



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

- Date:** March 3, 2016
- Time:** 4:10 PM
- Location:** Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building, 2260 West Mall
- Attendees:** [MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL:](#)
Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante, Walter Francl (Presenter: Item 4.1), Neil Guppy, Maurice Pez
- Regrets:** Oliver Lang (Chair), Ronald Kellett, Janet Teasdale (on leave)
- Staff:** Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
- Presenters:** Walter Francl, Francl Architecture
Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership
Joe Stott, UBC Campus + Community Planning
Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust
-

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

Panel members and staff welcomed Neil Guppy, Acting Managing Director, Student Development and Services and a UBC professor of Sociology to the Panel.

3.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

3.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the March 3, 2016, meeting be approved. MOTION CARRIED

3.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the meeting held on February 4, 2016, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

4.0 Application:

4.1 Lot 15 (Eton), Wesbrook Place

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Lot 15, Wesbrook Place
Applicants:	Francl Architecture Polygon Homes Ltd. PWL Partnership

Introduction:

Scot Hein noted staff support the overall parti and distribution of density of the three buildings and their respective typologies. The challenges of achieving 3.5 FSR for such a large site has been done effectively. The Panel was asked to reflect on the strong expression of verticality, particularly through the board formed concrete vertical features on the building which exhibits a distinguished character about them in the context of the forest. In addition, the base of the buildings and their integration, the darker colour palette, the south facing glass on the high rise, and how the underground parking entry/exit interfaces with the greenway.

Architect Walter Francl and Landscape Architect Bruce Hemstock presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The general form of the development is supported. There is a good variety of housing. A Panel member thought the high rise had a wide floor plate but noted it is not blocking anyone's view.
- There should be a higher level of materiality at the streetscape. Better scale and richer materials to add to the quality of the public realm and reflected on the base of the high rise. The proposed dark brown cementitious panel cladding is found on many buildings.
- The high rise needs some smaller scale elements.
- There were concerns over the dark brown colour introduced into the colour palette and the level of contrast between dark and light colours. The colorful aspects of the previous colour palette at the pre-application review was stronger.
- Some Panel members liked the addition of the roof cap on the high rise, whereas another thought the expression of verticality was stronger on the previous scheme. To achieve some integration and uniformity between the three different building scales explore how they meet the sky without a cap.
- The integration of the mid-rise building in the previous scheme was stronger. A Panel member challenged the device of taking elements of the low rise and applying them on the high rise. The previous strategy was stronger.
- The visual weight of the vertical banding should be thicker as presented at the pre-application review.

LANDSCAPE

- The pedestrian pathways offer a good connection to the community. Another pedestrian pathway between the townhouses would be a good addition for children to access Michael Smith Park.
- One Panelist suggested the oval green could have a more pronounced mound.

Chair Summary:

- The Panel generally supported the project. The challenges of achieving 3.5 FSR for such a large site has been well handled.
- The townhouses have a good scale.
- Some Panel members supported the addition of the roof cap to the high rise, whereas another did not.
- Introduce richer materiality at the lower level of the high rise at a human scale.
- Rethink the lower colour palette.
- The pedestrian connections to the community were supported. An additional connection is needed so children can access Michael Smith Park.

- There was general support for the water feature at the tower and the thoughtful use of water in the landscape.

Applicant's Response:

The applicant thought the Panel member's comments were perceptive and welcomed the opportunity to work with the commentary as the project moves forward noting there is good solution to be found.

Resolution: SUPPORT [4-0]

5.0 Wesbrook Place Design Vision Supplement and Neighbourhood Plan Amendment

Introduction:

Scot Hein noted the draft Design Vision Supplement and the proposed amendment to the Wesbrook Neighbourhood Plan is being presented to inform the Panel of changes being put forward and the strategy to try to solve some challenges, distribution of density and greater variety in form.

Presentation:

Joe Stott opened explaining the draft Design Vision Supplement consists of guidelines on the interpretation of the Neighbourhood Plan and will be used to inform the development and design of the remaining neighbourhood sites. This phase of consultation follows up on earlier consultation that took place in 2013 with the AUDP and the development community.

Paul Young and Joe Stott indicated the proposed amendment to the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan is to update the "Plan of Land Uses map P-10", which determines how floor space is allocated and maximum height is permitted on a lot-by-lot basis in the neighbourhood. These changes will allow for a broader variety of housing unit types on the remaining sites in Wesbrook Place. The amendment to map P-10 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan follows the consultation process on the draft Design Vision Supplement.

Panel Commentary:

- For future reference, seeking early advice from the Panel on substantive policy matters is appreciated.
- General support for a greater variety of housing typologies throughout the neighbourhood and maximizing opportunities to increase and enhance open and green space, views and pedestrian links.
- General support for high rise developments along the forest edge. A high rise with a smaller floor plate has less shadowing impact and better quality of light compared to a six-storey development with a larger floor plate. A Panel member noted high rises can isolate residents from the community and are massive unless the form is broken down.
- Affordability is a challenge for ground orientated housing developments.
- The low-rise townhouse streetscape is the most successful at a human scale. In a more urban context, six-storey developments were favored by a Panel member.

6.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.