

Applicant Response to Urban Design Review Panel Comments

November 22, 2023

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	October 4, 2023	
Time	1:00	
Panel Members	Present Jeff Lyness (Co-chair) Rick Gendron Noorullah Hussain Zada Raphael Neurohr Glen Pardoe Beverly Sandalack Jack Vanstone	Distribution Chris Hardwicke (Chair) Jadwiga Kroman Gary Mundy Kathy Oberg Katherine Robinson
Advisor	Jihad Bitar, Sr Urban Designer	
Application number	DP2023-05573	
Municipal address	1015 3 Av NW	
Community	Sunnyside	
Project description	New: multi-residential development (1 building)	
Review	Second (first at LOC2022-0086)	
File Manager	Ben Bailey	
Urban Design	Xia Zhang/Hardy Huang	
Applicant	Lola Architecture	

*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 panel recognizes and appreciates the applicant's willingness to present to the panel as part of the Development Permit approvals process. The panel acknowledges that this project was initially reviewed by the panel as part of LOC2022-0086 on May 18th, 2022.

The project overall is a well-considered proposal that successfully navigates the interface between the similar scaled developments to the South and the more commercially focused to the North. The development of the project and the incorporation of the previous comments is evident in the materials presented.

The Panel acknowledges that the façade's choice of materials, articulation of balconies and detailing of the architecture are major contributors to the overall positive responsiveness of the project to the urban design elements and that it should be maintained through the construction of the project. Any changes to these elements shall be carefully considered.

DP2023-05573
UDRP Comments

10/04/2023

Respecting the work that has been completed to date, the panel endorses the project as presented. As such, the panel has endeavored to provide commentary that aligns with the first review and respect the evolution / development of the project in the intervening time. The panel's comments are generally encompassed in the following Themes: Please refer to further discussion in the elements section.

1. Definition of the NW corner at grade
2. Evolution of the rear lane (East) at grade
3. Interface between building facade and adjacent curb
4. Material detailing

Applicant Response

We have taken the comments into consideration and have made changes to accommodate the panel's concerns. Most notably, the NW corner has been revised to increase glazing and provide a more open and inviting space. Additionally, the rear lane condition has been reviewed and additional glazing and lighting added to increase the safety and "eyes on the street." The front entrance has been further refined to include signage locations and feature lighting. Overall, we feel the materiality of the building has been carefully considered and several notes have been added to the drawings to ensure design quality. During the building permit process, we will maintain the high-quality materials and ensure careful detailing to maintain the design concepts.

November 22,2023

Urban Design Element	
Place 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	<p>There remains an opportunity to further refine the rear lane façade at grade. As currently presented, the laneway could pose a CPTED concern give the dark and uninviting nature of the materials and interface from the building face. The panel recommends lightening the areas through more direct articulation of the "rear access" to be just that and not necessarily a simple steel door.</p> <p>Potential to integrate a mural as well as this face of the building will be highly visible due to the pedestrian movement across 3rd Avenue.</p> <p>Consider adding a window to the stairwell facing the lane which will animate the building corner.</p>
Applicant Response	<p>We understand and have addressed the concerns regarding the building at the lane. Notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Windows have been added to the exit stair and gym, increasing the eyes on the street. • The exit stair has been rotated to provide a more open feel. • The rear loading doors have been revised to add glazing • Feature lighting and a proposed location for an additional mural have been provided
Scale 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.	
Site	Does the arrangement of buildings and spaces on the site address street edges well?
	Is the scale and placement of buildings and structures appropriate for the street and public space size and type?
	Are large service and surface parking areas modulated and screened by structures and landscaping?
Architecture	Are design strategies employed to reduce the impact of building height and bulk?
	Are street walls well defined and of appropriate height to street width and type?
	Are human scaled elements and details included to enhance street character?
Public Realm	Are public spaces well edged and framed by structures and/or landscaping?
	Does the design include detail which will enhance street character and encourage use of the public realm?
UDRP Commentary	The massing and articulation of the building are well resolved. The balconies are doing a lot of the articulation work for the facade which as presented works well. The panel recommends careful consideration of the balcony detailing as these elements will define the overall perception of the building moreso than the face materiality itself. The material images noted need to accurately reflect the material panel sizing and detailing proposed so as to not cause a mis-interpretation of detailing.
Applicant Response	Thank you for this comment. The balconies will be carefully considered at the BP stage to ensure that the design intent and careful detailing is maintained. Materials have been meticulously chosen to ensure adherence to the renderings and design concept.
Amenity Ensure that public sidewalks and gathering spaces are generously proportioned, comfortable, safe, fully accessible, and framed by permeable facades which allow for activation throughout the year.	
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 Commentary	The panel appreciates the move to further define the 3 rd Avenue edge at grade as being non-residential in nature through the expansion of the amenity program at this location. The panel acknowledges the challenge of integrated commercial uses in a defined residential building. However, further refinement of this interface could enable a more unified and pedestrian-scaled podium experience.
Applicant Response	As noted, a commercial space in a residential building is not part of the design intent. The north façade (3 rd Ave) has been designed to ensure expansive glazing and a 2m podium step out which would be typical of a commercial podium. Additional notes have been added to ensure the glazing is transparent. The façade at the gym is only a single storey, which was a design feature to create a more pedestrian friendly and human scaled element.
Legibility 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.	
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 Commentary	Suggestion to continue the curved / wood soffit recess elements that are located on 9 th Street to 3 rd Avenue, fully integrating the two faces of the building. The residential entrance is intriguing given the materials chosen – careful integration of building lighting will be required to realize the intention. Consideration should be given to further enhancing the main entry and provide clear legibility and visibility from 10 th Street. The rear access should be further defined for the purposed of bicycle access. The panel appreciates the constraints of the site, but in this specific case, simply being on the lane does not suffice to treat this face as a back of house element alone.
Applicant Response	The wood soffit will be continued to the residential entrance and noted above. Also, the residential entrance has been further defined with additional signage and a feature wall sconce. The location of a heritage plaque has been chosen, which will provide interest. Please refer to UDRP “Place” comment above which addresses the additional design features on the west façade.
Vibrancy 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	The lack of commercial space is unfortunate given the close proximity to the 10 th Street High Street and adjacent LRT Station. Effective integration of the various elements across 3 rd is key: currently, the rear lane remains an aspect that could be better integrated into the façade development along 9 th and 3 rd .

	Encourage additional trees to be incorporated at grade – specifically along 9 th where a previous site driveway was removed. There is sufficient space to add this element and continue the canopy along 9 th .
Applicant Response	The exit stair on the lane has been revised to be more integrated with the building. Additional glazing has been added and the stair has been rotated.
Resilience <i>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.</i>	
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 a range of uses accommodated; does the design anticipate future change?
	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 notes aspects in the written commentary provided, but the panel respectfully requests that further refinement and quantitative statistics be included in the material package that reflect the actual building performance goals for the project.
Applicant Response	As noted in the climate resiliency form, this building will exceed NECB by 20% (25% is the target). The building features many sustainable design initiatives such as 1:1 bike parking and only 21 parking stalls, encouraging alternate modes of transportation. EV ready charging stalls, drought resistant landscaping, durable cladding and a robust building envelope are also part of the design. Both public and private amenity spaces exceed the minimum requirements according to the bylaw and there are open spaces that could be adapted to changing building requirements.