

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date:	April 11, 2018	
Time:	2:45 pm	
Panel Members:	Present:	Absent:
	Janice Liebe (Chair)	Chris Hardwicke
	Yogeshwar Navagrah	Glen Pardoe
	Gary Mundy	Robert LeBlond
	Bruce Nelligan	Terry Klassen
		Chad Russill
		Bruce Nelligan
		Jack Vanstone
		Eric Toker

Advisor: David Down, Chief Urban Designer

Application number:	DP2018-0883
Municipal address:	7603 7 St SW
Community:	Kingsland
Project description:	Multi-Residential Development – Assisted Living
Review:	first
File Manager:	Lisette Burga Gherzi
City Wide Urban Design:	Lothar Wiwjorra
Applicant:	Davignon Martin Architecture
Architect:	Davignon Martin Architecture
Owner:	

Ranking:	Endorse with Comment
-----------------	-----------------------------

Summary

The proposal is a welcome addition to a mature neighbourhood where many existing residents may be looking for alternative and suitable housing within the neighbourhood they know well. There are many amenities such as the adjacent mall with supportive retail and services, transit connections and nearby churches to name a few. Improving the mix of housing types within existing residential neighbourhoods is a positive development.

The material palette and use of quality materials is welcome. The philosophy of designing the housing for residents so that they do not have to move out of their units when greater levels of care may be needed is laudable. It has directly resulted in a proposal that looks and feels more residential than institutional and is more sympathetic to the existing neighbourhood as a result (major public spaces (dining spaces) have been moved to the roof leaving room for residential apartments at grade with independent street access and patios.

The project overall meets most of the best practices in urban design. The panel has made recommendations for direct access to the grade level units from the public sidewalk and is looking for a more easily navigated ramp to the front entry. The south elevation is currently under developed. It is recommended that the applicant work with CWUD to develop a suitable south elevation.

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Applicant Response (2018 June 11)

Urban Vitality			
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
1	Retail street diversity	Retail streets encourage pedestrians along sidewalk with a mix and diversity of smaller retail uses. Retail wraps corners of streets. Space for patios and cafe seating is provided.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	NA		
2	Retail street transparency, porosity	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	NA		
3	Pedestrian-first design	Sidewalks are continuous on all relevant edges. Materials span driveway entries and parking access points. No drop offs or lay-bys in the pedestrian realm. Street furnishings support the pedestrian experience.	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		
	<p>The vehicular access is off the laneway so there is no interference with the pedestrian sidewalks. The current note on the drawings provided that indicates a proposed loading zone / layby on 7th street is inaccurate. The applicant noted that the curb cut is to facilitate those in wheelchairs being dropped off in this zone at the street. There is no layby. It was requested that the applicant revise the wording and remove the linework that indicates a layby. The sidewalk is continuous and is simply expanded in the zone of the front entry.</p> <p>The panel further requested that the sidewalks be increased in width on the two street faces of the project to better accommodate wheelchairs, pedestrians and other mobility devices. The panel also recommended that the sidewalk be moved inboard and a tree'd boulevard be placed between the sidewalk and the street for safety. The applicant noted that the sidewalk width and location matches that in the neighbourhood and was looking for consistency. The panel commented that these walkways could still be improved as suggested particularly when the applicant noted that there is potential for the purchase of the remaining properties on the block to extent this development for the full block, meaning that the entire block length of sidewalk could be widened.</p> <p>The proposal also indicates a west entrance to the building in proximity to a desirable access to the retail / commercial uses in the adjacent block. The panel endorses this design and asked for measures to clearly indicate the crossing of the laneway. The applicant noted that this will likely be done by paint application to the roadway surface. The panel believes this connection will be well used and provides a strong transit connection. To that end, the panel encourages the applicant and the related city departments to work toward a design that provides signage, markings and other appropriate elements to ensure the safety of pedestrians using this crossing.</p>		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Applicant response		
<p>The plans have been revised to accommodate a pick-up/ drop-off zone. No lay-by is planned. The public boulevard sidewalk is complimented by a second circulation walkway along the building, which will be accessible from the street. The main local attractors, the mall, the bus stop and the park, are located on the west side of the building and have pedestrian connections that are safely provided at the back side of the mall, which will minimize the pedestrian movement on the boulevard sidewalks along the 7th street and 75th avenue SW. There are no significant destinations in walking distance on the east side of the proposed Development.</p> <p>Considering this additional infrastructure and the underground parking which is directly connected to the lobby coordinating the core pedestrian traffic, the boulevard sidewalk use is therefore not expected to increase to a large degree which in turn would not justify the efforts of widening the boulevard sidewalk. The additional investment would be better directed towards a secure and easily accessed connection to the mall parking lot and the access to the major bus route on Elbow Drive SW, as suggested by the UDRP in close collaboration with Calgary Transportation. The plans have been revised. Please refer to the landscaping plans for the laneway crossing design.</p>		
4	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible
	UDRP Commentary	Support with comment
	Applicant Response	
5	Residential multi-level units at grade	Inclusion of two or three storey units are encouraged, particularly at street level. Private outdoor patios with access to the sidewalk are ideal. Patios are large enough to permit furnishing and active use.
	UDRP Commentary	Support with comment
	Applicant Response	
	<p>The nature of this development does not recommend the use of multi storey units. Patios are provided at grade in compliance with best practice. The panel does recommend the inclusion of stairs directly to the public sidewalk in alignment with the units. These can be a single set of stairs per two units facing 7th. It was discussed that the benefits are twofold: One – providing the direct connection is in alignment with best practice and with the applicants stated philosophy of providing truly independent units for active aging. Two – the private sidewalk runs directly adjacent to living room windows with no landscape buffer impeding the privacy of these units. The stairs to the public sidewalk will reduce the number of people walking directly adjacent to the unit windows. If the private sidewalk is not required for barrier free access to these units, the applicant might consider deleting it and placing landscaping in front of the unit windows.</p> <p>In consideration of implementing the additional connections to the sidewalk from the street-oriented units:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of individual stair runs on the property is a safety concern as it creates additional tripping hazard. The ground level is intended to be barrier free to a high extent, providing a barrier-free path of travel for maximum safety. The proximity of the walking ways around the building and the living room windows of the street-oriented units is intentional. There are three dangers, as per operator's experience: boredom, loneliness and helplessness. The Assisted Living Development is planned as a community, with a high degree of engagement and interaction, both with fellow residents and staff members. The exchange between the residents is promoted throughout the building to 	

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	<p>encourage interaction. The walking paths in close proximity to the ground level units are intended to support this design idea and bring the residents closer together. Furthermore, the safety aspect is served, as there will always be eyes on the walking paths to ensure no accidents are unseen.</p> <p>c. In a typical Multi-residential development an individual connection to the sidewalk with a separate entrance to the unit provides identity and sense of ownership. The proposed development is planned as a community and with design principals to promote interaction, security and inclusivity as mentioned under point a and b.</p>		
6	At grade parking	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
7	Parking entrances	Ramps are concealed as much as possible. Entrances to parking are located in discrete locations. Driveways to garage entries are minimized, place pedestrian environment and safety first.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
8	Other		
	Applicant Response		
Urban Connectivity <i>Provide visual and functional connectivity between buildings and places, ensure connection to existing and future networks. Promote walkability, cycle networks, transit use, pedestrian-first environments.</i>			
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
9	LRT station connections	Supports LRT use via legible, dedicated pedestrian pathways to stations with direct routes. Avoids desire lines / shortcutting through parking areas.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	NA		
10	Regional pathway connections	Supports LRT use via legible, dedicated pedestrian pathways to stations with direct routes. Avoids desire lines / shortcutting through parking areas.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	NA		
11	Cycle path connections	Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to bicycle storage at grade.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	NA		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

12	Walkability - connection to adjacent neighbourhoods / districts / key urban features	Extend existing and provide continuous pedestrian pathways. Extend pedestrian pathway materials across driveways and lanes to emphasize pedestrian use.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
13	Pathways through site	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The proposal has placed amenity spaces at the roof to provide mountain and city views for all residents.		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
16	Vehicular interface		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
17	Other		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
Contextual Response <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass, spacing and placement on site in consideration to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i>			
Topic		Best Practice	Ranking
18	Massing relationship to context	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		
	The highest mass of the project is at the north end of the project. It would be preferable to be lower at this end to blend with the existing neighbourhood to the north.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	Applicant Response		
	The maximum building height is located on the north end of the proposed building at the corner between 7th street and 75th Avenue SW. The impact of the shadows in this area is minimized due to the location. As shown by the shadow study, which was submitted with the DP application, the placement of the maximum height throws shadows onto the street intersection for the majority of the year and not onto the neighbor properties.		
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
21	Massing distribution on site		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
23	Other		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
Safety and Diversity <i>Promote design that accommodates the broadest range of users and uses. Achieve a sense of comfort and security at all times.</i>			
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
24	Safety and security	CPTED principles are to be employed - good overlook, appropriate lighting, good view lines, glazing in lobbies and entrances.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
25	Pedestrian level comfort - wind	Incorporate strategies to block wind, particularly prevailing wind and downdrafts. Test assumptions and responses via Pedestrian Level Wind Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	TBD

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	UDRP Commentary		
	No analysis was provided. The applicant is to work with CWUD to determine if one is needed.		
	Applicant Response		
	Not required		
26	Pedestrian level comfort - snow	Incorporate strategies to prevent snow drifting. Test assumptions and responses via Snow Drifting Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	No analysis was provided. The applicant is to work with CWUD to determine if one is needed.		
	Applicant Response		
27	Weather protection	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	-		
28	Night time design		TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Lighting design will be important to the safety and comfort of the residents. The applicant is to work with CWUD to provide detail for approval of the exterior lighting design.		
	Applicant Response		
29	Barrier free design	Site access to be equal for able and disabled individuals. Provide sloped surfaces 5% grade or less vs ramps.	Do not support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The ramp indicated for the front entry is not compliant with the best practice stated. The applicant is encouraged to find the means to reduce the slope of the ramp.		
	Applicant Response		
30	Winter city	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	The slope of the barrier-free ramp has been adjusted as per UDRP comment.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	-	
31	Other	
	Applicant Response	
	Service / Utility Design <i>Promote design that accommodates service uses in functional and unobtrusive manner. Place service uses away from and out of sight of pedestrian areas where possible. Screening elements to be substantive and sympathetic to the building architecture.</i>	
Topic		Ranking
32	(specify)	TBD