

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

### Urban Design Review Panel Comments – Review #2

<b>Date:</b>	May 2, 2018																				
<b>Time:</b>	2.45 pm																				
<b>Attendance:</b>																					
<b>Panel Members:</b>	<table><tr><td><b>Present:</b></td><td><b>Absent:</b></td></tr><tr><td>Chad Russill (chair)</td><td>Janice Liebe</td></tr><tr><td>Terry Klassen</td><td>Jack Vanstone</td></tr><tr><td>Glen Pardoe</td><td>Eric Toker</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Chris Hardwicke</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Bruce Nelligan</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Yogeshwar</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Navagrah</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Robert LeBlond</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Gary Mundy</td></tr></table>	<b>Present:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>	Chad Russill (chair)	Janice Liebe	Terry Klassen	Jack Vanstone	Glen Pardoe	Eric Toker		Chris Hardwicke		Bruce Nelligan		Yogeshwar		Navagrah		Robert LeBlond		Gary Mundy
<b>Present:</b>	<b>Absent:</b>																				
Chad Russill (chair)	Janice Liebe																				
Terry Klassen	Jack Vanstone																				
Glen Pardoe	Eric Toker																				
	Chris Hardwicke																				
	Bruce Nelligan																				
	Yogeshwar																				
	Navagrah																				
	Robert LeBlond																				
	Gary Mundy																				
<b>Advisor:</b>	David Down, Chief Urban Designer																				
<b>Application number:</b>	DP2017-4075																				
<b>Municipal address:</b>	1818 1 ST SE, 1825 Park Rd SE, 1919 Macleod Tr SE																				
<b>Community:</b>	Beltline																				
<b>Project description:</b>	New: Multi-Residential Development, Retail and Consumer Service (1 building, 1250 units)																				
<b>Review:</b>	Second (previous November 1, 2017)																				
<b>File Manager:</b>	Brendyn Seymour																				
<b>City Wide Urban Design:</b>	Lothar Wiwjorra																				
<b>Applicant:</b>	Norr Architects, Engineers, Planners																				
<b>Architect:</b>	Norr Architects, Engineers, Planners																				
<b>Owner:</b>	Albari Holding, Cidex Developments																				
<b>Ranking:</b>	<b>Endorse</b>																				

#### Summary May 2, 2018

The revised presentation package shows positive advancement for the project and relates to several aspects previously discussed by the Panel. In the current form, few issues remain outstanding and require further review to address urban design components.

Some of the notable revisions to the previous design include:

- enhancements to the podium level (materiality and articulation), reduced by one storey in height
- additional active uses introduced into the ground level floor plan plus added transparency
- greater building setback from 1<sup>st</sup> Street SE
- tower massing articulation developed

Adjustments to the Elbow River interface with the proposed promenade layout continue to be a work in progress by the Applicant. It is obvious that much desire to create a creative and active edge are constrained by various setback regulations and fill restrictions as it relates to profile of the riverbank within this area. The submitted drawings specific to this scope were outdated at the time of review and sketch options more relevant to reflecting the regulations were presented. As a general statement, the Panel appreciates the original effort focused on this interface and understands the parameters restricting various design decisions. While the final design is still a work in progress, UDRP believes that the direction is suitable and outstanding details will be resolved as part of the remaining process.

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

**Applicant Response** April 23, 2018

Noted.

### **Summary** November 1, 2017: Further Review Recommended

UDRP commends the applicant for an ambitious proposal on a difficult to develop site. Given its location as a gateway to Calgary's city centre, the eventual development will be a landmark for the City. UDRP supports the density and the programming of the site, but suggests that a number of design changes would improve the overall quality of the site in an urban design context. UDRP is particularly concerned with the architectural design and language of the podium levels and has provided more detailed commentary below.

Although the site is bound by two major roadways, Macleod trail SE and 1 Street SE, UDRP believes that the site could be better integrated with the surrounding urban context. With significant improvements to 17 Avenue east currently underway and the planned extension of 17 Avenue across Macleod Trail into the Stampede Grounds and the ultimate extension of Riverwalk, the panel suggests that the connection of the project to the site to 17 Avenue can be improved by extending the proposed Park Road paving condition to the north. UDRP further recommends that this connection be extended to the river promenade by introducing a public north-south connection through the building from Park road to the river.

### **Applicant Response** December 18, 2017

*Our intention is to extend the proposed paving shown in our Landscape drawings North to 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW, pending approval from Roads / Transportation, and the approval/coordination from/with neighboring landowners to our site. The request to consider the introduction of a public path/opening through the site to access the river promenade would cause circulation, functionality, building operations, safety, CPTED and constructability concerns to Hat @ Elbow River. Additionally this would further complicate the limited servicing/back of house frontage we have at Park Road itself. As an alternative, the ground floor level is now proposed as a continuous double and triple height space with animated uses including thematic retail, coffee, fine dining and gathering/socializing areas which can be accessed from both building frontages (Park Road and the river promenade). The overall height of the lobby and the transparency of the glazing will allow the public to see through the lobby from both directions. To further complement, the existing sidewalks and City grid will have direct access to the river promenade portion of the site (with the respective agreement) so the public can freely have use of it. Please see Image 1 and Image 2 for clarification.*

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.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

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.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
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.	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		
	It is noted that the Applicant is pursuing patterned paving for the roadway that extends beyond the subject property line for an enhanced pedestrian environment and plaza-type quality. This is subject to review by Roads/Transportation however UDRP strongly supports the Applicant in the pursuit of this element.		
	Applicant response Noted. Based on further review by Roads / Transportation our intention would be to pursue the patterned paving for the roadway beyond the subject property up to the 18 <sup>th</sup> Ave. SE to enhance the pedestrian environment; creating a plaza quality experience at the entry of the building.		
4	<b>Entry definition / legibility</b>	Entry points are clear and legible	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
5	<b>Residential multilevel 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.	NA
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
6	<b>At grade parking</b>	At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
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		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

Applicant Response		
Noted.		
8	Other	
Applicant Response		
<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, pedestrianfirst environments.</i>		
Topic	Best Practice	Ranking
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
UDRP Commentary		
Applicant Response		
Noted.		
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.
		Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary		
See comment #14 as final design of Elbow River ongoing.		
Applicant Response		
Noted.		
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.
		Support
UDRP Commentary		
Applicant Response		
Noted.		
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 with comment
UDRP Commentary		
See comment #3.		
Applicant Response		
Noted.		
13	<b>Pathways through site</b>	Provide pathways through the site along desire lines to connect amenities within and beyond the site boundaries.
		Support with comment
UDRP Commentary		
See comment #3.		
Applicant Response		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

	Noted.		
14	Open space networks and park systems	Connects and extends existing systems and patterns.	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
The Panel appreciates the original effort focused on this interface and understands the parameters restricting various design decisions. UDRP believes that the Applicant's intended direction is suitable and outstanding details will be resolved as part of the remaining process; it therefore notes further review recommended, until the final design is determined.			
Applicant Response			
Noted. Development of designs along the floodway are progressing based on discussions with the CPAG Team and River Engineering.			
15	Views and vistas	Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks.	Further review recommended
UDRP Commentary			
See comment #14.			
Applicant Response			
Noted.			
16	Vehicular interface		Support
UDRP Commentary			
Applicant Response			
17	Other		
Applicant Response			
Contextual Response Optimize built form with respect to mass, spacing and placement on site in consideration to adjacent uses, heights and densities			
Topic		Best Practice	Ranking
18	Massing relationship to context	Relationship to adjacent properties is sympathetic	Support with comment
UDRP Commentary			
The Applicant provided a detailed response to the previous comments as it relates to massing and context. Most of the current revisions since UDRP presentation #1 improve upon the previous design including the aspect of incorporating tower massing components into the podium. No items require further review, though refinement is encouraged should the Applicant wish to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- randomized podium pattern VS a meta-pattern expression; review if a planned artistic design reinforced in the patterning could strengthen overall massing and aesthetic</li><li>- the prow of the boat appears somewhat disjointed from the rest of the building; if the true intention is that the podium represents the boat itself and towers the chimneys (per response comments), being relatively arbitrary for the prow itself does not reinforce this design approach. The Panel suggests the Applicant consider subtle design moves that strengthen the narrative, to be holistic in the execution. This exercise could happen in tandem with the above patterning comment.</li></ul>			
Applicant Response			

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

Noted. Further investigation regarding the podium patterning will be explored to link the design language of the prow throughout the podium through the use of color and material differentiation.			
19	Massing impacts on sun shade	Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
20	Massing orientation to street edges	Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
21	Massing distribution on site		Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
22	Massing contribution to public realm at grade	Building form contributes to a comfortable pedestrian realm at grade	Support with comment
	UDRP Commentary		
	Adjustments to the podium have improved the massing at grade/public realm including the articulation, materiality study and reduction by one storey in height.		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
23	Other		
	Applicant Response		
Safety and Diversity Promote design that accommodates the broadest range of users and uses. 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.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

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.	TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted. A pedestrian level wind analysis will be pursued with particular attention focused on winter conditions when the river plaza design is further developed so that more details are understood for this specific condition.		
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.	TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted. Refer to Response s#25.		
27	<b>Weather protection</b>	Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages.	Support
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
28	<b>Night time design</b>		TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Opportunities exist for detailed review of soffit design and lighting approach.		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
29	<b>Barrier free design</b>	Site access to be equal for able and disabled individuals. Provide sloped surfaces 5% grade or less vs ramps.	TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
30	<b>Winter city</b>	Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity.	TBD
	UDRP Commentary		
	Applicant Response		
	Noted.		
31	<b>Other</b>		

## Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response (Review #2)

Applicant Response		
<b>Service / Utility Design</b> <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 Waste / recycling		TBD
33 Enmax (Power) / Atco (Gas)		TBD
34 Transformer / switchgear		TBD
35 Exhaust / intake		TBD
36 Electrical vaults		TBD
37 Loading		Support
38 Fire truck access		Support
39 Other		