



# Minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

**Date:** October 17, 2019

**Time:** 4:05 PM

**Location:** Policy Labs, CIRS building, 2260 West Mall

**Attendees:** MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL:  
Shelley Craig (Chair), Russell Acton (Vice Chair) [*recused item 4.3*],  
Adriaan de Jager, David Jacobson, Melissa Higgs, Ron Kellett. Bob Lilly,  
Sophie MacNeill [*recused item 4.2*]

**Staff:** Matthew Roddis, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)

**Presenters:** Michael Leckie, Leckie Studio Architecture + Design Inc.  
Chris Phillips, PFS Studio  
Colin Shrubbs, DYS Architecture  
Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.  
Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc.  
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

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

2.0 Welcome incoming members Bob Lilly and Sophie MacNeill.

3.0 Approval of agenda and previous meeting minutes  
The October 17, 2019, meeting agenda was approved.  
The September 9, 2019, minutes were approved.

4.0 Applications:

4.1 **Arts Student Centre**

Application Status: Development 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

**EVALUATION: SUPPORT [8-0]**

Advice from the panel was sought on the following:

1. Success of the massing as it relates to its site and responds appropriately to the scale of commons as defined by Allard Hall, Brock Commons Phase 2 buildings and Buchanan.
2. Success of the architectural expression and materiality, and response to the panel's previous advice including reflecting a simple pavilion within the commons.
3. Success of the relationship between the entry, public spaces at the ground floor and the commons open space.
4. The integration with the public realm envisioned for Walter Gage Road and the commons.

**Panel Commentary:**

-Some panel members thought more delineation between the levels is needed. The precedents show levels that mediate the scale. The physical model should have focused on context with more representative colours for the building and support information for material palette in the vicinity.

-Some panel members thought the building is too tall. Consider compressing the building proportion so it is more comfortable in the interior spaces and has stronger proportions at the exterior to ensure that it presents as a pavilion. Another panel member thought the massing was top heavy. Adjusting the heights of the floors by making the ground floor higher and reducing the height of the upper floors would help to change the proportions.

-A panel member thought the porch on the north elevation will be dark. Several panel members suggested the ground floor recess on the north elevation could be reduced to make the space lighter or a change in materiality/colour/signage considered.

-Study the roof relationship to the commons. Consider a green roof or provide access to the roof for student space.

-A panel member thought the connectedness of the pavilion to the Brock Commons Phase 2 buildings needs further study with reference to the urban realm treatment.

-The form as a pavilion is successful. A panel member thought the hardscaping takes away from the reading as a pavilion from Walter Gage Road – careful relationship to the paving/grass and the transition to paving/grass areas is required.

-More information is needed on the palette of the “urban room” or precinct in which the building is located. The panel was not convinced the dark colour is the right move. The dark palette is a lost opportunity for the reading of shadow on the fins. Another panel member thought the paper phenolic material looked flat.

-The pavilion could be a counterpoint in Brock Commons to the Tall Wood House by expressing with wood materials. There was support for use of lighter colour wood materials on the soffits and columns at the porches.

-The choice of roofing material is critical given the pavilion will be viewed from above. Consider the urban heat island impact.

-A more considered relationship with the wood is needed to move away from a mini turret affect. Consider extending the height of the vertical bands to two floors to help with the proportions. Consider how the bands touch the ground.

- The ground floor porosity is good. The edges are well landed. Explore more hierarchy to the entry.
- Consider what makes it an art space didactically.
- The uniformity of spaces is a concern. Consider making the ground floor more generous by pushing out the glazing.
- The paving patterns become a prominent feature without trees.
- Comments regarding the public realm were deferred as will be presented at a future meeting.
- A panel member suggested terracing pavers in the grass to transition to the commons. Consider the durability and usage of the paving materials.

**Chair Summary:**

- General support for the massing.
- Study what is the roof as viewed above and consider rooftop access. The building has a stacked effect – could be mitigated by connectivity of the cladding across the building levels. Relationship to grade also needs to be further developed.
- Further modeling is needed to understand how the building sits in the space and its materiality at different elevations in the commons.
- Clarify the materials and consider what is wood and how dark is dark.
- Examine how the fins play off the striations and explore light and shadow.
- The panel was generally supportive of ground floor views through the building.
- Examine the entry in detail and clearly articulate the hierarchy.
- Comments on the public realm was deferred. Consider delineating where the road and the plaza starts and how the paving relates or varies in relationship to the commons.

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 Lot 5 (The Conservatory), Wesbrook Place**

Application Status:	Pre-application
Location:	Lot 5, Wesbrook Place
Applicants:	Polygon Development 374 Ltd. DYS Architecture PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.

Architect Colin Shrubbs (DYS Architecture) and landscape architect Bruce Hemstock (PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc.) presented. Developer: Hugh Ker, Polygon Development 374 Ltd.

### **Panel Commentary:**

-The proposed siting was supported by a couple of panel members. As a corner site consider how can you respond to the corner itself. Two other panel members supported the exploration of rotating the tower in an east-west direction linking the open commons space visually to the park. The views to south would be less impeded by neighboring towers. In terms of building performance, a south orientation would result in better shading and less heat gain.

-Consider how the tower ground level suites engage the courtyard. Is there a way they create an edge to the courtyard so it becomes less of an ambiguous space? A couple panel members suggested the ground level suites facing the courtyards could be two-stories. Consider the scale and sense of enclosure of the courtyard and how the architecture works to resolve it.

-For the tower, explore the differentiation of what is the base and how it lands at grade.

-Study the transition to the public realm along Binning Road. Is there an opportunity to set back or slide closer to Binning Road and add to the public space in the interior courtyard?

-Some panel members liked the two-storey glazed box noting the amenity room has a good relationship to the courtyard. A panel member suggested the amenity space and lobby could be flipped. The lobby against the south wall would enable the amenity room users to experience the forest.

-The cooler tones on the west facing facade are bright and sunny. The application of colour under the balconies can look great or the painted concrete can look cheap. The darker tones on the north side might make the suites feel more austere inside.

- Build on the ocean and forest inspired forms through the height of the building with elements that surprise and delight.

-Consider the practical application of staggered balconies in regards to window cleaning.

### **CITY HOMES**

-A panel member thought the city homes are successful but have a scale issue in terms of proportion to the tower. Consider using the rooftops for amenity space. Other panel members thought the city homes as juxtaposed next to the tower provide an uncomfortable shift in massing. Suggestions included eliminating the four city homes and placing all the density in the tower and developing the additional green space or adding more city homes in groups that are more compact. Whereas another panel member suggested it might be better to study the relationship of the city homes to adjacent townhomes.

-A panel member thought the city home vocabulary is already established in the neighbourhood and provides eyes on the street next to the park.

### **LANDSCAPE**

-A panel member supported the modulation and arrangement of elements in the landscape, noting the mounds are surprising and delightful elements in the landscape. Another panel member liked the idea of transposing architectural forms in the landscape.

-Study the outdoors spaces and how public to private works - is it orderly? How does the architecture engage the space? Explore the opportunity to connect to the park. Informal routes and connections create porosity within the development and surrounding neighbourhood. Is there an opportunity around the parking ramps – reducing impact by sharing with ramp to the south?

-Consider how the second exit stair from the parking garage could be more than an exit route from grade.

-A panel member suggested the landscape of Khorana Park could be carried through rather than the lawn with street trees. Take the forest edge and develop the transition by using a naturalized vocabulary with the forest.

-The grass frontages on Binning Road will be shaded and hard to grow. Explore other options.

-Explore the interface from the fire truck access to the site. The seating node is a good move.

-A panel member thought the grade change at the main entry is awkward noting there is an accessible path nearby.

#### **Chair Summary:**

-Further study is needed to understand the relationship between city homes and the tower. Consider if some shifting of scale will create less of an imbalance.

-Look at the orientation of the building and study from a solar axis perspective the public realm surrounding the project and from the units. Are the balconies located to maximize sustainable opportunities appreciating the west elevation always challenging.

-Explore a vocabulary that has roots in your inspiration but not connected. Take positive attributes of each side for more of a holistic approach and meld better to simplify the building.

-Support for the treatment and individual components of the landscape such as mounds and blurring edges between public and private space.

-Glass box at entry should relate to the surrounding public realm.

-Take care in creating small moments in the landscape such as seating connected to the trail head.

-A sustainable narrative is needed to understand what the goals are and how they are going to be achieved.

#### **4.3 Technology Enterprise Facility (TEF) 4 Digital Tech Office**

Application Status:	Pre-application
Location:	Agronomy Road & Health Sciences Mall
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Acton Ostry Architects Inc. Perry + Associates

Architect Russell Acton (Acton Ostry Architects Inc.) and landscape architect Michael Patterson (Perry + Associates) presented. Project Manager: Nathan Ma, UBC Properties Trust

Advice from the panel was sought on the following:

- Massing and form
  - Given the height proposed, can we achieve a good result if:
    - the future changes (i.e. height change through Campus Plan update)
    - or if it doesn't (existing policy around height remains)?
  - Knowing:
    - Desire to reconcile height differences appropriately and demonstrably.
    - Massing and form needs to respect existing and future context.
  
- Ground floor uses and relationship to the public realm:

- Given future growth to the south, how are the ground floor uses a 'stepping off point' for continuing engaging, expressive, and unique facades – expression of technology, collaboration, partnerships and opportunities?

#### **Panel Commentary:**

-The panel members were supportive of the project's general direction. The panel appreciated the balance between sensitivity to how people will occupy the spaces and the clear, direct expression. The skin can adapt itself in a simple vocabulary.

-Study the floorplate step facing Agronomy Road in proportion to the overall mass of the building and its value. Articulate how the deck on the fifth level will be used and who will have access to the outdoor space – make the step back less hesitant. Consider the across road connections to balance the massing.

-Consider the program around the entrances. Understand the sectional relationship, the shadow study and the experience in the space whether pass-through or occupied. Activate the ground floor with a program that is compatible with pedestrians easily moving in/out of the space.

-A panel member suggested removing the corner columns to free up the corner glazing would be a good move.

-The panel is looking forward to how the building's simplicity and discipline will be reflected and tied into energy modelling.

#### **ROOFTOP AMENITY**

-Expand the scale of the rooftop amenity. Trees or other plantings on the rooftop could give context and provide a setting that is less exposed rather than some green amongst the roof. Explore the opportunity for a green roof.

#### **LANDSCAPE | PUBLIC REALM**

-Show how the landscape is contributing to the sustainability objectives of the campus and how the planting spacing is responding beyond screening. Consider matching the tight tree spacing in the neighborhood.

-A number of panel members thought the location of the outdoor gym amenity was blocking the circulation in the pedestrian mews. Its adjacency to the building service functions could cause conflict. Consider a location away from the public for the comfort of the users.

-A panel member wondered if the mews to the lane could be a covered pedestrian space, recognizing the back-of-house issues.

-Consider generous awnings over the sidewalks for weather protection. Provide more weather protection and anchor in the landscape the corner showing covered umbrellas and movable seating.

-Consider planting the medians on Health Sciences Mall with plantings other than grass given the trend to move away from the maintenance regime and resources required for grass.

-Consider if there is a better location for the bike storage racks. Site the benches along the sidewalk in more of a setting.

-Consider the connection through the mews to the lane and how it sets up a future condition to the south.

-Maximizing the use of the ground plane as the campus density increases by repurposing surface parking lots is a positive direction for the university.

**Chair Summary:**

-General support for the building height, rooftop amenity and the clean contemporary look that builds on precedents from the nearby Pharmaceutical Sciences building.

-General appreciation for the sensitivity to occupation at grade and relationship to the program tied into the uses of the building.

-Support for creating an energy efficient tight facade.

-Extend the rooftop amenity by adding trees, a green roof, or other planting materials.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:20 PM.