



Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	January 10, 2019
Time:	4:05 PM
Location:	Policy Labs A+B, CIRS building, 2260 West Mall
Attendees:	MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL: Nigel Baldwin (Chair), Russell Acton, Shelley Craig, Kelty McKinnon, Pam Ratner [<i>left during item 3.2</i>]
Regrets:	Rob McCarthy (Vice-Chair), Ron Kellett
Staff:	Matthew Roddis, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Brian Wakelin, Public Architecture + Communication Kai Hotson, Hotson Architecture Inc. Norm Hotson, Hotson Architecture Inc. David Stoyko, Connect Landscape Architecture Chris Phillips, PFS Studio

1.0 The meeting was called to order at 4:05 PM. A quorum was noted.

2.0 Approval of agenda and previous meeting minutes
The January 10, 2019, meeting agenda was approved.
The December 6, 2018, meeting minutes were approved.

3.0 Application:

3.1 **Acadia Modular Childcare**

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Acadia Park Neighbourhood
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Public Architecture + Communication Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.

Associate Director, Campus Design, Matthew Roddis introduced the development proposal.

Advice from the Panel on this development application is sought on the following:

1. Where are the opportunities for modular buildings across campus and what uses should be considered for modular buildings?
2. What considerations should be prioritized in the evaluation of modular buildings?
3. Specific to this application, the success of the siting in balancing the retention of mature trees with access to sunlight.
4. Specific to this application, the success of the materials in terms of context and durability, and ability to adapt to future uses.

Project manager: Sepehr Rad, UBC Properties Trust. Brian Wakelin (Public Architecture + Communication) presented.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT [4-0]

Related General Commentary:

Consider a holistic campus experience by determining where there are opportunities for renewal, renovation and new build. Consider how the building contributes to the public realm. A panel member suggested a mandate on temporary buildings be established. Another panel member recommended a sustainability analysis.

Durability, maintenance and use of quality materials that exceed residential standards are key considerations. There could be a future for modular buildings which is also dependent on how the industry progresses.

A panel member thought the experience of being in a modular building is key.

A panel member suggested modular buildings could be used as temporary artist or design studios sited in interesting areas.

Panel Commentary:

A panel member suggested rotating building 3 counter-clockwise to increase the southwest exposure and to be consistent with the other proposed buildings. Another panel member suggesting turning building 1 perpendicular to the parking lot to retain a tree.

A panel member thought the canopies were quite utilitarian and small for a rainy climate.

The expression of the project needs a sense of delight and playfulness. Durability, maintenance and details are important. The materiality needs to be robust. Mechanical damage to the rainwater leaders is a concern (the details of these and other appendages important). Wood left to weather naturally if not maintained can be an issue. One panel member was not supportive of corrugated metal.

A couple panel members supported the darker/background building. Whereas a couple panel members thought the colour of the buildings was too dark especially for the shorter days in the winter. A panel member thought the art on the walls and windows and toys will add colour.

Explore opportunities to create more connectivity to the woods. There is a good separation between active and passive play space. Consider path loops all the way around to tie the spaces together. Any plantings, especially grass, will get trampled. The grass on the slopes needs to be well managed and controlled. Consider natural play areas. Some panel members suggested introducing some playful elements to the chain link fencing, or a fence of slightly higher quality. The use of rainwater could be a dyadic learning opportunity for children.

Consider how these modular buildings function as a living lab and how the buildings infuse the theme of play. Explore better indoor/outdoor connectivity. Consider what are the key views, the indoor experience and seeing beyond the fence. From a winter perspective, how can the buildings act as a welcoming beacon in the morning and evening - what is that experience? Consider the access to daylight and the percent of daylight lit inside. Are there opportunities to bring in different forms of light and utilize as a moment of discovery? Larger windows would let the woodland atmosphere into the building and impact the surroundings.

The reduced working drawings were difficult to read.

Chair Summary:

General siting was supported. Consider the orientation of building 1 to retain a tree and building 3 to maximize sunlight.

There was a mixed opinion on dark background buildings.

Durability, maintenance on exterior materials and weathering of wood are concerns.

The construction technique may reduce the amount of indoor light. Larger windows are recommended to develop more of a relationship between the indoors and outdoors.

Consider opportunities to create more connectivity to woods and playfulness in the landscape.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Panel SUPPORT the project with the applicant taking note of the Panel's concerns as they work with staff.

3.2 Pacific Residence

Application Status: Development Application
Location: 5959 Student Union Boulevard
Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
Hotson Architecture Inc.
Ryder Architecture (Canada) Inc.
Connect Landscape Architecture

Associate Director, Campus Design, Matthew Roddis introduced the development proposal.

Advice from the Panel on this development application is sought on the following:

1. Success of the massing as it relates to the existing context, including Student Union Boulevard, Wesbrook Mall, and Exchange Residence;
2. Success of the revised facade treatment, including materials; and
3. Success of the landscape in reflecting a hierarchy of spaces, including its relationship to the public space at the corner of Wesbrook Mall and Student Union Boulevard.

Norm Hotson (Hotson Architecture Inc.), Kai Hotson (Hotson Architecture Inc.) and David Stoyko (Connect Landscape Architecture) presented. Project manager: Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust. Chris Phillips (PFS Studio) participated as a contextual advisor. The Gage Court landscape concepts did not form part of the review by the panel.

EVALUATION: NOT IN SUPPORT [2-2]

Panel Commentary:

MASSING

The Panel were frustrated that a previously requested massing study incorporating a higher tower was not shared. All panel members felt the un-shown alternative massing would likely yield a better result.

Although Building 2 has been lowered, the height of both buildings fronting Student Union Boulevard remains problematic in terms of overlooking and overshadowing the adjacent Gage buildings. One Panel member felt the street section between Building 2 and the Exchange Building was oppressive and

out of context with UBC's emerging streetscapes. The Panel felt that adding mass to the northeast corner of the site and reducing the height of the remaining buildings would improve the project's relationship to Gage. A Panel member noted that a tower would be an appropriate corner marker for the campus.

No Panel member expressed any concerns about the impact of a tower on neighbouring properties. Over-sensitivity to a few neighbours' concerns is negatively affecting the livability of the entire UBC community in this precinct.

Panel members repeated their concerns over target densities in the precinct. The proposed small reduction in beds has not produced a significant benefit. Wider consideration should be given to where are the best places for students to live on campus.

In the event a better massing strategy is not considered, one panel member suggested more variety in the height of the buildings.

FACADES AND MATERIALS

The architecture is generally engaging.

Some panel members thought the facade treatment was successful but was a lot of the same. Consider broadening the material and sculptural expression to relieve the repetitiveness. The end elevations could consider alternative materials other than the primary brick. Consider opportunities for canopies and weather protection.

With its hotel use, Building 1 could have a different expression announcing its presence and unique identity. Consider developing and expanding on the large glazed area on the south side.

Some panel members thought the lighter colours were more successful. The darker colours could be used on smaller buildings rather than taller buildings. One panel member suggested a different material palette for each building.

The renderings make it difficult to see differences in sheen and texture and play of light. A panel member suggested more colour is needed. The previous scheme had more vitality.

LANDSCAPE

The corner open space between Building 2 and 3 has a suburbanized expression. Consider moves to slightly urbanize it, creating a transitional space. The sidewalk adjacent to the fitness studio is an opportunity to introduce an exterior hard surfaced area rather than just a path to create more of an indoor-outdoor relationship. The parking access pavilion is an opportunity for architectural sculpture that has not been addressed at all.

Explore opportunities for gathering spaces for the people living in the area.

One Panel member thought the pathway system felt like a fire-lane, and did not have the triangulated geometry or meandering path shown in the precedent images. The proposal does not live up to the quality of its precedents.

The pathways near buildings 4 and 5 and at building entrances look right into some ground-floor units. Use grading and planting to delineate private and public space.

RELATED COMMENTARY

One Panel member had concerns over the sense of privacy and security of some ground floor units, most particularly the four north facing units in Building 5.

Several Panel members noted deficiencies in the presentation materials provided. Little context or program data was offered. The landscape design seemed undeveloped. No details of grading, planting, paving or site furnishing were provided. Street comparative studies and width-between-building comparisons, along with precedent studies, are needed to justify the urban realm that is being proposed.

Chair Summary:

The massing as presented remains a concern, not looking at the best solution.

Facade repetition and sameness should be examined.

Variety between buildings is a potential solution worth investigating.

Landscape – passive green corner, turn a path into a space.

More convincing contextual and programmatic information needed.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Panel was NOT IN SUPPORT of the project as presented.

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:35 PM.