



Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	April 6, 2017
Time:	4:10 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS building, 2260 West Mall
Attendees:	MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL: Walter Francl (Chair) <i>Items 4.1; 4.2</i> , Jane Durante, Ronald Kellett, Arno Matis (Acting Chair) <i>Item 4.3</i> , Pam Ratner
Regrets:	Maurice Pez (Vice-Chair), Karen Marler
Staff:	Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Hugh Ker, Polygon Development 340 Ltd Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership

1.0 Call to Order

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Welcome new Panel Member

The panel members and staff welcomed new panel member Dr. Pamela Ratner as the UBC staff representative on the panel.

3.0 Approval of Agenda

It was moved and seconded: That the agenda be approved.
MOTION CARRIED

4.0 Applications:

4.1 UBC Research Park, South Campus

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	South Campus
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Perry + Associates

Scot Hein, C+CP, asked the panel to comment on how the space strengthens and influences the formation of community through opportunities to further contribute to and share the park.

Perry + Associates have designed and implemented Khorana, Smith and Mundell Parks as well as the overall public realm for Wesbrook Park. The proposed design builds upon successful precedents evident in the neighbourhood while introducing more specific local amenity, including community garden plots which are in high demand.

Paul Young, UBC PT, provided introductory remarks noting the park is a former site of a research building and a surface parking lot. The site has been optimally regraded. The parks help shape the community. Water is an important element in all the parks by creating white noise in a high density neighbourhood and a west coast theme. The community gardens are a central feature and a gathering place.

Landscape Architect Michael Patterson presented.

RESOLUTION: Support [4-0]

Commentary:

The park is intensely programmed with elements needed to animate the neighbourhood.

A lot of paving although recognizing it will visually diminish in a green landscape.

Some concern regarding the use of potable water and the maintenance of water features.

Some concern about access and separation of pedestrians from bicyclists on the 3-metre wide paths recognizing the bike paths are not a community bike route.

A panel member did not understand the edges of the water feature. Upgrade the tool shed.

Related Commentary:

A panel member noted the recurrent use of water in Wesbrook Place acknowledging the feature provides amenity and sound masking for the communities but was disappointed with the interpretation. The panel member challenged Campus and Community Planning staff to consider different ways water can be used in an urban environment while reducing the amount of potable water referencing the work of Herbert Dreiseitl, a doyen of landscape design with water. The panel member thought it would have been more appropriate if the project was reviewed at the preliminary stage to allow for early discussion rather than design refinements commentary.

A panel member stressed there is a demand for more working community gardens and appreciated discussions are taking place to find synergies to utilize space.

It was noted that a shadow analysis was completed when the Wesbrook Neighbourhood Plan amendment was done.

4.2 South Campus Greenway

Paul Young, UBC PT, noted the South Campus greenway design is conceptual but serves as context for how the units on Lots 7 & 8 will interface with the greenway.

Landscape Architect Michael Patterson provided a brief overview.

4.3 Lots 7 & 8 - The Residences at Nobel Park

Application Status: Pre-Application
Location: Lots 7 & 8, South Campus
Applicants: Polygon Development 340 Ltd
Francl Architecture
PWL Partnership

Scot Hein, C+CP, asked the Panel for advice around form and development, and character and expression.

Architect Walter Francl presented. Landscape Architect Bruce Hemstock presented noting the orthogonal organization of the UBC farm and the curves of the forest canopy helped inform how the landscape works.

Commentary:

Further design development is needed to ensure the water feature and underwater lighting element are successful when the feature is dry.

A panel member thought the use of the geometry of the farm and the trees was an original move. Consider doing something subtle in the paving so it carries through the townhomes, too.

Simplify the interior courtyard. Explore if there is a shorter route from the greenway through the site to the street.

Consider the fenestration and how people's activities might inform the design between the street-greenway and north-south orientations by creating variation.

Some of the landscape beds are disconnected from the pattern they are derived. Consider the connection across the greenway into the farm. The orientation of the beds lose some of their value when separated spatially from the geometry which they were generated.

The tower form is generally successful. The use of sculpting conceals the massing in a smart way. Further refinement is needed on the top of the tower toward a lighter expression.

The base of the tower appears to be a residential program. Consider if there are any programs that could animate the base. Explore the corner into the courtyard.

A panel member thought the bridging component connecting to the tower and mid-rise needed more detailing and thought given to the materiality and expression.

The townhome form is successful. In terms of materiality, the use of wood surfaces is appropriate.

Consider some detailing on the roof surfaces that are close to tower that respects the view down from the tower. Decks on the townhomes might help to create more animation, if appropriate.

The framed height of the bridge element feels low. Some concern how deep the bridge section is and how much light you are getting through it. The soffit material under the bridge may affect the quality of reflected light off the pond. The use of a lower quality material such as aluminum may not achieve the desired effect.

Consider ways to treat the bridging element that frames the courtyard views through to the greenway and beyond in a more unique way so pedestrians can discover the building in meaningful way. Consider adding benches on the edge of water feature to enjoy the landscape element.

Chair Summary:

Support for the form and massing, and the general expression. The concept of the UBC farm and forest rationale seems to resonate. Further refinement is needed on the top of the tower toward a lighter expression.

Create variation and refine the architectural expression based on orientation north-south and greenway-street edge.

Consider whether the base of the tower needs to be entirely programmed with residential uses or other uses at the base of the tower.

Ensure the water feature is well detailed so when the pool is dry it is still a welcoming feature.

Develop the geometry ideas further in the townhome areas, linking of pathways through the site and to the greenway itself. Pay attention to the links.

Explore building up sequence of views and expression through bridge itself and the height of the bridge as well as the mid-rise and townhome roofscapes.

Related Commentary:

Scot Hein, C+CP, noted how the expression of the UBC farm and pattern of the forest has been drawn into a private site which might initiate some larger ideas of how the other sites interface the greenway.

Paul Young, UBC PT, noted feedback from the UBC farm is to try keep as much separation as possible. At this time the best way of reducing impact is to retain as many trees and dense understory to act as a buffer.

A Panel member thought the use of grasses as a small-scale example could create passage between the forest and the UBC farm.

There is bike storage at grade and on the first level in the parkade. Children will likely use the elevator to enter/exit rather than the ramp.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:20PM.