

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	December 9, 2020	
Time	1:00	
Panel Members	Present Chad Russill (Chair) Gary Mundy Michael Sydenham Jack Vanstone Noorullah Hussain Zada	Distribution Chris Hardwicke (Co-Chair) Ben Bailey Anna Lawrence Jeff Lyness Glen Pardoe Katherine Robinson Beverly Sandalack
Advisor	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number	DP2020-6663	
Municipal address	1110, 1114, 1120, 1124, 1126 Gladstone Rd NW	
Community	Hillhurst	
Project description	Multi-residential building	
Review	first	
File Manager	Matt Rockley	
City Wide Urban Design	Jihad Bitar	
Applicant	JS Architect	

*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

After presentation by the applicant and discussion with the Panel, it is the opinion of the Panel that there are urban design issues that should be addressed through refinement of the design that was presented for review. As presented, the design does not meet the expectations of the Panel in terms of the urban design quality criteria as set forth by City Wide Urban Design. Key issues include:

- The panel believes that there are Building Code issues related to limiting distances and exposed building faces that would impact the proposed form and massing as presented. Affected areas include the courtyard in the area of the main building fire separation, as well as between the church and the east façade.
- The panel is concerned with the visual access between units in the acute elevations of the courtyard where bedrooms of one unit are directly facing bedrooms of another unit. The condition could have negative effects on the use of the spaces, and ultimately the occupancy of the units.
- The form and massing of the building does not adequately address the Historical Church Building. The applicant is urged to consider building massing that would better embrace the Church Building so that the existing and new structure are reliant upon each other, achieving a successfully built out site.

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	Dual courtyard design appears to be a valid approach to break up the massing, though presents other related concerns in terms of unprotected openings. The massing and positioning of the new structure on site should better address the existing Historical Church Building. Applicant to review further.
Applicant Response	A mural/silhouette of the existing church has been incorporated into the proposed east elevation to honor the heritage building with subtle visual and emotional connection

<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	Influence on the church not seen in the current design, massing lack of steps and street wall effect. The proposed development should better consider the adjacent scales of the neighbouring property, the lane, and the street. The proposed building height that exceeds the 45 degree angle is not meeting the contextual sensitivity intended by this design parameter.
Applicant Response	Stepbacks at top floors have been considered along north and west lane to create better transition between the neighbouring property and the proposed building. Further step back considered at northwest corner to increase townhome feature at lower levels.
<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	The courtyards contribute to a lively façade along the street, and rear at-grade patios do a good job of animating the lane, however, the applicant should consider modifying units to allow for entries off the lane rather than secondary uses to further animate the space.
Applicant Response	As per transportation department comment, the width of rear lane has been increased to 7.5m to allow for “woonerf “/shared car-pedestrian space.
<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	While the courtyards do a good job breaking down the scale of the street façade, they will be in shadow for much of the day which could limit their use and effectiveness.
Applicant Response	Majority parts of the courtyards are facing south to minimize shadow impact on outdoor activities
<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	The building as proposed integrates well with the surrounding area at street level but can do more in stepping back to better address the scale of the adjacent uses. Applicant to be aware that the courtyards will be in shadow much of the time and are anticipated to be cold spaces. Design should realistically anticipate limited use during the shoulder and winter months. Additional information on the courtyard lighting strategy is required for a more thorough analysis.
Applicant Response	Lighting plan provided. Will incorporate more detailed design for lighting fixture selection at Building permit stage
<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	An opportunity is missed in enhancing the relationship between the Historic Church Building and the new development to generate a solid pedestrian connection between the site and 10 Street.
Applicant Response	An open plaza in front of the Historic Church Building has been considered to provide a civic vibrant space for civic activities.
<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	<p>The building as shown appears to have all entrances at grade, and does a good job mitigating the need for ramps and stairs to access the site and building.</p> <p>Applicant to review location of bicycle parking immediately adjacent to the front door to ensure appropriate balance of functional use alongside enhancement of the front entry.</p>
Applicant Response	The bike stalls have been relocated a bit away from the main entrance to allow for better navigable main entrance to residents
<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	Fairly good mix of unit sizes and layouts – the panel looks forward to the proposed future commercial development of the church for an overall mixed-use development.
Applicant Response	Commercial use to be provided as per the community’s suggestion by separate Tenant Improvement application
<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	While the proposed new building is limited to residential only, the potential reuse of church for commercial / community uses on the site are promising.
Applicant Response	Detailed commercial use to be provided as per the community’s suggestion by separate Tenant Improvement application
<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	Applicant to review the lane interface, specifically for resident comfort – the spaces immediately adjacent to the bedrooms appear to be a CPTED issue.
Applicant Response	Exterior wall lighting to be introduced along the lane to enhance CPTED strategy.
<p>Orientation <i>Provide clear and consistent directional clues for urban navigation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance natural views and vistas 	

UDRP Commentary	The development can do more to better address the church and 10 Street beyond. In addition, the acute angles of the courtyard create over-looking issues between units, and dark corners in the landscape below.
Applicant Response	With constraint of the unique triangle site, subtle design has been considered to mitigate the privacy issue by orienting the bedroom window away from direct facing adjacent unit, introducing featured fin at balconies, and design unit to occupy both side of the inner corner etc.
<p>Sustainability <i>Be aware of lifecycle costs; incorporate sustainable practices and materials</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site/solar orientation and passive heating/cooling • Material selection and sustainable products 	
UDRP Commentary	The development appears to take advantage of the walkability of the area, but should do more to better address direct at-grade access for individual units.
Applicant Response	At-grade accesses are available for ground floor units along Gladstone Road, rear lane and the units around the courtyards.
<p>Durability <i>Incorporate long-lasting materials and details that will provide a legacy rather than a liability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of low maintenance materials and/or sustainable products • Project detailed to avoid maintenance issues 	
UDRP Commentary	The applicant is urged to investigate an increase in the amount of more durable materials at grade, such as masonry at the podium. The use of true brick product will be more durable than a panelized brick façade product.
Applicant Response	Instead of full-size brick, the thin brick (brick veneer) has been widely used as alternate option when consider durability and sustainability. Brick veneer material has been fully introduced at ground floor, including recycling room area, west and east elevation, and in courtyard area.