	
UDRP Commentary	The project is generally accessible and meets expectations, though related to the Connectivity comment, a viable solution to unify design strategy and enhance the public realm transition should be reviewed along 22 nd Street. This interface presents some grade challenges and accessibility aspects could be reviewed in conjunction with this area.
Applicant Response	Revised landscape and exterior elevations along 22 nd street
<p>Diversity <i>Promote designs accommodating a broad range of users and uses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail street variety, at-grade areas, transparency into spaces • Corner treatments and project porosity 	
UDRP Commentary	Applicant to review blue glazing selection, as it reduces transparency and project porosity. This aesthetic consideration also separates the proposed development from the residential context.
Applicant Response	Revised plans indicates transparent glazing
<p>Flexibility <i>Develop planning and building concepts which allow adaptation to future uses, new technologies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project approach relating to market and/or context changes 	
UDRP Commentary	n/a
Applicant Response	
<p>Safety <i>Achieve a sense of comfort and create places that provide security at all times</i></p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and security • Night time design 	
UDRP Commentary	The pedestrian walkway through the parking/loading area does not appear to be safe and focus to improving this portion of the site is recommended. Vehicle movements also appear to be awkward and potential for removal of surface parking in this area could be considered. No site lighting information was provided as part of the presentation.
Applicant Response	Revised surface parking , walkways and landscape
Orientation <i>Provide clear and consistent directional clues for urban navigation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance natural views and vistas 	
UDRP Commentary	The Panel discussed main entrance natural wayfinding cues based on building design and find it appropriate for the context. Applicant to review courtyard design to maximize year-round utilization such as outdoor heating and lighting affects as well as increased glazing on perimeter walls from common areas to improve permeability into this feature area. See Integration and Connectivity for 22 nd Street interface and navigation cues.
Applicant Response	Revised plans indicated improve the courtyard and main floor glazing area
Sustainability <i>Be aware of lifecycle costs; incorporate sustainable practices and materials</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site/solar orientation and passive heating/cooling • Material selection and sustainable products 	
UDRP Commentary	Sustainability features are evident in the proposed application and are commendable. Applicant to review technical requirements of green roofs such as roof penetrations; the Panel suggests further investigation to ensure the proposed design can be achieved as envisioned.
Applicant Response	Revised roof plan indicated the above comments
Durability <i>Incorporate long-lasting materials and details that will provide a legacy rather than a liability</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of low maintenance materials and/or sustainable products • Project detailed to avoid maintenance issues 	
UDRP Commentary	Materials meet expectations in terms of durability.
Applicant Response	Yes all materiel as low militance