



# Minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

<b>Date:</b>	September 9, 2019
<b>Time:</b>	4:05 PM
<b>Location:</b>	BC Hydro Theatre, CIRS building, 2260 West Mall
<b>Attendees:</b>	<b>MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL:</b> Shelley Craig (Chair), Russell Acton (Vice Chair), Adriaan de Jager, Melissa Higgs, Ron Kellett [ <i>recused Item 4.1</i> ], Kelty McKinnon [ <i>recused Item 4.3</i> ]
<b>Regrets:</b>	David Jacobson
<b>Staff:</b>	Matthew Roddis, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
<b>Presenters:</b>	Liam Davis, ZGF Architects Inc. Ashleigh Fischer, ZGF Architects Inc. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Colleen Dixon, Stantec Consulting Ltd. Keith Bate, Stantec Consulting Ltd. Nalon Smith, Stantec Consulting Ltd. Michael Leckie, Leckie Studio Architecture + Design Inc. Chris Phillips, PFS Studio

---

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

2.0 Thank you to outgoing member Kelty McKinnon.

3.0 Approval of agenda

The September 9, 2019, meeting agenda was approved.

The July 18, 2019, minutes were approved.

4.0 Applications:

4.1 **BCR 8, Wesbrook Place**

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Gray Avenue & Wesbrook Mall, Wesbrook Place
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust ZGF Architects Inc. Perry + Associates

Architects Liam Davis and Ashleigh Fischer (ZGF Architects Inc.) and Landscape Architect Michael Patterson (Perry + Associates) presented. Project Manager: Sean Ang, UBC Properties Trust

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT [5-0]**

Advice from the panel is sought on the following:

1. Success of the revised massing in expressing Passive House principles, and reflecting a more simplified and cogent expression.
2. Success of the floor plans in addressing the Panel's previous comments regarding inside corners.
3. Relationship between the building and the public realm, particularly the ground floor units and the sidewalk in addressing sociability and privacy.
4. Success of the public realm and landscape in reflecting sustainability principles, establishing clear connections around the site, and the coordination of the interior courtyard.

**Panel Commentary:**

The simplified massing is moving in a good direction however the north facade should be more aligned with the rest of the building expression. Design development is needed by adding some filigree and vertical connection. Opportunity to introduce a screen as a visual barrier between the units to help to enclose and define the public space and relate to the building's signature eastern elevation. A panel member did not think changing materials in the same plane was successful.

Consider adding more glazing at the lobby for more impact and connection to the courtyard.

Consider the parkade door part of the glazing system perhaps make translucent and different than the entry.

The inside corner is successful. Consider expanding the glazing at the entry lobby to double height to give the entrance more presence an articulate differently than the units. The staggered entry is successful.

The two three-bedroom units that face the courtyard have small living room windows. Explore flipping the living space or adding another window to allow more cross ventilation within the units and keeping the lineal window aesthetic.

Separation above grade for privacy at the terraces is successful. Planters with trees will add extra filigree to help create a screen. Including the movable screens to the grade level could create a dynamic streetscape and contribute to further privacy.

Consider rotating the amenity room in the lobby 90 degrees to create a programmable space (or rotate mail room for similar effect).

A panel member thought the parkade access provides a sense of security landing at the main entry.

Explore if there is an opportunity to shift the parkade ramp to maximize green space. Consider adding vines over the parkade ramp to soften the view for the units overlooking the parkade.

Maximize the size of trees in the boulevard to help with screening of the facade and soil depth to maximize the tree canopy.

**COURTYARD:**

Generally, the urban realm is linked via routes and pathways creating connectivity between the development parcels. The courtyard in this parcel is somewhat self-contained. The planters along the east side are creating an introverted courtyard. Consider opportunities to have a courtyard that is more interconnected.

More articulation is needed in the outdoor room on north side.

Play equipment, trampolines are good. Consider a tricycle path around the playground for younger children.

**BIKE RACKS:**

There are a lot of bike racks. Consider doubling up the bike racks to get more connectivity.

**Related commentary for UBC Properties Trust:**

Consider opportunities for development over the parking ramp.

**Chair Summary:**

1. Successful approach to passive house massing. Important to have a passive approach read as a passive building. Fine tuning required around the screen typology, introduce and bring language more to north side.
2. Inside corner treatment is successful. Consider treating the elevation for common elements in a different vocabulary to differentiate from the units.
3. Ground floor units are moving in a positive direction with interface with the public realm. Some further consideration of location of window openings is required.
4. Ensure the paths set the scene for the future connectivity within the public realm/open space of the neighbourhood. Further articulation of the rooms with the courtyard space is also required.

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.

**4.2 Pump House Replacement**

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	University Boulevard & Education Road
Applicants:	UBC Project Services Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Architect Collen Dixon, Mechanical Engineer Keith Bate, and Landscape Architect Nalon Smith (Stantec Consulting Ltd.) presented. Project Manager: Elizabeth Meagher, UBC Project Services.

**EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT [0-6]**

Advice from the panel is sought on the following:

1. Success of the project in its relationship to Education Road as its primary frontage, with a secondary frontage off University Boulevard.
2. Success of the project in reflecting a 'Living Lab' on campus.
3. Success of the project as it references and responds to other infrastructure projects on campus.
4. Success of the landscape concept.

**Panel Commentary:**

Some panel members thought University Boulevard is the primary frontage and Education Road is where the workings are revealed. One panel member thought the building did not have a frontage. Another panel member thought the building is a more successful element of Education Road but its siting is problematic being on a service road and the public realm. Understand the building within its context and the pedestrian experience around the building.

The building should align with the Henry Angus building for a stronger urban design response. The potential Sauder School of Business expansion should be considered. A panel member thought the Sauder School of Business needs its landscaped forecourt. It was suggested the PMT and gas meter could be rotated 90 degrees with a forecourt for access.

The west elevation is successful. The east facade does not address the Living Lab concept. Clarity is needed on what being featured.

Screening can be used to enclose, hide, screen and shield things that are of less pedagogical interest and contrast with more pedagogical interest.

There were mixed opinions on whether the building responded to other infrastructure projects on campus. A panel member thought the wood expression felt forced. Another panel member thought the infrastructure family is not about materiality such as wood, but are they simple pavilions that express their functionality. Steel was a suggested material.

The panel was underwhelmed by the landscape approach. Landscape materials are grading, grass and concrete. A clear intent with more detail is needed.

The gas meter and PMT on the west elevation is not successful. Screen and gate for access if technically possible (as part of using a screening element elsewhere on the building).

Consider a screen as a barrier to protect the building from vehicles on University Boulevard.

The stair to the second level requires further resolution. The applicant presented an alternate sketch. Options include integrating the stairs with the composition, wrapping the screen around the stair and simplifying the layout.

A panel member thought proportionally the building feels too tall. There are a lot of elements on the upper part of the building. Simplify the expression.

**Chair Summary:**

1. The development application is incomplete. The panel has clearly stated that the building needs to be further documented to show constraints and site the building within its context from an urban design perspective. This includes consideration of the potential Sauder expansion and demonstration of siting restraints, as the panel is not convinced that the building has to be located to the south of the Sauder elevation.
2. Living Lab – determine an approach. It can be enough to feature views into the facility.
3. Definitive approach to infrastructure buildings required – it is within the family of buildings.
4. Further resolution of the stair required.
5. Composition of the building needs to be simplified. Currently there are four parts – the transparent base, the screen, the stair and the metal cladding. Consider the primary composition of the transparent base and the upper screen. Metal can be combined with the screen to simplify.
6. Landscape approach is under-represented. Requires inclusion of grading. Palette to include grading, concrete and grass.

**Related commentary to Campus and Community Planning:**

Provide an analysis of the siting and orientation.

Clearly demonstrate why the building can't be aligned with the Henry Angus building and show in diagrams.

Does this need to be a pavilion in terms of its mechanical uses or can it be incorporated as part of a larger expansion?

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the panel was NOT IN SUPPORT of the project with the applicant taking note of the panel's concerns and returning to the panel.

#### 4.3 Arts Student Centre

Application Status: Pre-application  
Location: Walter Gage Road & East Mall  
Applicants: UBC Properties Trust  
Leckie Studio Architecture + Design Inc.  
PFS Studio

Architect Michael Leckie (Leckie Studio Architecture + Design Inc.) and Landscape Architect Chris Phillips (PFS Studio) presented. Project Manager: Craig Shirra, UBC Properties Trust

The panel was asked to comment on the form, massing and scale of the building and how it relates to expressing the program within. In addition, the functionality of the form and opportunities to vary the form as it responds to the site and program and its relationship to the Commons.

##### **Panel Commentary:**

The panel is confident the design team will come up with an elegant solution.

A couple panel members supported the siting and parti noting it is about executing the form and detailing well. Another panel member thought the previous location of the new Arts Student Centre in the Bosque was the best urban design response for activating the public realm.

A panel member thought the cylindrical form creates equality around all sides, whereas there are very different environments – road verses Commons.

One panel member was not convinced it was the right form and wondered if a north-south linear scheme had been explored. Hegemony of the circle makes for some awkward spaces. A complete urban analysis is needed. Consider a form that is site specific that responds to the different conditions in the urban room – the road edges and the green, especially at the ground plane. Another panel member suggested looking at curves beyond the rigour of the pure form.

The ground floor plan has a massive outdoor covered area. The Word Library precedent has a shallower covered area and a sense of transparency. The ground floor may not need as much covered overhead space. General consensus lightness and transparency is needed for the top two stories.

A panel member thought the internal organization was complicated with everything equally the same and equally hard to find. Study how the entry condition works, the location of the stairs and consider if they can be used as a reference point. Demonstrate why the building needs to be three-stories. A panel member thought the basement plan should be radial.

A panel member thought the public space around the building needs attention. The deep recess creates a large soffit area. Calibrate the overhangs to suit different orientations with connections between interior and exterior spaces.

#### 5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.