

Urban Design Review Panel comments

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date: June 13, 2018
Time: 1:00 pm
Panel Members:

Present:	Absent:
Chad Russill (co-chair)	Janice Liebe (chair)
Gary Mundy	Glen Pardoe
Jack Vanstone	Robert LeBlond
Amelia Hollingshurst	Terry Klassen
Ben Bailey	Yogeshwar Navagrah
	Bruce Nelligan
	Eric Toker

Advisor: David Down, Chief Urban Designer
Application number: **LOC2018-0021/DP2018-0390,**
LOC2017-0127/DP2017-1699
Municipal address: 230 7A ST NE, 438 8 ST NE
Community: Bridgeland
Project description: Multi-Residential Development (1 building, 4 units.)
Multi-Residential Development (1 building, 4 units.)
Review: first
File Manager: Sara Kassa
City Wide Urban Design: Angela Kiu
Applicant: 02 Planning and Design
Architect: Davignon Martineau Architects
Owner:
Ranking: **Support**

Summary

The Panel recognizes that this development does not require UDRP review and feedback, however commends the applicant for voluntarily seeking input on this innovative proposal for a new residential typology within the neighbourhood of Bridgeland.

Overall, the Panel is excited by the applicant's desire to address a corner residential lot differently than an infill lot and activate both the avenue and street facades through the residential unit configurations and the exterior design. The Panel also commends the intent of the design to provide more variety within this community with regards to scale and cost, ultimately supporting a diverse community fabric and demographic.

The Panel encourages further study of the contrasting expression of the third level and garage exterior treatment. Although it is understood that the current proposal attempts to accentuate the two-storey massing of the building, the graphic illustrations seem to highlight both the third level and garage, as oppose to diminishing their presence.

Although this application does not align exactly with the current ASP for this community, the Panel strongly **supports** this application and the change in zoning to Direct Control for both sites.

Applicant Response

(date)

Urban Design Review Panel comments

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.	N/A
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not Applicable.		
	Applicant Response		
2	Retail street transparency, porosity	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	N/A
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not Applicable.		
	Applicant Response		
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
	UDRP Commentary		
	The existing public sidewalk is maintained along the street and avenue. Access to residential units are connected to the public sidewalk through hard scaping. A rear parking garage is provided for residents with concrete pads connecting the garage to the rear lane. Private patios and landscaping define the edge condition between the public and private realm.		
	Applicant response		
4	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Entry to each of the private residential units is clear and legible. The proposed development activates both street and avenue through meaningful points of entry.		
	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.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	The design proposes two and three storey units at the street level, facing both the street and avenue at this corner site condition. Private outdoor patios, at grade, provide opportunity for furniture and extend towards the sidewalk. They offer physical and visual access to the public sidewalk. Second and third level balconies also contribute to animating the façades.		
	Applicant Response		
6	At grade parking	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		
	A private, enclosed garage, is provided for four vehicles (one per residential unit). Street parallel parking is by permit only and a C-train station is located within 10 minutes walking distance. The panel feels this is more than adequate. Designated 'Car to Go' parking locations near-by may assist the applicant in negotiating Community support, as it could minimize Community concerns around vehicle volumes. Some exploration of pushing the garage away from the property line is encouraged as it could allow for some landscape to buffer this portion of the building.		

Urban Design Review Panel comments

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			
There are no ramps in this application. The parking entrance is in keeping with the existing context and all other adjacent residential properties; via the rear lane. The panel supports reducing the garage parking capacity from four stalls to three stalls. This will improve the exterior form/massing along the avenue façade by reducing the current bump-out of the garage. Further reducing the private parking capacity will support the use of public transit and increase pedestrian activity.			
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.	N/A
UDRP Commentary			
Beyond the property lines of this site, a LRT Station is located within a 10 minute walk.			
Applicant Response			
10	Regional pathway connections	Supports walkability via intentional urban design connections to pathway systems.	N/A
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
11	Cycle path connections	Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to bicycle storage at grade.	N/A
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
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.	N/A
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			

Urban Design Review Panel comments

	The design provides an exterior walkway along the side setback through the site, connecting back entryways to the garage, laneway and front street. Suggest the addition of gates to discourage public access and enhance CPTED principles.		
	Applicant Response		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	N/A
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
16	Vehicular interface		
	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
	UDRP Commentary		
	Although the proposed massing deviates from the existing residential context by proposing a third story, the design is sensitive to the adjacent two storey structures by stepping back the proposed third storey and articulating the building massing on the shared side-yard elevation. The street and avenue facades project slightly into the required setback, however the panel feels that the projection on the street façade is minimal and as a corner lot, this projection does not diminish the overall street perspective or negatively impact the adjacent property. Visibility triangles for vehicles is not affected. The panel does feel that retracting the garage façade along the avenue would have a positive impact on the avenue perspective and elevation, allowing sufficient space for a landscaping feature to soften the blank wall façade. Overall, the massing addresses both the street and avenue, which is a positive urban design gesture.		
	Applicant Response		
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Although the proposed massing deviates from the existing residential context, that being a main residence with a detached garage and a backyard space, the proposed massing is located on north corner sites, and therefore does not introduce shadows onto adjacent backyards.		
	Applicant Response		

Urban Design Review Panel comments

20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
See comment #18. This application is innovative in that it is addressing both streets through form and layout. As a corner lot it fronts two streets and the design addresses both streets differently, relating to the attitude of 8 th Street through a duplex massing, and initiating an attitude for the avenue through a townhouse massing. This solution is in fact less than what could be built within the current zoning, further strengthening the rationale behind support of this project.			
Applicant Response			
21	Massing distribution on site		Support
UDRP Commentary			
The panel commends the applicant's intent to provide affordable density and improve the quality of space within the residential units. The massing occupies the entire site, while achieving natural light within each unit and maintaining visual privacy for existing adjacent properties.			
Applicant Response			
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Support
UDRP Commentary			
See comment #5			
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			
The design provides lighting and glazing along both the street and avenue, which is an improvement within the neighbourhood. This improvement lends much needed 'eyes on the street' for the avenue, where laneway access can provide hiding areas. All unit entry doors are visible and provide full glazing. Also see comment # 13.			
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.	N/A
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
26	Pedestrian level comfort - snow	Incorporate strategies to prevent snow drifting. Test assumptions and responses via Snow Drifting Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	N/A

Urban Design Review Panel comments

	UDRP Commentary		
	Although this was not discussed, the applicant may wish to identify the snow shoveling procedures to the Community Association to address any sidewalk maintenance concerns.		
	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		
	All residential unit entries have canopies to protect against weather conditions and improve the safety of landings.		
	Applicant Response		
28	Night time design		N/A
	UDRP Commentary		
	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.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	One of the proposed units is single storey and accommodations could be made to ramp the main entry walkway. This could support the design intent of supporting a diverse community both generationally and economically.		
	Applicant Response		
30	Winter city	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	N/A
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
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		Commentary	Ranking
32	(specify)		TBD