

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

### Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date:	June 25, 2018	
Time:		
Attendance:		
Panel Members:	<b>Present:</b> Brian Horton (vice-chair) Robert LeBlond Yogeshwar Navagrah Terry Klassen	<b>Absent:</b> Janice Liebe (chair) Chad Russill Bruce Nelligan Philip Vandermey
Advisor:	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number:	PE2016-01557 / DP2017-4891	
Municipal address:	1802 11 St SE	
Community:	Ramsay	
Project description:	New: Multi-Residential Development, Retail and Consumer Service (1 building, 144 units)	
Review:	First	
File Manager:	Jihad Bitar	
City Wide Urban Design:	Afrah Rayes	
Applicant:	S2 Architecture	
Architect:	S2 Architecture	
Owner:	11-Street Developments	
Ranking:		

### Summary

As the first major development adjacent to the future LRT station, this project is an ambitious and pioneering project for Ramsay. Although UDRP appreciates the at-grade retail and upper floor residential mix of uses this project proposes, UDRP believes that there has been a missed opportunity to create a development that contributes to the unique character and identity of Ramsay. UDRP feels that the design of the project is generic and would benefit and would be improved by responding to the local architectural style and eclectic mix of uses present in the neighbourhood. UDRP is particularly concerned with the lack of character of the at-grade retail, as the monotonous design of the long expanse of frontage along 11 street does not result in a fine-grained retail character along the street. UDRP suggests that by varying the height of the podium and materials along the retail façade, this condition would be improved. UDRP also believes that the area between the building rail ROW could be activated by ground floor uses that are oriented towards the tracks. This area presents an opportunity to introduce light industrial or artist uses that are frequent in Ramsay.

Although the applicant provided a thorough analysis of the existing context and renderings were provided with the presentation package, UDRP would have appreciated additional renderings that illustrated the building in the context of the neighbourhood. Particularly, UDRP would like to understand how the proposed building relates to its immediate neighbour, the Ramsay Design Centre building.

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

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.	Further review required
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
	Please see comment above regarding improving the retail street diversity. UDRP is concerned with the monotony and generic design of the at-grade retail.		
	<b>Applicant Response</b>		
	<i>The treatment of the podium at street level has been reviewed and adjusted as per the UDRP comments. The contemporary continuously glazed podium has been divided into 9 smaller bays by bring the podium brickwork down to grade in between the individual CRUs. Further, several bays on either side of the principal residential entrance have been stepped back to create a larger plaza space that offers opportunities for retailers to bring product and café seating into the public realm. Corner of the podium have been articulated with increased massing height and taller areas of glazing to provided varied vertical expression.</i>		
2	Retail street transparency, porosity	Retail street maximizes glazing - 70% and more. Maintains view into and out of retail, avoids display-only windows.	Support with comment
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
	UDRP recommends relocating the proposed bicycle racks that are situated in front of the southern retail bay as these will inhibit views into the retail bay.		
	<b>Applicant Response</b>		
	<i>We have reviewed the location of bicycle racks throughout the development and relocated them to improve pedestrian circulation and to provide convenient bicycle storage locations close to entrances. As bicycles are well utilized in the Ramsay area we are also proposing additional bicycle rack locations along the fairly wide City Sidewalk.</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.	Support with comment
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
	UDRP would prefer that the vehicle access be combined with the neighbouring property, but we understand that this was investigated and deemed not feasible.		
	<b>Applicant response</b>		
	<i>This was our preference as well, but is not an option.</i>		
4	Entry definition / legibility	Entry points are clear and legible	Further review required
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
	The residential lobby entrance requires improved definition.		
	<b>Applicant Response</b>		
	<i>Through the development of the podium, the bays on either side of the principal residential entrance have been stepped back in order to create public gathering space. This gesture also serves to provide emphasis on the residential entrance spatially. The stepped back podium to the south of the residential entrance further highlights the form of the entry canopy that is now visible at grade when approached from the south. Further, vertical signage has been added to the south of the residential entry.</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.	N/A
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
	<b>Applicant Response</b>		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

6	<b>At grade parking</b>	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Support with comment
<b>Commentary</b>			
UDRP supports the placement of parking between the building and tracks, but suggests that this space could be better animated with uses that front this parking area.			
<b>Applicant Response</b>			
<i>We have reviewed multiple use options for this area that have ranged from commercial to varying types of residential. Market driven feedback that has been provided by our client has assisted in the development of our revised solution. Architecturally we developed the two bays at the north end of the site to have storefront access on both the principal west elevation and along the rear east elevation. In response to the provided UDRP feedback, we have worked with our landscape architect to improve the public space offering at the back of the project and to improve the exterior link from the parking area to the retail spaces along the west elevation. Further, we have removed 7 parking spaces along the east side of the site and redefined this area as a public amenity space for the residents. The proposal for this area now shows planters, grassed space, and hard surfaced seating areas with a trellis.</i>			
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
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>			
<b>Applicant Response</b>			
8	<b>Other</b>		
<b>Applicant Response</b>			
<b>Urban Connectivity</b> 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.			
	<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.	Support with comment
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>			
UDRP recommends that the applicant work with the City team to ensure that pedestrian connections to the LRT station are legible.			
<b>Applicant Response</b>			
<i>Through discussion with the planning department, transportation, and the green line we have adjusted the proposed development for the west side of our site. There is now a clear 3m+ side walk that links the future LRT station to the north of our site with the commercial street to the south of our site. We have shown how this generous sidewalk area will work with the future bus layby at the north end of our site and have further proposed an array of City trees.</i>			
10	<b>Regional pathway connections</b>	Supports LRT use via legible, dedicated pedestrian pathways to stations with direct routes. Avoids desire lines / shortcutting through parking areas.	
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>			
<b>Applicant Response</b>			
<i>We are proposing a direct and dedicated connection across our site that links the future LRT station to the north to the commercial street to the south.</i>			
11	<b>Cycle path connections</b>	Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to	N/A

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

	bicycle storage at grade.	
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	
	<b>Applicant Response</b>	
	<i>We have provided for discrete and convenient bicycle parking between city trees along the front elevation. We have provided additional class 2 and class 1 parking spaces at grade along the east (rear) side of the site.</i>	
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.
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	
	<b>Applicant Response</b>	
13	<b>Pathways through site</b>	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	
	UDRP suggests that a pedestrian connection between the parking located at the rear of the building and the retail be created through the building lobby.	
	<b>Applicant Response</b>	
	<i>We have reviewed this item at length with the City's Urban Design department. In response to concerns for the safety of the residential owners of the building we have opted not to extend the use of this space to commercial patrons. We have also acknowledge that with the increase scale of the amenity space along the east side of the property there are now only 10 dedicated commercial parking spaces. The remainder of the at grade parking spaces are dedicated for residential guests which have convenient access to the elevator lobby via the rear secured residential entry.</i>	
	<i>The commercial patrons have been provided a pass through the building available to them through the two northern most commercial bays which have entrances located along both the west and east sides of the building. In addition, the exterior connection along the south side of the building has been further developed with curbs and lighting to better define and protect the pedestrian access route. Further, to reduce the distance of travel for commercial patrons the dedicated commercial stalls have been relocated to the southern portion of the parking area.</i>	
14	<b>Open space networks and park systems</b>	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	
	<b>Applicant Response</b>	
15	<b>Views and vistas</b>	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	
	<b>Applicant Response</b>	
16	<b>Vehicular interface</b>	
	<b>UDRP Commentary</b>	



## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

<b>Applicant Response</b>		
17	Other	
<i>Applicant Response</i>		
<b>Contextual Response</b> Optimize built form with respect to mass, spacing and placement on site in consideration to adjacent uses, heights and densities		
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Best Practice</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
18	<b>Massing relationship to context</b>	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic
		Support with comment
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
This is the first development project in this area so will be out of scale with the context in short term, but UDRP believes this is the appropriate massing for this location.		
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
<i>The massing and scale of this project has been developed in response to the approved new landuse.</i>		
19	<b>Massing impacts on sun shade</b>	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites
		Support.
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
20	<b>Massing orientation to street edges</b>	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.
		Further review required
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
As noted above, UDRP recommends varying the podium height along the retail street.		
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
<i>In response to UDRP's comments we have adjusted the podium in plan and in section to create a varied and animated streetscape. As noted previously, the podium has been articulated by stepping it in towards the building to create a plaza space central to the principal residential entry. The height of the podium has been lifted along the north and south end to create strong anchor points for the development. The southernmost corner of the podium has been further articulated with glazing that wraps along the south elevation in response to the indent in the buildings massing.</i>		
21	<b>Massing distribution on site</b>	
		Support
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
22	<b>Massing contribution to public realm at grade</b>	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade
		Further review required
<b>UDRP Commentary</b>		
As noted above, UDRP recommends varying the podium height along the retail street.		
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
<i>Please refer to response to comment 20.</i>		
23	Other	
<b>Applicant Response</b>		
<b>Safety and Diversity</b> Promote design that accommodates the broadest range of users and uses.		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

Achieve a sense of comfort and security at all times.			
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.	N/A
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.	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
UDRP Commentary			
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		Support with comment
UDRP Commentary			
UDRP suggests that the upper level soffits could be up-light.			
Applicant Response			
<i>We have reviewed lighting opportunities for the wrapping elements on the building including the upper soffit portion. Our analysis has revealed that all of these areas are directly adjacent to residential units and we have therefore concluded that lighting these elements would have a negative impact on the end users.</i>			
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			
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			

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments/Responses

<b>Service / Utility Design</b> 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 Waste / recycling		TBD
33 Enmax (Power) / Atco (Gas)		TBD
34 Transformer / switchgear	UDRP recommends that the applicant investigate an alternative location for the transformer, rather than next to the Ramsay Design Centre.	Further review required
<i>We have reviewed alternate locations for the transformer at length. Any location along the east, south, or north portions of the site would require a dedicated utility easement from the roadway and thus would further reduce the available developable area of the site. One of the primary concerns this raises is the reduction in the size of the below grade parking area. Cable lengths and associated costs would also increase. The selected location has been chosen for numerous reasons including reduced cable length, separation from CRU access points, and separation from residential units.</i>		
35 Exhaust / intake		TBD
36 Electrical vaults		TBD
37 Loading		Further review recommended
38 Fire truck access		Endorse
39 Other		

### Urban Design Review Panel – Policy Conflicts

#### FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

Date:	
Time:	

Address:	
Application number:	
Description:	
Review:	
Architect:	
Planner:	
Urban Designer:	

#### Description of Conflict

Best practice recommendation:

Conflicting policy:

Suggested resolution: