

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------|--|----------------|--|---------------|--|------------|--|--------------------|--|------------|
| Date: | March 21, 2018 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Time: | 1:45 pm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Panel Members: | <table> <tr> <td>Present:</td><td>Absent:</td></tr> <tr> <td>Chad Russill (chair)</td><td>Janice Liebe</td></tr> <tr> <td>Bruce Nelligan</td><td>Chris Hardwicke</td></tr> <tr> <td>Jack Vanstone</td><td>Glen Pardoe</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Robert Leblond</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Terry Klassen</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Gary Mundy</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Yogeshwar Navagrah</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td>Eric Toker</td></tr> </table> | Present: | Absent: | Chad Russill (chair) | Janice Liebe | Bruce Nelligan | Chris Hardwicke | Jack Vanstone | Glen Pardoe | | Robert Leblond | | Terry Klassen | | Gary Mundy | | Yogeshwar Navagrah | | Eric Toker |
| Present: | Absent: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chad Russill (chair) | Janice Liebe | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bruce Nelligan | Chris Hardwicke | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jack Vanstone | Glen Pardoe | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Robert Leblond | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Terry Klassen | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Gary Mundy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Yogeshwar Navagrah | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Eric Toker | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Advisor: | David Down, Chief Urban Designer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Application number: | DP2018-0932 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Municipal address: | 1555 210 Av SE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Community: | Walden | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project description: | New: Retail and Consumer Service, Restaurant: Licensed - Large, Outdoor Cafe, Liquor Store (9 buildings); New: Community Entrance Feature, Sign - Class A (Banner Sign), Sign - Class B (Fascia Signs), Sign - Class C (Freestanding Sign), Sign - Class D (Canopy Sign, Projection Sign) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review: | first | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| File Manager: | Stuart Gripton | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City Wide Urban Design: | Lothar Wiwjorra | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant: | B+A Planning Group | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Architect: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Owner: | Royop (Legacy) Development Ltd | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking: | Further Review Recommended | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Summary

As a long-term vision and full buildout design, the project presents itself as a unique opportunity to create something unique and meaningful. In the current application, this initial quadrant needs to compliment the overall vision being pursued by the applicant as a critical first step for the development.

In general, the current layout is relatively expected for a suburban commercial shopping centre with a centralized parking field and perimeter building placement (in addition to one standalone building in the middle). If the applicant's desire is to create something that is *'not a shopping centre, but a community'*, UDRP urges further review as to what makes this first phase special and reinforces a placemaking concept as it relates to the master plan.

Small adjustments to walkability and scale are to be studied. Pedestrian network throughout the site (axial pedestrian connection), how to successfully connect to the future phases, and the edge conditions around the perimeter (considering the public will see 'back of buildings') were consistent subjects of discussion by the Panel. Additional study on sightlines as one approaches the site and the sense of entry to the development is encouraged.

Applicant Response

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

| 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 recommended |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | The retail streets are typical of a suburban development with respect to their size and location in proximity to the parking lots. The retail is focused towards the center parking of the development in the first Phase of the development. | | |
| | Applicant to consider enhancement of the overall frontages through interesting pavement treatments, planting considerations and other urban design elements. Corner units appear to consider frontage on more than one side of the building. Due to the overall size of the central parking area, the Panel encourages a more meaningful central destination to promote pedestrian movement throughout the site. This could be revisiting placement of a second pad building, as shown in preliminary concept images. | | |
| | 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. | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Glazing on the site is typical of similar developments with respect to frontages that address the parking lots. Additional treatment of the rear facades to be emphasized. Potential consideration that provides glazing/effectively of creating portions of frontage onto the adjacent streets is suggested to reinforce overall street porosity. | | |
| | 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 | | |
| | Sidewalks that access the site from the community generally support pedestrian circulation. A connection into the SE corner (at the proposed liquor store location) is strongly suggested to improve walkability and permeability. This would align with the axial pedestrian thoroughfare that divides the site and connects to what will be the centralized intersection, strengthening the Township concept. Internal site pedestrian circulation generally meets site requirements. Enhancements, especially through the site as it relates to Building G in the center are suggested to improve overall pedestrian circulation. | | |
| | Applicant response | | |
| 4 | Entry definition / legibility | Entry points are clear and legible | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | The Panel supports entry points that are clearly defined, though any analysis and revisions to strengthen the sense of entry to the site itself are encouraged. | | |
| | 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. | NA |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

| | | | |
|----|---|--|----------------|
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 6 | At grade parking | At grade parking is concealed behind building frontages along public streets. | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | At grade parking internal to the site is generally consistent with the guidelines and policy. Small pockets of parking between and behind buildings should consider screening and site grading to maintain a strong edge condition to the site. | | |
| | 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. | NA |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | No underground parking proposed. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 8 | 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 | | |
| | 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. | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Pathway connections to the site and along the primary entry road provide adequate connection. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 11 | Cycle path connections | Supports cycling via intentional, safe urban design connections to pathway systems and ease of access to bicycle storage at grade. | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Pathway connections to the site and along the primary entry road provide adequate connection. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 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. | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

| | | | |
|----|--|--|----------------------------|
| | From a walkability perspective, the panel recognizes and supports the conversion of traffic circle to a T-intersection at the south edge of the phase. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 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 | | |
| | A connection SE corner (at the proposed liquor store location) is encouraged, to align with the axial pedestrian thoroughfare and connect to the centralized intersection, strengthening the Township concept. See comment for item #3. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 14 | Open space networks and park systems | Connects and extends existing systems and patterns. | Further Review Recommended |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | The site plan places building rear facades in a more interesting 45-degree fashion as compared to flat facades. The resultant open spaces could benefit from additional consideration to prevent dead spaces from developing. The panel recognizes the solar access, isolation and CPTED constraints for these areas. More detail on the nature and type of planting and overall ground cover is encouraged. Large areas of mown turf grass are discouraged. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 15 | Views and vistas | Designed to enhance views to natural areas and urban landmarks. | Further Review Recommended |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Viewshed analysis to adjacent natural and urban landmarks is not explicit in the package provided. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 16 | Vehicular interface | | Support |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Vehicle circulation responds to the site and adjacent uses. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 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 | | |
| | The Panel recognizes the variety in urban form and architecture contemplated on the site. Variation in roofline, floorplate and façade treatments for internal frontage is indicative of good design. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 19 | Massing impacts on sun shade | Sun shade impacts minimized on public realm and adjacent sites | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

| | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| 20 | Massing orientation to street edges | Building form relates / is oriented to the streets on which it fronts. | Support |
| UDRP Commentary | | | |
| The overall massing of the development is supported however, the Panel recommends improved architectural design detail of rear facades facing adjacent communities and roadways is recommended. Avoid large blank walls on rear and side facades. | | | |
| Applicant Response | | | |
| 21 | Massing distribution on site | | Further Review Recommended |
| UDRP Commentary | | | |
| The Panel suggests the applicant consider a more significant massing in of the building in the center of the site, to provide complimentary scale of the building relative to the rest of the site, and a more significant pedestrian destination at this location of the site. Massing should contemplate adjacent landscape in addition to the building massing. | | | |
| 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 Panel recognizes the scale and setbacks of buildings with respect to the perimeter conditions, and interface with the adjacent roadways and pedestrian connections. Internal pedestrian realm is typical of suburban retail and commercial development, and not aligned with the vision and theming identified in the introductory section of the submission. The Panel understands that future phases may include a high street concept and encourages consideration of enhanced walkways and pedestrian oriented pedestrian realm that complements the architecture and massing in quality and scale. | | | |
| Applicant Response | | | |
| 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 | | | |
| The Panel encourages a CPTED statement be included in future submissions, highlighting potential area of concern and design interventions to improve safety and security on the site. Examples of area for consideration include loading areas and the 45-degree wedges formed by the massing, along the site edges. | | | |
| 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. | TDB |
| UDRP Commentary | | | |
| Information on this item is not included for review. | | | |

UDRP Comments 2018 March 21 (including applicant response)

| | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | 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. | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 27 | Weather protection | Weather protection is encouraged at principal entrances. Continuous weather protection is encouraged along retail / mixed used frontages. | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 28 | Night time design | | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 29 | Barrier free design | Site access to be equal for able and disabled individuals. Provide sloped surfaces 5% grade or less vs ramps. | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 30 | Winter city | Maximize exposure to sunshine for public areas through orientation, massing. Design public realm that supports winter activity. | TDB |
| | UDRP Commentary | | |
| | Information on this item is not included for review. | | |
| | Applicant Response | | |
| 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 | Service Access | Loading areas are integrated into the overall site plan, between buildings in many cases. The locations and proximity to the pedestrian realm suggest that design interventions of architecturally designed gates or moveable screens to provide an integrated urban edge and provide a visual screen to loading areas, waste collection and other associated back of house facilities and amenities | Further Review Recommended |