

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date:	July 25, 2018	
Time:	2:00 pm	
Panel Members:	Present:	Absent:
	Terry Klassen (acting chair)	Janice Liebe (chair)
	Robert LeBlond	Chad Russill (co-chair)
	Yogeshwar Navagrah	Bruce Nelligan
		Jack Vanstone
		Gary Mundy
		Eric Toker
		Amelia Hollingshurst
		Ben Bailey
		Chris Hardwicke
Advisor:	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number:	DP2018-3019	
Municipal address:	901 68 Street SE	
Community:	Red Carpet	
Project description:	New: Multi-Residential Development (8 buildings, 9 phases); Sign - Class A: Address Sign (2)	
Review:	First (reviewed twice as LOC2015-0085)	
File Manager:	Christine Leung	
City Wide Urban Design:	Lothar Wiwjorra	
Applicant:	Casola Koppe Architects	
Architect:	Casola Koppe Architects	
Owner:	Lansdowne Equity Ventures Ltd.	
Ranking:	Further Review Recommended	

Summary

UDRP, in its review of the DP2018-3019 application, recognizes the Applicant's positive and progressive efforts toward continuous improvement in the proposed multi-phase development. As such, UDRP offers what it hopes is constructive comment to advance similar responsiveness for the first phase of development.

The first phase will be a multi-residential development within townhouse building forms that have units with direct grade-access to private roads that are connected to adjacent public streets. Given the proposed street design and land use framework, the proposed looped layout shows street-oriented buildings.

UDRP supports the public realm intent of how the residential dwelling units will contribute enhancement of the connecting streets, sidewalks and pathways.

Where UDRP feels the plan should be improved are in the general areas following:

- Establishing a hierarchy of gateways or entry points, contributing to a more complete building/streetscape/landscape experience for residents as they move from one kind of space to another
- Optimizing semi-public and semi-private common or shared spaces between residential buildings
- Extending the shared spaces' character and qualities of accessibility from the sidewalks into private street pedestrian crosswalks – by equalizing the transitional grade change for all modes (modifying storm water management design, if necessary)
- Facilitating or making future provision for mode choice with parking options – aligning flexible transitions that can morph into innovative outcomes for parking – small cars, possible future need to accommodate electric charging stations, bicycle parking areas (in lockers or otherwise secured space), etc.

UDRP feels the suggested improvements are equally relevant to the character of the proposed homes, their street-oriented interface and the overall landscape setting.

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

From a best practices perspective, UDRP recommends further review, to optimize the project's general characterization – in the context of Calgary's strategic urbanism – and in the planning, design and development of affordable housing.

Applicant Response

August 24, 2018

We appreciate UDRP's feedback and have made our best efforts to amend the plans to the satisfaction of this panel. While we have revised the drawings to provide a hierarchy of entry points, the landscaping has been revised to provide for trees on both sides of the vehicle entry at 14th Street, promote the interaction of the park space between buildings 2&5, and provide for a pedestrian path from the corner of 14 & 68 where we have added community signage. We have optimized the landscaping as much as possible and removed the chain-link fence between buildings 8&9 to create a courtyard that uses paving and landscaping to help delineate private spaces but allowing for social interaction within these units as a semi-private space that is open to itself, but not the general public. We have removed the waste and recycling from the entry point at 14th street and have sited it next to the mailboxes so the residents will can check their mail and take out their garbage at the same time. We are unable to create changes in grade for the pedestrian walks because of our storm water design, but have been advised that planning will accept painted pedestrian crossings which are indicated on the site plan. We have also opted not to include electric charging stations for this phase, but we can consider it for future phases, particularly phase 7 & 8 which will have more public parking and space to allow for different vehicle types.

We have however, included bicycle parking stalls. We feel as though we have provided an exceptional pedestrian and public realm, particularly as this is intended as an affordable development. We would request that since we have carefully considered and implemented many of UDRP's suggestions, that further review not delay our CPC date.

Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Talicia Wagner
Casola Kopp Architects Ltd.

Previous Comments: LOC2015-0085

June 28, 2017

UDRP appreciated the opportunity to provide initial and second review input to this project at the land use application stage. Administration indicated initial concerns around four main issues including sound attenuation along 68 Street, walkability, pedestrian vehicle connections to adjacent neighbourhoods and landscaping. UDRP shares Administration's concern about walkability and open space planning along with effective and elegant traffic calming outcomes that support all modes sharing the public realm. Specifically, UDRP's concerns regarding the lack of hierarchy for the street and pathway system and variety of housing products within the development have been addressed appropriately. Key points addressed are the following: Orientation of built form that reinforces the streets by fronting units to the street. This includes fronting retail and housing onto the main entry drive (the extension of Applewood), reorienting units to face the primary residential street running north south from the traffic circle on both sides of this street, so that front doors, porches address this main residential street, and include more diverse housing design along this street. Park spaces initially felt residual, now occur more prominent and central in the development. These should be designed to achieve intentional connectivity, use and design to encourage use, and to improve the environment for housing fronting them. Finally, more information is required on specific dimensioning of the public realm from face of building to street that identifies the green space reserve, street tree realm, scale of sidewalks, reserve for patio or other private open space fronting streets etc. There

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

remains a general concern that not enough space is available to provide for the landscape public realm that is illustrated in the precedent images.

May 3, 2017

UDRP appreciated the opportunity to provide some input to this project at the land use application stage. Administration indicated some concerns around four main issues including sound attenuation along 68th Street, walkability, pedestrian/vehicle connections to adjacent neighbourhoods and landscaping. UDRP shares Administration's concern about walkability and open space planning. Specifically, UDRP has concerns regarding the lack of hierarchy for the street and pathway system and variety of housing products within the development. Key points to be addressed are the following: Orientation of built form that reinforces the streets by fronting units to the street. This includes fronting retail and housing onto the main entry drive (the extension of Applewood), reorienting units to face the primary residential street running north south from the traffic circle on both sides of this street, placing garages to the rear of this street so that front doors, porches address this main residential street, and include more diverse housing design along this street. Park spaces currently identified feel residual. These should be designed to have intentional connectivity, use and design to encourage use, and to improve the environment for housing fronting them. Finally, more information is required on specific dimensioning of the public realm from face of building to street that identifies the green space reserve, street tree realm, scale of sidewalks, reserve for patio or other private open space fronting streets etc. There is a general concern that not enough space is available to provide for the landscape / public realm that is illustrated in the precedent images.

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		
	Not applicable to this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
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		
	Not applicable to this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
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		
	a) Where the Boulevard street connects with the Crescent street, the pedestrian crosswalk should be elevated across the intersection splitting the 150mm difference, between the street and the sidewalk (street gradually gently ramping up to the intersection by plus 75mm and the interfacing sidewalks with shallower ramps by minus 75mm).		
	b) Extend clearly-marked, vehicle-rated, consistent-material sidewalks that continuously span driveways along the Crescent.		
	c) Sidewalk should be curb-less at the community mailbox (at the same level as the visitor parking area, i.e. flush with street surface).		
	d) Clearly delineate pedestrian ramp design at all interfacing conditions.		
	Applicant response		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	We are proposing painted crosswalks to achieve the same intent. As discussed with CPAG, the storm water and civil design is such that it would create complications to raise the grades for the pedestrian crossings.		
	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
4	<p>a) UDRP feels strongly that the point of entry setting is important, and as currently composed from 14th Avenue SE – Access 3 needs further review.</p> <p>b) Clarity and legibility need to harmonize in creating a focused sense of arrival – it needs to be a more appealing welcome than the proposed wide-throated road, square-cornered layout with central waste/recycling facilities, one-side tree-canopied road that doesn't shield headlights from entering interior spaces of the exposed south units in Building 3.</p> <p>c) UDRP recommends further review and options to explore the feasibility for the following: i) tree-lined entry way, both sides; ii) mountable median suitable, for Fire and EMS, and transitional from public roads to private streets; iii) auto-turn back-out analysis to find a more elegant and smooth transition for dwelling unit car movements and for people walking and cycling on the pathway along the south boundary, to delineate sufficient space for buffering tree(s); iv) low profile planting beds to buffer predominant views (accessing and egressing) of the Molok waste bins.</p> <p>d) As previously introduced – arbour entries to pathways and common areas and amenity open spaces, including an arbour over the community mailboxes – for streetscape integration of building architecture into the landscape.</p>		
	Applicant Response		
	We have narrowed the Access from 14 th Avenue SE for storm water management and development engineering, which has allowed extra space to provide trees on the West side of the entry. We have rounded the corner and removed the waste and recycling facilities. We have pushed the pedestrian access to against the property line to allow for a row of trees flanking both sides of this entry. As discussed with CPAG, we understand that Planning and Transportation does not recommend adding a median, particularly as this access will not be the main access for the comprehensive development.		
	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
	UDRP Commentary		
5	Not clear if there will be patios or decks with flanking privacy/wind screens. Recommend removal of interior fencing for a common shared open space between Buildings 8 and 9 and behind Buildings 3 and 4.		
	Applicant Response		
	Interior fencing have been removed between buildings 8 and 9 with enhanced landscaping provided to create semi-private spaces. We have opted to keep the private yards at building 3, but have added landscaping to enhance this yard space. The space between buildings 8 & 9 can start to speak to the treatment for all yards that are behind the units on Ellisborough Boulevard, but since the space between buildings 3 & 4 is not part of a larger network, and the buildings are not oriented towards each other, we feel as though this is a nice compromise.		
	At grade parking	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
6	Adjacent at-grade parking, the Showy Mountain Ash trees in the Boulevard street should be confirmed or revised if necessary regarding size of area and soil volume for this type of tree.		
	Applicant Response		
	The landscaping has been revised to low water, and the Showy Mountain Ash is no longer specified. We have confirmation from the Landscape designer (818 Landscape Architects) that the plantings in the Boulevard have adequate soil depth.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

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.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not applicable to this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
8	Acknowledged.		
	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		
	Not applicable to this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
10	Acknowledged.		
	Regional pathway connections	Supports walkability via intentional urban design connections to pathway systems.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	As noted in previous submissions, not directly relevant to initial phase of development.		
11	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
	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		
12	No indication in the Applicant's package where or how cycling will be integrated within this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Bike racks have been introduced beside the mailboxes. Residents can store their bikes in their private garages or houses. The scale of this development is not such that separate cycling paths are required, however we do have a 3000mm wide regional pathway along 68 Street SE that would be an excellent connection for cyclists. As this is primarily a residential neighbourhood, it is fair for bikes and cars to share the road like they typically would.		
	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.	NA
13	UDRP Commentary		
	As noted in previous submissions, not directly relevant to initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
13	Pathways through site	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	Pathways in the landscape provide an important looping network with the sidewalks. UDRP feels there is opportunity to strategically introduce the entry 'arbour vernacular' as part of the pathway experience, at entry points.		
	Applicant Response		
	The entry's have been enhanced with trees and have interpreted the 'arbour vernacular' though these entries.		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	<p>a) The pathway locations currently divide the amenity open space between Buildings 2 and 5. UDRP suggests combining and aligning the pathway and sidewalk as one, to one side or the other so that it organizes the proportions of pathway/hard surface and planting areas and available lawn area to create useable open space.</p> <p>b) Similarly, the unit-sized fencing that delineates private backyards between Buildings 8 and 9 and at the back of Buildings 3 and 4 appear busy and cluttered. Challenging for mowing. Much easier to maintain if only the common area is fenced, and the composite open space is shared between all units. The semi-private open space could be celebrated as common area – with entry arbours. The homeowner's association, once established, could draft good neighbour policies /guidelines for patios, decks, wind/privacy screens and maintenance of the semi-private common area.</p>		
	Applicant Response		
	The amenity space between buildings 2&5 has been revised. Although this space still primarily be used as a thoroughfare to the adjacent transit stop, benches have been placed within the green space to encourage users to step beyond the boundaries of the path. As mentioned in previous comments, the amenity space between buildings 8&9 has been revised to remove the fencing that separates the units, and has introduced at grade patios for building 8 and uses landscaping instead of fencing to create semi-private yard spaces that are still apart of a larger courtyard. We have opted to provide for a wood fence on the perimeter as to maintain this space for the residents of these buildings only.		
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Although not directly applicable to this initial phase of development, there is a linear pathway connection with long view to Phase 7 commercial development. It will need to effectively interface with the adjoining phased residential development, an extension of the type of residential development in Phase 1.		
	Applicant Response		
16	We will work to address this interface in greater detail at the development of phases 2, 3, 4 & 7.		
	Vehicular interface		Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	<p>a) The Boulevard roadway will feel like a primary street with angled parking on both sides.</p> <p>b) A variety of parking options would facilitate a more dynamic streetscape – if consideration given to small car parking, maybe motor cycle parking near cross-walks to address the potential conflict of cars backing up across cross-walks, possible future need to accommodate electric charging stations, bicycle parking areas (in lockers or otherwise secured space), etc.</p> <p>c) Consider seasonal landscape best-fit, urban-style planters to attractively down-size selected parking areas for small cars.</p>		
	Applicant Response		
	We would suggest that providing stalls that meet City standard can be utilized for every type of use where small car parking is only available for a select group, particularly as we do not have a single stall to spare. We have introduced bike parking even though it is not required by the bylaw. Since this is a Condominium, the parking will be assigned, and the visitor stalls need to accommodate the maximum number of users.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

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		
	Adjacent relationships are compatible.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Generally, low rise development in this initial phase of development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	As noted in Summary above.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
21	Massing distribution on site		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Support in context of larger planning framework.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The flanking interface of buildings to streets and pathways could be further enhanced with expanded use of architectural entry theming, particularly where pathways intersect with streets.		
	Applicant Response		
	The buildings along the boulevard have porches to promote an animated streetscape. The interface to streets from buildings has been designed as a complete streets with trees on both sides of the walk. The buildings do incorporate a degree of architectural detail and variety of materials and roof lines.		
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.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	In addition to street lighting, not clear if ambient light from adjacent residential units is sufficient or if additional pathway lighting is proposed.		
	Applicant Response		
	Pedestrian scaled decorative lighting has been added to the landscaping plan.		
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
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not clear if patios or decks with privacy /wind screens will be provided for each unit?		
	Applicant Response		
	Yes, each balcony/deck has a privacy screen.		
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		
	Information not available for review.		
	Applicant Response		
	The roads are private and the whole development is a condominium for which the road maintenance is included. The snow will not actually just be plowed into giant piles but will be managed appropriately and removed from the site if necessary.		
27	Weather protection	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	As illustrated in building elevations.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged.		
28	Night time design		Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Will landscape amenity areas include lighting?		
	Applicant Response		
	Yes. Decorative lighting has been provided in these spaces. Overall sight lighting to be done by Enmax.		
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		
	a) Pedestrian ramps not shown – once delineated, ramp locations should illustrate best practice in safe, accessible street crossings.		
	b) Angled parking stalls that back out across cross-walks are not best-practice and a public safety concern.		
	Applicant Response		
	Depressed curbs have been shown at each corner for pedestrian crossing. It has also been noted on the site plan for phase 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		
	a) Impromptu socializing areas, such as at the community mailboxes, might be better positioned in a central location, encouraging a short walk to pick up the mail. As a shared central gathering space, it might also serve as a traffic calming measure.		
	b) Planting tight to the pathway does not provide a clear zone for stepping aside, if necessary. Plant growth will require a higher level of maintenance to prevent the vegetation from		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

	encroaching onto the pathway. And for snow removal, the edges will trap drifting snow and likely snag snow removal equipment – mechanical damage, most evident the following Spring.		
	Applicant Response		
	Acknowledged. See responses above that address this.		
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	URW	Planting ornamental grasses or other types of perennials is suggested in URW areas. Setback requirements prevent planting trees. If nothing is planted between driveways, people may start using the in-between lawn areas for additional /visitor parking.	Further Review Recommended
	Applicant Response		
Bushes have been added along streets adjacent to URW to enhance the street. The URW areas have been modified since reviewed by URDP, and the planting of ornamental grasses in these areas would not necessarily be the ideal location for decorative grasses.			