

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	September 2, 2020	
Time	1:00	
Panel Members	Present Chad Russill (Chair) Terry Klassen Ben Bailey Colin Friesen Jeff Lyness Michael Sydenham	Distribution Chris Hardwicke (Co-Chair) Gary Mundy Beverly Sandalack Ryan Agrey Jack Vanstone Glen Pardoe Noorullah Hussain Zada
Advisor	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number	DP2020-4338	
Municipal address	507 11 Av SW	
Community	Beltline	
Project description	New: Multi-Residential Development, Retail and Consumer Service	
Review	First	
File Manager	Adam Sheahan	
City Wide Urban Design	Sonny Tomic	
Applicant	Gibbs Gage Architects	

*Based on the applicant's response to the Panel's comments, the Chief Urban Designer will determine if further review will include the Panel or be completed internally only by City Wide Urban Design.

Summary

Overall, Phase 2 of the development represents a continuation of the design intentions established in the now constructed Phase 1. As a whole, the development is a positive addition to the Beltline Community by meeting several urban design elements promoted by UDRP.

The Panel endorses the project and is supportive of the architectural design intent. However, the area that prompted the most discussion was the design and resulting impact on connectivity and activation of the internal lane, noted on the applicant's package as 'Art Walk – Pedestrian Realm'. As this project acquired additional density bonusing for this area—deemed Publicly Accessible Private Open Space, further detailed design refinement is recommended by the Panel. The current design of the laneway is viewed as a private access primarily serving the needs of building residents rather than promoting a more holistic view of multi modal circulation and a publicly accessible / navigable interface.

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	The applicant's design concept of two 'sibling towers' is a thoughtful and subtle way of allowing for an interface between the two phases of the development without simple mimicry.
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 Tower masses are located so as not to interfere with each other. The integration of a defined retail / commercial street face along 11 th and 4 th addresses the community's desire for a mixed use and public street interface. The movement of the parkade access to 11 th may pose a concern as it abruptly breaks this edge – careful consideration on the design of the entrance for the parkade is recommended.
Applicant Response	

<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	<p>Acknowledging the level of detail required for a high-rise tower, the incorporation of additional human scaled elements at or near the ground plane will advance the design aspirations presented. In the laneway, moving away from standard bollards to delineate pedestrian and vehicular movements to more universal shared space principles would help achieve a better human scale experience at-grade.</p> <p>In addition, the incorporation of element(s) that physically bridge the two phases would create a more human-scaled, defined sense of place. Discussion by the Panel included overhead string lights or other design elements that create a sense of enclosure or 'outdoor room'.</p>
Applicant Response	
<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 vision for the internal laneway is seemingly in conflict with the design as presented. Outlined in the submission, the design is overtly formal with strictly defined vehicular access with typical sidewalk conditions on each side. If the design intent is to create a public realm amenity where people are encouraged to linger, the Panel recommends re-designing the lane/access to be less linear with structured laybys and demarcating bollards to one that incorporates natural traffic calming techniques. A woonerf or shared space public realm is an interface that intentionally plans for a degree of uncertainty to heighten caution and respect for all users in the space. The current layout in this area contrasts that concept. Additional consideration should be given to one-way directional movement for vehicles from 4th ST SW through to 12th AV SW.</p>
Applicant Response	
<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 • Pedestrian pathway materials extend across driveways and lanes 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>Similar to the rated urban design element 'Integration', the connectivity of the multi-modal laneway could be increased through a less rigidly defined separation of spaces. With bollards defining the pedestrian-vehicle realms, crossing from phase 1 to phase 2 by pedestrian is not promoted. Further incorporation of the art walk component to act as a defining element to limit vehicle movement without being overt could be explored.</p> <p>The notion of shared space was presented and is recommended to be further developed so that the design represents the presented intentions. It should be noted that as part of application DP2017-2379 (Phase 1), the termination (or potential to extend to 11th Avenue) of the galleria would be critical to the success of the open space. The treatment of the laneway and interface to the proposed building still has room for improvement in this regard.</p>
Applicant Response	
<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>Phase 2 represents a lessening of warmth in materially from Phase 1. Although this allows for individual definition of the two phases, the use of a primarily dark color palette in the podium could be reconsidered.</p> <p>The Panel strongly advises extending the retail / commercial elements around the SE corner of the podium in order to activate the lane. The primary residential entrance is located off the lane and is highly visible from both 4th ST SW and from 12th AV SW through the Phase 1 breezeway. As a result, the second additional residential lobby entrance fronting 4th ST SW should not be required. In the current format, it is perceived to erode both the strength of the internal lane connection as well as the commercial storefront along 4th Street.</p>
Applicant Response	
<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 definition of the individual entrances are clear and well defined. The incorporation of a transition through the art walk / pedestrian zone without curbs is a great addition to promoting accessibility of users.
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 Corner treatments and project porosity 	
UDRP Commentary	Viewed in relation to phase 1 as an overall development, there is a wide range of uses, making this development a truly mixed-use project that will serve Beltine community for years to come.
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 podium floors allow for a variety of uses that can fluctuate over time in relation to market demand.
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	<p>Potential to incorporate more overhead lighting as noted in previous comments. Otherwise, the design presents a thoughtful layout re: safety with a high degree of eyes on the street and passive monitoring of the laneway.</p> <p>Achieving safe flow negotiates shared areas at appropriate speeds and with due consideration for the other users. This includes laying out the streetscape furnishings with auto-turn analysis /test-fitting to thoughtfully expand the pedestrian realm and improve overall experience. The design should make active modes attractive by meeting their needs i.e. bike parking and seating areas and ensuring safety. i.e. smooth surfaces and clear of obstacles, contrary to rows of bollards.</p>
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	The orientation of the facades of each tower establishes oblique views across, while still allowing for unimpeded views from the residential units.
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	Sustainability was not noted as being considered past the code requirements even though the team was presented as being well versed in the subject matter. More thoughtful integration of sustainable approaches relative to the project would be welcomed.
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	Use of durable and quality materiality throughout. Consideration on the durability of lit bollards as they are often problematic if considered the principle interface for lighting and wayfinding in the pedestrian realm.
Applicant Response	