

Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response

Urban Design Review Panel Comments

Date	April 17, 2019	
Time	1:00	
Panel Members	Present Janice Liebe (Chair) Terry Klassen Colin Friesen Chris Hardwicke	Absent Chad Russill (Co-Chair) Gary Mundy Eric Toker Beverley Sandalack Ryan Agrey Jack Vanstone Ben Bailey Glen Pardoe Michael Sydenham
Advisor	David Down, Chief Urban Designer	
Application number	DP2019-1257	
Municipal address	1510, 1514, 1516, 1518, 1530, 1534 10 Av SW	
Community	Sunalta	
Project description	New: Retail and Consumer Service (within podium); New: Multi-Residential Development (2 towers)	
Review	first	
File Manager	Yuping Wang	
City Wide Urban Design	Xia Zhang	
Applicant	S2 Architecture	
Panel Position	Further Review Recommended	

Note: Overall ranking is not an average of the 13 *Urban Design Elements*, but a qualitative project rating of the application in its context.

Summary

The panel supports the inclusion of affordable housing and understands the challenges of the site as described by the proponent. The site is a good location for higher density development given its context, but the lot depth presents a significant constraint in achieving the density entitlement. The panel encourages the City to work collaboratively with the applicant to find a solution to the property setbacks and constraints. This is the first proposal on this stretch of 10th Avenue. Similar conditions occur along the Avenue which will present the same challenges. The panel supports the including of small retail units lining 10th Avenue. Three areas of priority for improvement are:

- Improving the open space at grade, particularly at the entrance
- Rethinking the massing of the project to minimize the tower/slab effect and create more open space at grade (even if it means just one taller tower)
- Minimizing the dominating affect of the structured parking to allow for the retail units to be taller

Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response

Urban Design Element	
<p>Creativity <i>Encourage innovation; model best practices</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall project approach as it relates to original ideas or innovation 	
UDRP Commentary	The proposal is creative only in how it manages the constraints of the site in order to achieve the allowed density.
Applicant Response	<i>The proposal is a creative and thoughtful product of its context, market conditions, local and municipal policy, CPTED standards and extensive conversations with the Sunalta Community Association.</i>
<p>Context <i>Optimize built form with respect to mass and spacing of buildings, placement on site, response to adjacent uses, heights and densities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massing relationship to context, distribution on site, and orientation to street edges Shade impact on public realm and adjacent sites 	
UDRP Commentary	Although the project is comprised of two towers it reads as a long slab building from most angles. Tower separation is too close – presents privacy issues in addition to a bulky silhouette. Building top design should reflect gateway site – greater height differentiation between the towers.
Applicant Response	<p><i>At three storey's (11.2m) in height, the proposed "street wall" is an appropriate scale and massing for its context and street width. The "street wall" is expressed as two uniquely coloured and textured blocks of approximately 40m and 25m in length, separated by the residential entrances, with each block articulated with fine grain retail utilizing blade signage, lighting, bike racks and shopfront glazing and doors to ensure that proper human scale is considered.</i></p> <p><i>Building Top: The owner has been careful to ensure that the architecture of the building has been used to conceal mechanical units in a simple and elegant way and chooses not to express the mechanical penthouse.</i></p> <p><i>Tower Height Differential: The tower heights have been determined by market demand for each phase.</i></p>
<p>Human Scale <i>Defines street edges, ensures height and mass respect context; pay attention to scale</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Massing contribution to public realm at grade 	
UDRP Commentary	The building is tight to 10 th Avenue and has a tall podium which is overbearing. The only relief at street level is the setback plazas at the entrances Podium looks monumental. The entrance and retail are only 4m high. Should be a minimum of 4.5m.
Applicant Response	<p><i>At three storey's (11.2m) in height of the proposed "street wall" is an appropriate scale and massing for its context and street width. The "street wall" is expressed as two uniquely coloured and textured blocks of approximately 40m and 25m in length, separated by the residential entrances, with each block articulated with fine grain retail utilizing blade signage, lighting, bike racks and shopfront glazing and doors to ensure that proper human scale is considered.</i></p> <p><i>The streetwall/ podium is setback more than 5m and the tower entrances are setback over 9m from 10th Ave. This provides a substantial urban realm and setback for pedestrian use and meets City policy for minimum and maximum set back requirements.</i></p> <p><i>The retail heights are maximized and are driven by the required internal ramp lengths.</i></p>

Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response

<p>Integration <i>The conjunction of land-use, built form, landscaping and public realm design</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking entrances and at-grade parking areas are concealed • Weather protection at entrances and solar exposure for outdoor public areas • Winter city response 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>The parking entrances and rear parking areas are confusing. Some of the surface parking spaces appear to be outside the property line. Given that the City is planning to create a public bikeway corridor directly to the north of the building – landscape improvements and passive surveillance should be considered. The canopies on the front of the building are aesthetic application and are not configured to provide shelter. Given the height of the two towers a wind study should be conducted to ensure pedestrian comfort at grade.</p>
Applicant Response	<p><i>Parking entrances will be accessed from the rear lane (beneath the overhead LRT tracks). The entrances will be signed and well-lit to ensure minimal confusion. The surface parking along the rear lane is not included in the bylaw calculations as it falls outside the property line on City owned land. The owner is not aware of a proposed public bikeway directly to the north of the building.</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate landscaping beneath the LRT tracks has been considered in this area.</i></p> <p><i>The entrance canopies are both functional and an aesthetic feature and have been designed to provide shelter over the main entrance doors.</i></p> <p><i>The owner will investigate the requirement of a wind study in accordance with the Sunalta ARP.</i></p>
<p>Connectivity <i>Achieve visual and functional connections between buildings and places; ensure connection to existing and future networks.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian first design, walkability, pathways through site • Connections to LRT stations, regional pathways and cycle paths • Pedestrian pathway materials extend across driveways and lanes 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>Improve the laneway access from 10th Avenue. Consider the laneway and the entrance plaza to be one space with pedestrian paving extending across the lane. Consider designing the laneway in a table condition without curbs. Ensure windows with active uses behind look directly into the entrance plaza and lane to provide passive surveillance. Consider moving the bicycle parking to on street to free up plaza space. Add seating areas to the entry plaza and move the planting to the edge of the building. Consider adding one specimen tree to the entrance plaza given the challenge of adding street trees along the face of the building.</p>
Applicant Response	<p><i>The owner will consider these suggestions.</i></p>
<p>Animation <i>Incorporate active uses; pay attention to details; add colour, wit and fun</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building form contributes to an active pedestrian realm • Residential units provided at-grade • Elevations are interesting and enhance the streetscape 	
UDRP Commentary	<p>The panel appreciated the quality of the street level cladding but thought that the white spandrel could incorporate a graphic design or kinetic sculptural panel or a solar capture mechanism or smart window application for greater animation. Finer grain detail could be added in the retail portals. Canopies would improve the façade.</p> <p>Finer grain detail at the portals Canopies will improve the façade Artful experiences on the fritted Architecture of the podium and towers Greater blending of the attributes of the tower and the podium</p>

Urban Design Review Panel Comments & Applicant Response

	Brought the tower down More of the language of the finer scale tower comes down
Applicant Response	<i>The owner will consider these suggestions.</i>
Accessibility <i>Ensure clear and simple access for all types of users</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrier free design • Entry definition, legibility, and natural wayfinding 	
UDRP Commentary	No issues for accessibility.
Applicant Response	<i>Noted.</i>
Diversity <i>Promote designs accommodating a broad range of users and uses</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail street variety, at-grade areas, transparency into spaces • Corner treatments and project porosity 	
UDRP Commentary	Transparency and corner treatments noted above. The panel appreciated the fine grain retail bays.
Applicant Response	<i>Noted.</i>
Flexibility <i>Develop planning and building concepts which allow adaptation to future uses, new technologies</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project approach relating to market and/or context changes 	
UDRP Commentary	The approach to the affordable housing units, although not a design issue, was innovative and adaptive in the future.
Applicant Response	<i>Noted.</i>
Safety <i>Achieve a sense of comfort and create places that provide security at all times</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and security • Night time design 	
UDRP Commentary	The laneway and the rear of the building present some CPTED issues. Passive surveillance, lighting and minimizing surface parking in the rear is recommended.
Applicant Response	<i>Noted. The parking ramp access will provide a certain amount of passive surveillance.</i>
Orientation <i>Provide clear and consistent directional clues for urban navigation</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance natural views and vistas 	
UDRP Commentary	The majority of the building will enjoy long views and vistas, but some residential units are below the C-train guideway.
Applicant Response	<i>The proposal has been revised to accommodate low intensity residential fitness area on the north half of the west tower at level four and five (below LRT guideway).</i>
Sustainability <i>Be aware of lifecycle costs; incorporate sustainable practices and materials</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site/solar orientation and passive heating/cooling • Material selection and sustainable products 	
UDRP Commentary	NA
Applicant Response	<i>Noted.</i>
Durability <i>Incorporate long-lasting materials and details that will provide a legacy rather than a liability</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of low maintenance materials and/or sustainable products • Project detailed to avoid maintenance issues 	
UDRP Commentary	The panel recommends cast concrete planters for the street grasses that are proposed. Ensure sculptural trees on podium with a strong branching habit and long green lifespan.
Applicant Response	<i>Noted.</i>