

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments

|                            |  |  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Date</b>                | January 18, 2023   |  |
| <b>Time</b>                | 2:00   |  |
| <b>Panel Members</b>       | <b>Present</b><br>Jeff Lyness (Co-chair)<br>Raphael Neurohr<br>Kathy Oberg<br>Glen Pardoe<br>Jack Vanstone | <b>Distribution</b><br>Chris Hardwicke (Chair)<br>Rick Gendron<br>Jadwiga Kroman<br>Gary Mundy<br>Katherine Robinson (conflict)<br>Beverly Sandalack<br>Noorullah Hussain Zada |
| <b>Advisor</b>             | David Down, Chief Urban Designer   |  |
| <b>Application number</b>  | <b>PE2022-01534</b>  |  |
| <b>Municipal address</b>   | 201 10 St NW   |  |
| <b>Community</b>           | Hillhurst  |  |
| <b>Project description</b> | Land Use Amendment   |  |
| <b>Review</b>              | first  |  |
| <b>File Manager</b>        | Coleen Auld  |  |
| <b>Urban Design</b>        | Jihad Bitar  |  |
| <b>Applicant</b>           | Quantum Place  |  |

\*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 Urban Design.

### Summary

The proposal presented is a Land Use submission for 201 10<sup>TH</sup> Street NW, located at the NW Corner of 10th Street and Kensington Road (LOC 2022-0227). The proposal as outlined by the applicant is to re-designate the parcel from the current designation from C-COR1 to a DC designation based on C-COR1 with the principle requests being an increase in height from 26m to 50m and an increase in FAR from 5.0 to 9.0. These two metrics are integral to the overall submission as they generally represent an increase of approximately 45% in development density rights for the parcel. As presented by the applicant, the proposal is to act as a gateway to Kensington as a transition from the high-rise downtown core to the lower mid-rise Kensington commercial and mixed-use precinct. This is key as a gateway project such as the proposed will need to establish a foundation for future developments to build upon.

Success in this case requires stewardship of the outcome by both the applicant and the City of Calgary for a mutually agreeable outcome. Only then will the resilience of social and economic benefits to the adjacent neighbourhood noted by the applicant be realized.

The Panel has framed commentary around the following considerations which are summarized in more detail in the element section below:

- The Applicant notes specific metrics of building height (50m) and FAR (up to 9.0). The Panel supports the desired density but suggests the height measurement is a limiting factor in establishing a comprehensively successful outcome. For example, an increase in building height would allow for the density of 9.0 without requiring a zero lot line condition on the western edge, which would then allow for glazing and other design considerations to be incorporated. Massing studies to support a density of 9.0 would require review in a subsequent submission and would enable a more positive design outcome.
- Do the metrics proposed promote the vision presented by the applicant? Or, are they a limiting factor to a successful design outcome for both the developer and the city at large?
- Bonusing calculations proposed – are they sufficient for the ask?
- In section, please show the proposed massing in relation to the street on both 10th Street and

Kensington Road interfaces. The Panel is concerned that the landscape elements such as trees, street lighting etc. may interfere with the applicant's desire to extend the balconies over the street as coverage. The Panel's position is that the urban realm along the street interfaces is extremely important and there must be sufficient room to account for the elements of a successful building / street interface. This is a Gateway development and should be designed as such.

- Inclusion of art on the corner. Although the Panel appreciates the commitment, art in itself does not necessarily promote high quality active public space.

The Panel is supportive of the increase in density requested. However, the metrics presented (height, FAR and bonusing) could be removed / revised to allow for a resultant design that is able to respond more holistically to the City of Calgary Elements of Urban Design whilst meeting the economic proforma of the developer. For example, if the height was removed as a limiting factor, what would be an appropriate massing to achieve a 9.0 FAR and an economically feasible project that is also viewed as a strong example of urban design integration?

The Panel generally supports the intention of the applicant and the submission. However, we strongly request that further review is required with a sharing of proposed massing of the resultant architectural and urban realm response. Although not tied to plans, the Panel interprets the plans presented as being representational of work completed to support the LOC submission. Further, the applicant themselves represented this design work on the development as encoding the aspirational aspects of the presentation; specifically noting a DP is forthcoming for the project.

The Panel strongly recommends to the applicant and the City of Calgary that a negotiated outcome is achievable, but as currently constituted the metrics in place / proposed are arguably a barrier to a successful and objective based decision on this very important gateway corner.

The Panel looks forward to reviewing a revised LOC submission that considers the commentary from the Panel and further encodes the applicant's presentation commentary.

## Applicant Response

| Urban Design Element  |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Place</b> Recognize and enhance the unique and emerging identity of a place by responding to surrounding context, local policy, and community objectives through the contribution of innovative architecture and public realm. |  |
| Site  | Does the site planning show innovation in addressing site constraints and challenges?  |
|   | Does the design respect existing topography, landscape, and archaeology?   |
|   | Does the site design accommodate people of all abilities?  |
| Architecture  | Is the project visually interesting and unique?  |
|   | Does the architecture respond to landmark and gateway opportunities presented by the site?   |
|   | Does the design reflect any distinctive social, cultural or historical aspects of the site and community?  |
| Public Realm  | Does the project contribute to the creation of a high quality, connected public realm?   |
| UDRP Commentary   | The project has aspirations to remove the barriers along both Kensington and 10 <sup>th</sup> by removing the wall and surface parking. This is an integral step to encoding a successful urban realm as is considered elemental to any other design considerations. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Applicant Response  | <p>Due to the setbacks from the retail space to the property line on the ground floor, a considerable amount of pedestrian space along Kensington Road and 10<sup>th</sup> Street NW has been created. This will yield a much safer pedestrian environment.</p> <p>In the plaza, there is an aspiration to do something interactive. The intention is to do an interactive piece of artwork, where people could interact with LED lighting on the floor, something motion sensitive, etc. This will not only create an interesting, contemporary art piece, it will invite the community and visitors to the community to have a wonderful interactive experience – thus creating a high quality active public art space. In a future stage, sculptors will be invited to put in proposals for artwork.</p> <p>Landscaping in the plaza will be addressed by incorporating planting into the plaza's bench seating in a fashion that contributes to the community without impacting visibility. Planting species will be selected accordingly.</p> <p>This land use redesignation will involve increase in FAR / height from what is specific in the Hillhurst-Sunnyside ARP. The preferred option (as previously mentioned) that has been communicated to City administration is agreeing that the plaza be provided in exchange for the full FAR / height bonus in exchange. The bonus will ultimately be resolved between the developer and the City of Calgary.</p> |
| <b>Scale</b> <i>Ensure appropriate transitions between building masses and adjacent places and spaces; define street and open space edges and bring human scale through articulation, materials, details and landscaping.</i> |   |
| Site  | <p>Does the arrangement of buildings and spaces on the site address street edges well?</p> <p>Is the scale and placement of buildings and structures appropriate for the street and public space size and type?</p> <p>Are large service and surface parking areas modulated and screened by structures and landscaping?</p>  |
| Architecture  | <p>Are design strategies employed to reduce the impact of building height and bulk?</p> <p>Are street walls well defined and of appropriate height to street width and type?</p> <p>Are human scaled elements and details included to enhance street character?</p>   |
| Public Realm  | <p>Are public spaces well edged and framed by structures and/or landscaping?</p> <p>Does the design include detail which will enhance street character and encourage use of the public realm?</p>   |
| UDRP Commentary   | <p>Noting the request for increased height and density, the Panel supports the increase in density as this will spark further densification and vibrancy in the area, but questions if the proposed 50m height is an appropriate solution. Rather, the 50m height is viewed as a restriction limiting the ability of the resultant building to incorporate the elements of urban design that will promote a viable and ultimately successful project for both those that will live and work within and the general public that will interface with it.</p>  |
| Applicant Response  | <p>Following the initial submission, significant adjustments have been made to the building to create a more articulate massing. Units have been removed from the west wall.</p> <p>The alcove has also been increased in size to break up the surface area of the west wall face. Articulation has also been improved on the north, south and east facades from the first massing concept presented to the UDRP.</p> <p>Regarding the height of the massing, exceeding 50 m in height negatively impacts the FAR and would cast additional shadowing onto the back yards of neighboring properties in the northwest. For this reason, the massing height is limited to 50 m in this redesignation.</p>   |

| <b>Amenity</b> <i>Ensure that public sidewalks and gathering spaces are generously proportioned, comfortable, safe,</i>  |   |
|--|---|
| Site   | Are equitable, inviting access and varied movement options provided for all ages and abilities?   |
|  | Does the design work with sun orientation and seasonal climate variation?   |
|  | Does the site plan safely accommodate all travel modes?   |
|  | Are service and utility requirements located appropriately to lessen visual impact?   |
| Architecture   | Does the building(s) meet or exceed expectations for universal access design?   |
|  | Does the architecture create a pleasant street edge which feels safe to users?  |
| Public Realm   | Does the public realm design prioritize pedestrians and cyclists over vehicle access?   |
|  | Is the public realm visually interesting, comfortable, and safe during all seasons?   |
|  | Are the public spaces designed for people of all abilities and ages?  |
|  | Do the public spaces meet or exceed expectations for universal access design?   |
| UDRP<br>Commentary   | <p>Applicant noted the enhancement of the rear (north) lane. Applicant is proposing to add 3m of open space. The result is an active vehicular edge.</p> <p>The Panel appreciates the consideration of extending the basic city sidewalk along the frontages of both 10th and Kensington. However, it could be noted that this separation also serves to enhance the internal uses of the proposal development are not simply a give back to the urban realm.</p> <p>Applicant noted the area will not look like a typical loading area. The future development should continue to demonstrate through design an approach that meets the items presented – incl. teak or other similarly high aesthetic as presented. Further, consideration of durability of materials is supported.</p> <p>The Panel is curious as to the amenity that will be integrated into the further development and how this may further reinforce the public realm considerations presented.</p>  |
| Applicant<br>Response  | <p>The northern setback has been increased to 5.0 m from the property line sharing the lane with low-density residential use, and 3.75 from the property line sharing the lane with the commercial use to the north. At a height of 34 m, the massing steps back further to a minimum of 6.5 m, thus exceeding the requirements delineated in 3.2.2.4 of the Hillhurst-Sunnyside ARP. This will serve to improve visibility in the lane.</p> <p>Furthermore, the residential units have been eliminated from the space above the loading area. Previously, garbage trucks and other tall loading vehicles would have had to operate from the back lane. Due to the creation of additional width off the back lane and elimination of the 2nd story above loading area, tall loading vehicles can operate inside the property lines. This will improve safety and reduce congestion in the lane.</p> <p>Materiality will be further handled with great sensitivity and consideration at a future stage of development.</p> |
| <b>Legibility</b> <i>Create logical, permeable networks of streets and pathways that connect within and between neighbourhoods and public places; design well-defined community and building entrances with distinctive, memorable attributes.</i> |   |
| Site   | Does the project provide a permeable, fine-grained and functional urban structure of blocks and streets?  |
|  | Does the project provide legible, accessible, continuous walking and cycling connections within the site that connect to adjacent systems and destinations?   |
|  | Does the proposed network consider future expansion into surrounding areas?   |
|  | Are large parking areas designed with clear, safe, direct pedestrian connections?   |
| Architecture   | Are buildings designed with clearly marked and differentiated entries to facilitate wayfinding?   |
| Public Realm   | Are the public routes and spaces configured to facilitate easy and safe navigation with clear paths and appropriately placed wayfinding elements?   |
| UDRP<br>Commentary   | <p>The corner condition and resultant response by the applicant is clear and legible. However, the design that is to come as part of the future development permit submission is more pertinent in this section. This project will establish a foundation for future developments to respond to. One example is: consideration of redeveloping the laneway that also acts as a pedestrian connection to the adjacent residential community.</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Applicant Response  | The developer is in full agreement with this comment. At a future stage of development, serious consideration will be made for the design readability and legibility of this space.   |
| <b>Vibrancy</b> Ensure that new developments are configured and designed to animate streets and public spaces with varied sizes and types of grade-oriented uses.   |   |
| Site  | Will the building placement and orientation together with the arrangement and variety of uses activate the adjacent streets and public spaces?  |
|   | Will the project contribute to creating greater economic, employment and/or residential diversity in the neighbourhood?   |
| Architecture  | Does the building articulation, materials and details contribute to the vibrancy of the streets and public spaces?  |
|   | Is there a variety of residential and/or commercial unit types and sizes?   |
| Public Realm  | Do outdoor spaces provide varied experiences and accommodate people with diverse abilities?   |
| UDRP Commentary   | Please consider the sectional qualities of the street edge / building interface. The applicant noted the building will have “dancing balconies” that will act as overhang/ protection of the grade level. How will these balconies interface with street lighting, trees etc? The sectional qualities from the perspective of the pedestrian need to be analyzed in detail as the building needs to promote and integrate with the urban realm rather than simply about it.   |
| Applicant Response  | The balconies extend within the property line, so they extend over the area of the street being dedicated to contributing to the existing city sidewalk. This will serve to protect pedestrians in the event of rain or snow.<br><br>The developer has also committed to adding continuous awning to the south and east façades of the retail level. This has resulted in revised massing, which will serve as a means of considering overhang and creating further protection for pedestrians at the grade level. This has been reflected in the revised massing included in this redesignation.                                   |
| <b>Resilience</b> Ensure that projects provide opportunities, through their site layout, spatial configuration, materials, and sustainable design features for responsible operation and continuous adaptation to change over time. |   |
| Site  | Is the project designed to respond to change (economic, social, demographic or other) over time?  |
|   | Does the plan meet/exceed climate resilience/sustainable design expectations?   |
|   | Are active travel modes prioritized, and active lifestyle choices encouraged?   |
| Architecture  | Does the building show indication of sustainable design practices and materials?  |
|   | Is the building designed to endure over time with reasonable maintenance?   |
| Public Realm  | Are public spaces adaptable for multiple uses over short and medium term?   |
|   | Does the public realm design respond to climate resilience / sustainability expectations?   |
| UDRP Commentary   | The applicant noted in the submission materials, the social and economic benefits to the community, but these are not outlined in a measurable manner. Further reinforcing the Panel stance that the bonusing, although supported in principle will need a rate that allows for the social benefits to the community to be encoded and not limited to the economic alone.<br><br>The Panel would appreciate further commentary in this section, not only in response to the climate emergency plan of the City of Calgary, but also how the economic elements can foster the aspirations of the applicant into a resilient outcome. |
| Applicant Response  | As per an agreement between the developer and the City of Calgary, a cost commitment has been made to ensure a vibrant public plaza is developed. Further details on valuation of the plaza will be provided at the DP stage.   |