



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	October 4, 2018
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), Shelley Craig, Kelty McKinnon, Pam Ratner
Regrets:	Rob McCarthy (Vice-Chair), Russell Acton, Ron Kellett
Staff:	Matthew Roddis, Steven Lecocq, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Gerry McGeough, C+CP Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Cindy Brenneis, RWA Group Architecture Ltd. Som Bose, Architecture49 Inc. Jacqueline Low, WSP Canada Group Ltd.

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

2.0 Approval of Agenda
The October 4, 2018, meeting agenda was approved.
The July 5, 2018, meeting minutes were approved electronically on August 23, 2018.

3.0 Applications:

3.1 **Stadium Neighbourhood Plan Options workshop**

Gerry McGeough (Campus and Community Planning), Chris Phillips (PFS Studio) and Cindy Brenneis (RWA Group Architecture Ltd.) presented.

Panel Commentary:

Consider an intuitive flow through the neighbourhood and weave different uses throughout so there is an active confluence and connection to adjacent neighbourhoods and the campus. Consider the destinations and how you draw people into the neighbourhood.

Several panel members commented on the length of the proposed mid-rise buildings. Dividing housing into two blocks may be more successful with an address on the promenade or Stadium Road, otherwise consider a woonerf approach so there are areas people want to be in at night.

A panel member thought the diagram depicting the new east-west pedestrian promenade was compelling. The panel member questioned whether 40% affordable housing using wood frame construction in option 1 was achievable and suggested adjusting the park. More low-rise frontage will allow for more flexibility in usage and change in the economy. Some functions other than residential are appealing.

A panel member suggested keeping the infill portion would be more successful rather than building the area out with residential uses. Provide porosity throughout and avoid continuous wall scenarios.

A panel member thought the Stadium should be an iconic piece that is open and transparent providing a sense of something happening.

A panel member questioned the value and livability of building housing behind the Stadium in terms of noise, light and views overlooking the Stadium.

A panel member was not concerned about tower height given the proposed locations of the towers with podiums in both schemes.

A panel member thought Option 2 had a lot of foot prints on the ground. Consider adding more height to the towers (5-10 stories per building) and ways to mix and match elements of both schemes.

A panel member referred to UBC's identity as a contemporary campus in a functioning ecological wilderness. The community is invested in trees. Option 1 has a large amount of soil on solid ground and is an opportunity to create a viable reforested area that functions better rather than building out the area with more housing.

Consider what will be done with any harvested wood and what that storey line is as you walk through the neighbourhood.

A panel member asked if there is an opportunity to introduce some urban form along 16th Avenue noting it would help make a connection between Wesbrook Place and the main campus.

3.2 TRIUMF – Institute for Advanced Medical Isotopes (IAMI) Cyclotron

Application Status:	Pre-application
Location:	4004 Wesbrook Mall, South Campus
Applicants:	TRIUMF Architecture49 Inc. WSP Canada Group Ltd.

Som Bose (Architecture49 Inc.) and Jacqueline Low (WSP Canada Group Ltd.) presented.

Panel Commentary:

Further exploration is needed on how the pedestrian flow works from the parking lot and lighting at night. Clarity is needed on how the landscape informs the architecture of the building. The landscape idea of “targeting” is a different concept from the architectural “sliding planes.” The architecture should work together drawing on the same inspiration or series of guiding principles.

Is it a contextual building or an object building? The north industrial side is quiet and the south side is very active. Consider how much programming can be displayed and how much remains hidden. There is a dichotomy of style and direction between building and landscape. There does not appear be any strong concept.

There is a lot of curtain wall on the south elevation which will result in an uncomfortable interior office environment. Explore the possibility of inverting it to have a more comfortable office environment on north side and industrial uses on the south side.

The glazed elements are successful. The use of colour on the back interior walls works well. A panel member thought the south facade should be all glass. Consider replacing the terracotta-coloured material on the storage room with a neutral, machine-like coloured material. Emphasize the exit stairs.

The building is not very contextual and does not have a lot of character. With a controlled design and use of colour, explore if the mechanical on the roof could be exposed rather than screened.

The detailing of the building is plain. Consider grouping the service room doors to fit in the recess. The basement doors could also be grouped together. If the building is a simple box, make it a well-defined simple box.

The rain gardens and access on the south side are very utilitarian. Articulate the entry to the building rather than spread the landscape treatment around all the edges.

The sustainability concept is okay. From a landscape point of view the proposed moves are expensive, it could be simplified. The building and landscape are two different expressions. Explore simpler moves and ways to tie the landscape and the building

Further work is needed to mediate the base condition of the concrete wall and long ramp. There are a lot of conflicting conditions. Consider simplifying. Remove the ramp guard. One panel member suggested reorienting the grading so there is a path at ground level.

The north side gathering plaza is shaded and does not have a good view. Is there an opportunity to bring more planting and develop a smaller gathering space.

The rainwater element has a narrow walkway. The ramp railing is not needed. There is not much rainwater from small site to need that much filtration.

The landscape is very intensive. The building is complex. A panel member asked if the secondary corridor could be removed and the hot labs moved closer to windows to provide views to the outdoors.

From a site planning perspective, the main entry is hidden from the arrival point and needs more work. The circulation around the site needs further study.

If the offices remain on the south side of the building consider providing a screen of trees for visual interest. The north side of building is a shaded difficult space.

Chair Summary:

There is a dichotomy between the landscape and architecture of the building.

There is a sense the landscape is trying too hard.

Concerns regarding the entry, courtyard, visibility, access and views.

The building has not found its character. Is it an object building, a contextual building, or a quiet building?

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:30 PM.