

## UDRP Response

### Urban Design Review Panel Comments

<b>Date:</b>	July 25, 2018	
<b>Time:</b>	1:00 pm	
<b>Panel Members:</b>	<b>Present:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>
	Terry Klassen (Chair)	Janice Liebe (chair)
	Robert LeBlond	Chad Russill (co-chair)
	Glen Pardoe	Bruce Nelligan
		Jack Vanstone
		Gary Mundy
		Eric Toker
		Amelia Hollingshurst
		Ben Bailey
		Yogeshwar Navagrah
		Chris Hardwicke
<b>Advisor:</b>	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
<b>Application number:</b>	<b>DP2018-2882</b>	
<b>Municipal address:</b>	1315, 1317, 1319, 1321, 1323 14 Av SW	
<b>Community:</b>	Beltline	
<b>Project description:</b>	New: Multi-Residential Development (1 building)	
<b>Review:</b>	first	
<b>File Manager:</b>	Desmond Bliek	
<b>City Wide Urban Design:</b>	Xia Zhang	
<b>Applicant:</b>	Battistella Developments	
<b>Architect:</b>		
<b>Owner:</b>		
<b>Ranking:</b>	<b>Further Review Recommended</b>	

### Summary

Indicative of the project brand, UDRP understands from the Applicant's description, Nude is intentionally a simple, paired back, streamlined, minimalistic design (thus the name). The eighteen (18) storey residential tower is just outside of the T.O.D. distance, with parking title separate from the unit, and bike-share in Calgary on the horizon.

Regarding accessibility, separation and setback, UDRP understands – accessibility has been addressed from front street to back lane; tower separation is slightly less than what is required to the east; and the podium interface has been brought forward.

In reviewing this application, the Panel's comments are focused on the street level public realm, in the context of balancing minimalization with distinctive outcomes. Two primary areas of UDRP's interest come to the forefront – first, the podium interface with the semi-public landscape and second, the landscape contribution to the neighbourhood setting.

UDRP feels the entrance experiences are like interfacing outdoor and indoor rooms that have not fully realized their potential. Imagine these minimalistic Nude moments contributing to the streetscape – like a light breeze refreshing the location with distinction. Arriving and leaving these entrance rooms will be an every day occurrence – they should be prodigious threshold moments. There is no pretending that the thoughtfulness demonstrated in the scale and setting of the entryways will either cause a swell of respect or leave a flat impression. The Panel's perception so stated, for entry to the main building and for the individual street level loft units, currently leaves a flat impression. The scale and the setting of the main and loft unit entries should better respond to the scale of the inside and outside volume of space. For example, they could animate a family of Nude branded entrances that are say a combination of – tall, short, wide, narrow. Humour aside, the position and playful details of their shape and the body of their spaces can and should expose placemaking in all its dimensions.

## UDRP Response

### Applicant Response

October 4, 2018

#### Citywide Urban Design comments

1. Consider providing a more desirable podium height of min. 2 storeys (9.0 metres) and max. 6 storeys to formulate a podium height to street right-of-way width ratio of 1:1-1:2. Consider stepping back the street wall by a min. 2.5m at the upper levels of the building.

2.

Podium increased 1.2 m, 2 storeys

3. A portion of the building frontage along 14 Avenue SW sets back beyond 6.0 m max. front setback line. If the intent is to provide an at-grade common amenity space, this north-facing space should be designed to be comfortable and conducive to pedestrian use with a variety of design treatments (such as seating, landscaping, public art, lighting, and natural surveillance, etc.). The privacy of the adjacent ground level residential unit should be respected.

Orienting 3 units to the side yard creates a mews and activates what is typically dead side yard space on these types of developments. It provides for more articulation at the main floor rather than a flat façade property line to property line, which in turn highlights to a higher degree the buildings main entrance than would typically be the case.

4. Amend the landscape plan to show potential boulevard trees along 14 Avenue SW to enhance the existing residential streetscape character. If utility line assignments preclude this, trees should be provided back of the sidewalk, integrated into the overall landscape plan.

Boulevard trees to be added where line assignments will allow. Need DSSP to know where pipes will enter the building.

5. Clarify if the ground-level units are designed to be accessible units. Provide a desirable grade separation between the ground floor level of residential units and public sidewalks, to offer privacy for residents. The optimal range of grade separation is 0.5m to 0.9m (3-6 steps) to balance accessibility and privacy. If no grade separation is provided, indicate the alternative strategy for achieving residential privacy.

Main floor units are at grade

6. Accentuate the design of the main building entrance, for example, using a visually light canopy, and/or architectural articulations such as continuous recesses or projections running vertically up the building façade of the upper building levels.

New entrance canopy created to accentuate building entrance.

7. Consider using a variety of articulations in the building facades (including colour and material contrast, projection bays, emphasis of building corners, site and building lighting, etc.) to distinguish and reinforce the building design.

Podium provides significant articulation at NW corner. Tower provides through entire floor plate. The NE and SW corners are also differentiated by materials (corrugated metal).

8. Consider stepping back some of the upper level units so that the building separation requirement is met, the building top is better expressed and an interesting skyline is created.

Design interest is created by building articulation, change in materials and at the roof with an amenity room and roof top garden. In addition an LED blue band at the top with "Hide Nothing" will create visual interest at the top especially at night.

## UDRP Response

Urban Vitality			
	Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
1	<b>Retail street diversity</b>	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.	Further review recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	While the Applicant's desire for uniformity and simplicity is noted, the concern of the Panel is that the podium looks like it could be residential or commercial and does not exude sufficient residential characteristics. The Applicant's discussion with the Panel did indicate the loft units are adaptable to evolving into commercial uses, should the neighbourhood so redevelop.		
	Applicant Response		
	<i>Townhome entrances redesigned to provide clear individual identity by material changes in the elevation, adding canopies and creating individual outdoor courtyards.</i>		
2	<b>Retail street transparency, porosity</b>	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	N/A		
	Applicant Response		
3	<b>Pedestrian-first design</b>	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 simple, minimalist seating ledge, along the continuous planter wall for example, connecting streetscape to main entrance would better support the pedestrian experience. The passage way to the lane should include wrap-around landscape with at least one tree or wall-climbing vine or simple, understated curb planter at foundation – something that can sustainably green the lane.		
	Applicant response		
	<b>Planters raised to provide for possible seating ledge on avenue. The mews area from the street to the lane is landscaped.</b>		
4	<b>Entry definition / legibility</b>	Entry points are clear and legible	
	UDRP Commentary		
	As noted in Summary, the main building entrance could be more legible and engaging from the street. Perhaps a larger or oversized door. Also, doors to individual street level lofts are all flush with the building face. It might be good to break up the face with some different insets or push-outs for doorways or uniquely differentiating qualities in the doors themselves. Street face is difficult to identify as being residential in nature. Based on the information provided, it could just as easily be commercial, which may or may not be a desirable appearance at this location.		
	Applicant Response		
	<b>Main entry door enlarged, and canopy with signage added to clearly identify main entry. As per #1 townhome entries re-designed.</b>		
5	<b>Residential multi-level units at grade</b>	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		
	Patios are proposed, but the relationship of the street level residential to the street are very uniform and could perhaps benefit from delineation along the building face with unique characterizations.		
	Applicant Response		
	<b>Landscaped courtyards redesigned</b>		

## UDRP Response

6	<b>At grade parking</b>	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	N/A		
	Applicant Response		
7	<b>Parking entrances</b>	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		
	Adequate as proposed.		
	Applicant Response		
8	<b>Landscape</b>		Further review recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The second item of note related to landscape architecture and the apparent landscape deficiency. The issue of soil depth above the underground parking structure is noted and should be addressed with appropriate plant material selections. The Panel commented on seeking a more layered landscape design with enhanced small tree planting appropriate to cold-climate planters. The Panel encourages the Applicant to diversify the characteristics and qualities of the landscape street edge and the approaches to building entries.		
	The deficiency of trees and complementary landscape are evident in the plan views and sketch up renderings at street level, in the boulevard and for rooftop amenity area(s). UDRP suggests that the Applicant provide more trees back of sidewalk to interface with the podium and the building as whole. More trees back of sidewalk should interface and/or pair with an unconfirmed boulevard tree line assignment.		
	Applicant Response		
	Landscape at main level and roof top re-designed. Boulevard trees to be added once line assignments identified.		
<b>Urban Connectivity</b> <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>			
	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Best Practice</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
9	<b>LRT station connections</b>	Supports LRT use via legible, dedicated pedestrian pathways to stations with direct routes. Avoids desire lines / shortcutting through parking areas.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	N/A		
	Applicant Response		
10	<b>Regional pathway connections</b>	Supports walkability via intentional urban design connections to pathway systems.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	N/A		
	Applicant Response		
11	<b>Cycle path connections</b>	Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to bicycle storage at grade.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	N/A		

## UDRP Response

Applicant Response			
12	<b>Walkability - connection to adjacent neighbourhoods / districts / key urban features</b>	Extend existing and provide continuous pedestrian pathways. Extend pedestrian pathway materials across driveways and lanes to emphasize pedestrian use.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
Adequate as proposed.			
Applicant Response			
13	<b>Pathways through site</b>	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.	
UDRP Commentary			
N/A			
Applicant Response			
14	<b>Open space networks and park systems</b>	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	
UDRP Commentary			
N/A			
Applicant Response			
15	<b>Views and vistas</b>	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
Adequate as proposed.			
Applicant Response			
16	<b>Vehicular interface</b>		Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
Parking supply is relaxed for tenants as well as for visitor. Might be worthwhile to try and reduce the variance for visitor parking, perhaps even at the expense of tenant parking.			
Applicant Response			
<i>Parking study being submitted to Transportation</i>			
17	<b>Other</b>		
Applicant Response			
<b>Contextual Response</b> <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass, spacing and placement on site in consideration to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i>			
<b>Topic</b>		<b>Best Practice</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
18	<b>Massing relationship to context</b>	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic	Support
UDRP Commentary			
Tower separation is less than by-law, but appropriate given the limitations.			
Applicant Response			
19	<b>Massing impacts on sun shade</b>	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
Shade study required as part of DTR. Not provided for UDRP review.			

## UDRP Response

Applicant Response			
<i>Sun shadow study completed for DTR 1 re-submission</i>			
20	<b>Massing orientation to street edges</b>	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	
UDRP Commentary			
Podium contains loft residential units. Building face is flat and not broken up by delineation or inset/push-outs of doors or walls. Very sterile and perhaps in need of some additional attention. Planters are large and should perhaps be considered as part of a larger scale layered landscape design that as shown appears deficient. The need to deal with the underground parkade vis a vis soil depth is noted.			
Applicant Response			
<i>Main floor lofts' entrances and landscaped area re-designed.</i>			
21	<b>Massing distribution on site</b>		
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
22	<b>Massing contribution to public realm at grade</b>	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
23	<b>Other</b>		
Applicant Response			
<b>Safety and Diversity</b> <i>Promote design that accommodates the broadest range of users and uses. Achieve a sense of comfort and security at all times.</i>			
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Best Practice</b>		<b>Ranking</b>
24	<b>Safety and security</b>	CPTED principles are to be employed - good overlook, appropriate lighting, good view lines, glazing in lobbies and entrances.	Support
UDRP Commentary			
Adequate as proposed.			
Applicant Response			
25	<b>Pedestrian level comfort – wind</b>	Incorporate strategies to block wind, particularly prevailing wind and downdrafts. Test assumptions and responses via Pedestrian Level Wind Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
26	<b>Pedestrian level comfort – snow</b>	Incorporate strategies to prevent snow drifting. Test assumptions and responses via Snow Drifting Analysis. Particular attention to winter conditions.	
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			

## UDRP Response

27	Weather protection	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
28	Night time design		Further review recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Lighting design mentioned by Applicant, however, no detail or illustrated rendering provided for UDRP review. Indenting doors and oversizing doors into window wall of podium and illumination of window wall should be considered.		
	Applicant Response		
	Night time rendering completed		
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		
	Adequate as proposed.		
	Applicant Response		
30	Winter city	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
31	Other		
	Applicant Response		
Service / Utility Design 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.			
Topic		Commentary	Ranking
32	(specify)		TBD