

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Summary

UDRP received a package from the Applicant for a land use amendment application to re-designate the parcel to allow a mix of uses, shifting the location and configuration of the current park that currently under-serves the community of Kingsland. Although the Panel endorses the positive preliminary direction in the Complete Community vision, further review is recommended.

As part of the land use amendment application, the Panel endorses the mixed-use development, activated street edges, community gathering and programming, and integrated with new mixed-use development. The Panel is encouraging aspects of the plan be strengthened – such as streets edges around the park, indoor/outdoor interface with parks and plaza areas, Building B2 commercial glazing to optimize porosity, a plaza-first approach to courtyard-like areas at Buildings B1 and B4, waste/recycling integrated in underground parking (if feasible), an improved walkable connection to LRT, and a narrated park design-response that connects with the history and heritage of Kingsland prior to urban development. Itemized Topic discussion follows with an overall recommendation for further review.

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 café seating is provided.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends wrap-around building interfaces with patio and café seating with relationship to park and street.		
	Applicant Response <i>This comment will be addressed at the development permit stage.</i>		
2	Retail street transparency, porosity	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel requests more design information regarding glazing and the visual relationships through Building B2 to optimize transparency, porosity, and activation benefit to the park.		
	Applicant Response <i>More information will be provided with the development permit.</i>		
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.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel requests more urban design detail to support Buildings B1 and B4 parking areas with plaza-first design principles.		
	Applicant response <i>The parking areas have been redesigned to read more as a plaza and this detail will be provided with the development permit.</i>		
4	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends a hierarchical design response to public realm entry points.		
	Applicant Response <i>Duly noted and defined entry points have included in the revised park design.</i>		
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.	Further Review Recommended

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

UDRP Commentary			
The Panel requests more information on layout of patios and furnishings for activation.			
Applicant Response			
<i>This information will be provided with the development permit.</i>			
6	At grade parking	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Further Review Recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The Panel recommends application of plaza-first principles at Buildings B1 and B4. The waste/recycling shown in the landscape sketch plan is in a high-profile location between Buildings B2 and B3 – if the break in parking at this location was a featured amenity, it would serve as a much better sequential approach to Building B3, the real estate developer’s future head office.			
Applicant Response			
<i>Plaza first design principles have been incorporated into the design of buildings B1 and B4. The waste and recycling facilities have been moved.</i>			
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.	Further Review Recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The Panel appreciates its dialogue with the Applicant regarding location options of parking entrances and requests design integration with pedestrian safety-first with plaza-first principles.			
Applicant Response			
<i>Based on the discussion with UDRP the parking and ramp locations have been moved. This detail will be included with the development permit.</i>			
8	Other	The Waste/Recycling area should not be detrimental to the project’s public realm activation and attractability.	Further Review Recommended
Applicant Response			
As noted in Topic 6, above.			
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.	Further Review Recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The Panel encourages the Applicant to continue pursuing with The City a proposed enhancement of path of travel connection (within the 10 min walkshed) to the Heritage LRT Station.			
Applicant Response			
<i>We are pursuing discussions with the City to improve the pedestrian connection to the LRT station.</i>			
10	Regional pathway 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			
n/a			
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.	Further Review Recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The Panel requests clarification on any planned supporting cycle pathway systems and how bicycle storage and related facilities will fit into the proposed buildings.			

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	Applicant Response		
	<i>Details on the cycle facilities will be provided with the DP/</i>		
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.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends improved crosswalks and walkable connections with a hierarchy of entry points to engage and activate the placemaking value of the park and associated mixed-uses. Points of arrival along the park edge should be emphasized, with the arrival place reflecting the scale and importance of the access route.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>We have considered the comment and amended the park design to define the entry points.</i>		
13	Pathways through site	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends the pathways and sidewalks effectively connect with improvements to street crossings /crosswalks strengthening interface between the park and community association building and pathway system, located immediately south of 78 Avenue SW.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>This comment has been addressed and details will be provided with the DP</i>		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	As noted above, in Topic 13.		
	Applicant Response		
	See response to comment 13		
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends internal sightlines capture the essence of the park open space and the permeable passageways between buildings in a meaningful expression of community gathering space. The sightlines should intentionally offer foreground and background interest, in each direction.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>This comment has been considered and details will be provided with the DP.</i>		
16	Vehicular interface		Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel recommends a plaza-first approach at courtyard-like surface parking areas at Buildings B1 and B4.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>This comment has been addressed and a plaza-first approach has been used. Details at DP.</i>		
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	Endorse

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel discussed the massing relationships to context with the Applicant.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Endorse
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel endorses the park open space at the south end of the site with maximum sun exposure.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Endorse
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel discussed massing orientation to street edges, complementary to existing massing on south side of street, along 78 Avenue SW.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
21	Massing distribution on site		Endorse
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel endorses the distribution of the massing on site.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Massing contribution to public realm at-grade is greatest at the north end and west side of the proposed park site. The Panel suggested operable doors would optimize the indoor/outdoor relationship of the focal building interfaces of south-facing B4 and west-facing B2.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>This comment has been addressed and details will be provided with the DP.</i>		
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.	Endorse
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel generally endorses the activation of park edges and the overlooking common areas within interfacing buildings to the park.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
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.	Further Review Recommended

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	UDRP Commentary		
	Although the Panel generally endorses massing distribution, pedestrian level comfort -wind information was not provided at this preliminary stage of design development.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
26	Pedestrian level comfort - snow	Incorporate strategies to prevent snow drifting. Test assumptions and responses via Snow Drifting Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Although the Panel generally endorses massing distribution, pedestrian level comfort -snow information was not provided at this preliminary stage of design development.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
27	Weather protection	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Building B2 frontage weather protection is not provided along the east-facing retail frontage, has minimum sidewalk width with no trees, and parking along the full frontage. The Panel does not endorse the proposed condition.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>The west side of Building B2 is intended to be the pedestrian activated frontage.</i>		
28	Night time design		Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not discussed at this preliminary stage of design development.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
29	Barrier free design	Site access to be equal for able and disabled individuals. Provide sloped surfaces 5% grade or less vs ramps.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not enough detail provided at this preliminary stage of design.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
30	Winter city	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel endorse the maximum exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Noted</i>		
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