

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	January 29, 2020	
Time	2:00	
Panel Members	Present Chris Hardwicke (Co-Chair) Gary Mundy Beverly Sandalack Jack Vanstone Michael Sydenham	Distribution Chad Russill (Chair) Terry Klassen Ben Bailey Colin Friesen Glen Pardoe Ryan Agrey
Advisor	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number	PE2019-01297	
Municipal address	16 Moncton Rd, 920, 954 16 Av NE	
Community	Winston Heights	
Project description	Commercial Development	
Review	first	
File Manager	Matt Rockley	
City Wide Urban Design	Lothar Wiwjorra	
Applicant	City of Calgary - REDS	

Summary

The Panel appreciates the considerable collective effort invested in bringing the project to this point, and the thoroughness and quality of the presentation submission. The Winston Heights Village site is an important development site for the City of Calgary given its gateway location and its role as a connection to the open space network in the valley. Given the size and location of the site along 16th Avenue NE the panel felt that the project will also set the stage for the future urbanization of 16th Avenue. The panel looks forward to reviewing the project again, as it develops. The panel felt that further work is needed in the following areas:

- The urban structure, road pattern and public spaces east of the Central park are not legible and have weak connections between urban form and public space.
- Resolution is needed in the location and type of retail locations with regard to the High Street and 16th Avenue.
- The 16th Avenue edge, High Street open space and the large surface parking lot require more thoughtful integration to provide a quality pedestrian experience.
- The scheme falls short in creating a significant architectural gateway for the site and providing a legible public realm.

Urban Design Element	
Creativity <i>Encourage innovation; model best practices</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall project approach as it relates to original ideas or innovation 	
UDRP Commentary	Acknowledging the creativity evident in the high street precinct and the central community park, the panel would like to see a more creative approach to the eastern part of the village with regard to legibility and public access.
Applicant Response	
Context <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass and spacing of buildings, placement on site, response to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i>	
<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 proposal is respectful to the adjacent neighbourhoods but does not adequately address its gateway location with regard to architectural massing. The proponent should provide a variety of key views to the site from the valley to demonstrate the gateway features of the design.
Applicant Response	
Human Scale <i>Defines street edges, ensures height and mass respect context; pay attention to scale</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Massing contribution to public realm at grade 	
UDRP Commentary	Although the development is human scaled the eastern end of the design does not define consistent street edges along all of the public realm.
Applicant Response	
Integration <i>The conjunction of land-use, built form, landscaping and public realm design</i>	
<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	The large surface parking lot is unresolved and lacks integration with the development. The central community park is well defined at its edges but the scale of the buildings in relation to the size of the park is low. Parking entrances are not shown on the plans. The central median in the High Street (shown as public realm) would better serve as a public space if shifted to the northern (sunny) sidewalk. The slip lane from 16 th Avenue is in conflict with a continuous pedestrian experience.
Applicant Response	
Connectivity <i>Achieve visual and functional connections between buildings and places; ensure connection to existing and future networks.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian first design, walkability, pathways through site • Connections to LRT stations, regional pathways and cycle paths • Pedestrian pathway materials extend across driveways and lanes 	
UDRP Commentary	The east end of the plan is well connected but connections in the west end are not clearly defined. Connections to the trail network are not fully developed. Escarpment edge park does not feel public and could be improved by creating legible street and park connections across the site.
Applicant Response	
Animation <i>Incorporate active uses; pay attention to details; add colour, wit and fun</i>	
<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	The package did not provide enough information to inform comments. Future submissions should include street sections and elevations.
Applicant Response	
Accessibility <i>Ensure clear and simple access for all types of users</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier free design • Entry definition, legibility, and natural wayfinding 	
UDRP Commentary	Insufficient information provided.
Applicant Response	
Diversity <i>Promote designs accommodating a broad range of users and uses</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail street variety, at-grade areas, transparency into spaces 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corner treatments and project porosity 	
UDRP Commentary	The proposal, as shown, provides a range of housing types and retail at grade. More information would be required to comment further.
Applicant Response	
Flexibility <i>Develop planning and building concepts which allow adaptation to future uses, new technologies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project approach relating to market and/or context changes 	
UDRP Commentary	The proposal provides a range of housing types and retail.
Applicant Response	
Safety <i>Achieve a sense of comfort and create places that provide security at all times</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and security • Night time design 	
UDRP Commentary	Insufficient information provided.
Applicant Response	
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	As stated previously, the panel felt that the project could be improved by providing a legible street network, views to the public realm, stronger connections to the trail network and stronger gateway treatment for the architectural forms.
Applicant Response	
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	Insufficient information provided regarding sustainable aspirations. The panel felt that the density shown could be much higher given its location on a major transit line.
Applicant Response	
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	Insufficient information provided.
Applicant Response	