

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and Applicant Response

Summary (July 11, 2018)

UDRP received an updated package from the Applicant for a Development Permit application following recent land use approvals to re-designate the site for a mix of uses, and to facilitate the transfer of City Municipal Reserve. The Panel notes improvements to the design, including the built form park interface, re-orientation of Building 1 (B1) to create a stronger urban edge, and the re-design of the Building 4 (B4) surface parking area for a more attractive pedestrian experience. The Panel acknowledges these improvements and endorses the general design progression though further review by administration is recommended.

The Panel is encouraging aspects of the plan to be strengthened – such as the east-west pedestrian connection from primary parking areas to the City park, a plaza-first approach to courtyard-like areas at Buildings 1 (B1), waste/recycling integrated in underground parking (if feasible), more legible residential access at Building 2 (B2), the continuation of the north-south pedestrian pathway between the park and Building 1 (B1), and an improved public realm interface with at grade units for Building 1 (B1).

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		
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		
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		
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		
	A hierarchical design response has been provided to the public realm for the entry points to the park. These are demonstrated and detailed on the site plan.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and 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.	Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	The Panel requests more information on layout of patios and furnishings for activation.		
	Applicant Response		
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		
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		
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. And Waste and recycling facilities have now been relocated to be away from the park environment. With the rotation of building B1 the solid waste management is off the Macleod Trail access.		
	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		
	The pathways through this site have been designed to facilitate access to the LRT station. The pedestrian environment through and around the site has been carefully thought through to create optimized interface.		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and Applicant Response

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		
	The regional pathway system for the City of Calgary in the context of the 10 minute walkshed to the Heritage LRT station has been examined and all of the pathways through the site have been designed to accommodate and enhance the pedestrian environment relative to the LRT.		
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.		
	Applicant Response		
	At grade bicycle parking and storage has been designed for accessibility from the pathway system. Bicycle storage facilities are also designed within the proposed buildings as noted.		
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		
	Crosswalks and walkable connections in the context of Park access have been designed to emphasize arrival and are designed for accessibility and visual clarity.		
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		
	The improvements to the Street crossings and crosswalks have been designed to strengthen the interface between the park and the Community Association building in the pathways system located immediately south of 78th of Avenue south west.		
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		
	The park at present is greatly underutilized and at its new location becomes accessible to the community and achieves a higher profile place within the system.		
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		

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and Applicant Response

	space. The sightlines should intentionally offer foreground and background interest, in each direction.	
	Applicant Response	
	The internal sight-lines of the park have been designed to capture the open space. The permeable passageways between the buildings have been designed to enhance the community and interaction experience.	
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	
	Building B1 has been rotated so that the vehicular interface is now located on the Macleod Trail side of the building. Building B4 has been re-designed with a plaza-first and courtyard-like surface.	
17	Other	
	Applicant Response	
	The most effective revision with regards to the vehicular access and building interface was the rotation of building B1.	
	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
18	Massing relationship to context	Endorse
	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic	
	UDRP Commentary	
	The Panel discussed the massing relationships to context with the Applicant.	
	Applicant Response	
	The building massing is such that it creates an effective foil to Macleod Trail for the residents to the west.	
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Endorse
	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	
	UDRP Commentary	
	The Panel endorses the park open space at the south end of the site with maximum sun exposure.	
	Applicant Response	
	The Sunshadow diagrams verify the effectiveness of the park in the north west corner of the site as stated.	
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Endorse
	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	
	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	
	The project has been designed with an effective massing orientation to the street edges. The massing is complementary to the south side of the street along 78th Ave. SW.	
21	Massing distribution on site	Endorse
	UDRP Commentary	
	The Panel endorses the distribution of the massing on site.	
	Applicant Response	
	As stated, the massing was ratified by the UDRP.	

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and Applicant Response

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			
The large operable doors are designed for the relationship between the park and the focal building interfaces of south – facing B4 and west – facing B2.			
23	Other	.	
Applicant Response			
The massing is designed to buffer Kingsland residents from Macleod Trail and to buffer the Park environment for an optimized community experience.			
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			
The park/building interface has been designed to accommodate CPTED principles and eyes on the park.			
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			
Although the Panel generally endorses massing distribution, pedestrian level comfort -wind information was not provided at this preliminary stage of design development.			
Applicant Response			
By utilizing 'cell effect' the wind environment of the pedestrian environment in the park should be mitigated.			
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			
With the 'cell effect' wind environment the snow drifting should also be mitigated.			
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			
Canopies have been added to the principal entrances of the buildings to provide weather protection.			

Urban Design Review Panel Comments and Applicant Response

28	Night time design		Further Review Recommended
	UDRP Commentary		
	Not discussed at this preliminary stage of design development.		
	Applicant Response		
	Shielded and indirect lighting has been provided to all of the exterior parking either by the way of shrouded or low level indirect bollards.		
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		
	Wheelchair accessibility has been accommodated in the design of all of the ramps and walkways proposed for the site.		
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		
	By relocating the park to the south west corner of the site the maximum exposure to sunshine has been provided for the public realm.		
31	Other		
	Applicant Response		
	The design for this site accommodates service uses at functional and unobtrusive locations out of sight from the pedestrian areas with screening elements sympathetic to the building architecture.		
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