



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes 2001

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

UBC ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING

May 15, 2001 – 1.00 p.m. to 4.30 p.m.

The Gardenia Room



In attendance :

Members:

- Mr. Patrick Condon, Associate Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture (PC)
- Ms Bev Nielsen, Nielsen Design Consultants Ltd (BN)
- Mr. Rainer Fassler, Senior Associate, Architectura (RF)
- Mr Douglas D. Paterson, Assoc Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture (DP)
- Ms Jane Durante, Principal, Durante Kreuk Ltd (JD)
- S/Sgt. M.J.Clark, Regional Commander, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (MC)

Consultants:

Busby & Associates

Peter Busby (PB)
Susan Gushe (SG)
Brian Wakelin (BW)

UBC Properties

Nora Stevenson (NS)
Joe Redmond (JR)

Henriquez Partners

Richard Henriquez (RH)
Yijin Wen (YW)

Chernoff Thompson Architects

Don Vaughan (DV)
Russ Chernoff (RC)
Naomi Gross (NG)

UBC staff:

Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (TL)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services (JC)
Dianna Foldi, Development Manager (Place Vanier presentation) (DF)
Jay Jethwa, Development Manager (Michael Smith Building presentation) (JJ)
Fred Fotis (Director of Housing – Place Vanier) (FF)

Regrets:

Kevin Hydes, Engineer, Keen Engineering

Agenda

1. Introduction of Members of Panel
2. Election of Chair and initial review
3. Place Vanier Project
4. Michael Smith Building
5. TEF 3

Meeting commenced at 1.00 p.m.

1. **Introduction of Members of Panel**

- TL introduced himself and welcomed the panel and thanked members for attending the UBC Advisory Design Panel (ADP) first meeting, followed by the attendees introducing themselves.
- TL explained that the previous ADP was discontinued when the AIBC objected that the panel was seen to be too much controlled by UBC staff; some members of the Panel felt it wasn't really objective or fair. During the brief life of the previous panel it did evolve to the point where it was agreed that there would generally be 2 reviews of a project. Discussed at some length the timing of the introduction of a project to the panel. With these first 3 projects today, we would have brought these projects to the Panel sooner had the panel been active and requested the Panel to bear that in mind. Acknowledgment that the members are busy professionals who have volunteered their time, which should not be wasted.

2. **Election of Chair and Initial Review**

- TL requested JD to guide the Panel through the process of electing a Chair from among themselves.
- RF proposed JD as Chair of the panel. JD accepted for a term of one year.
- Terms of Reference were distributed to all members and discussed. TL explained some of the problems with the previous panel to the University's senior administration. Engaged Urban Systems who drew up the Terms of Reference with reviews by TL. Also reviewed West Vancouver, District of North Vancouver and another model. The idea was to be aligned with similar bodies in the Lower Mainland.

TL called for comments on the Terms of Reference.

- JD: noted need for election of Vice Chair. Clause to be drafted in Terms of Reference. PC nominated RF as Vice Chair. Nomination was seconded by JD and accepted by RF;
- RF: what procedure in terms of the Presenter being in or out of the room in relation to discussion? Discussion will be in the presence of the presenter in the order of presentation → questions → discussion/clarification. West Vancouver always sent the Presenter out.
- BN – can questions be asked of the Presenter? RF suggested that recommendations/questions of the Panel could be discussed around the table.
- Only members have voting rights
- Chair will summarise commentary and vote at the end of the presentation and discussion.
- TL - process contemplates two meetings, to review suggestions. However because of the relatively advanced stage of each of the present projects, TL suggested one meeting subject to change as the meeting progressed.
- RF – re above point, this would depend on the reaction of the panel. If there are some reservations at the 2nd meeting, a 3rd meeting might be needed.

TL – in principle, it would. Though the process contemplates two meetings, did not see that as a limiting factor.

- RF – it is extremely helpful and much easier for the architect to digest discussion and comment when he comes really early. When the concept of the project is well

established, it's much harder. The earliest presentation should be when serious options can still be put on the table, especially big-ticket items.

TL – that's how it evolved previously. If a Panel had been in place, these projects would have been presented sooner in the process.

- JD – are there any other projects coming on stream?
TL – about to do consultant selection on a \$60 million Main Library project, \$30 million Chemistry + Bio Engineering building, shelved in 1995, \$19 million ICICS (information technology – back of CISIR building).
- DP – it would help to have a quick overview of projects and discussion internally, to before arrival of the proponents. Was a practice of the Vancouver Panel. Advance package helps but not the same as a general discussion.
RF – if a project is presented at the beginning, this would be less needed. Would feel more comfortable if he understood the projects, before the proponents come. Could determine what level comments are going to be constructive.
- TL to address that issue in opening remarks in the presence of proponent, to avoid repetition. TL also to present the background and context of the project and the Architect would present the details

3. **Presentation of Place Vanier Project** (JD stepped down from the Chair for this presentation due to her involvement)

- History of project:
 - Location is at Place Vanier – north-west of campus
 - 1st phase of University of Korea and UBC collaboration to provide 200 student beds.
 - UBC Housing & Conferences project; Fred Fotis is Director of Housing and UBC Properties & Trust is managing the project. Nora Stevenson is contracted to UBC Properties as Project Manager. DF is the Development Manager. University Architect and Director of Planning had discussions with architect about fit with the existing Place Vanier character, siting with regard to existing open space, maintenance of landscape. Staying within the existing fence line was an important determinant of design due to unresolved geotechnical matters in discussion with the GVRD, Musqueam and Wreck Beach people.
 - Looked at various building massing configurations to meet the program. L shape plan was generally agreed by TL and architects as the best fit. Its about a storey and a half taller than existing. . Can get exactly the same brick that was used 40 years ago.
 - Site design and landscape – fitting in with the existing mature landscape. Korean partner have asked for a Korean garden to be incorporated in the building design and this will probably take the form of a garden.
 - Summary: Extensive discussions with the architect to date; in agreement with the direction taken. Building is fairly simple, not a copy of the 40-year-old existing buildings but relates reasonably well in terms of scale, colour and materials.

Presentation by PB

- First such new housing in 30 years. Funding and economics for building has not been there. Project is on a very tight financial budget.
- Central facilities for the whole building are on the ground floor, arrival area.
- Laundry and kitchen facilities servicing the whole building.

- Typical floors don't have kitchen, only lounge area, with the idea of occupants having their meals in the main building together
- Corridors are designed to have visibility/natural light at the ends.

JD continued to explain master plan issues

- Worked with NS to do the original Master Plan and figure out how to fit more housing into the community. Most phenomenal thing was the mature landscape they were putting the building between. Building is sited to take full advantage of the landscape around it. Some landscape will be moved and reused. Only two trees will have to come out. Existing groups of Rhododendrons will be taken off site and replaced later.
- Explained access to new building, concept of Korean garden. Discussed social space, bike storage, and benches.
Landscape will be lit so that safety and security is looked after.
Minor changes to be done on fire lane – will be repaved.
Possibility of using material that comes out of the excavation to do some modulation of the adjacent topography.

Fred Fotis further explained project with material and model.

- Sustainability target is to consume only 50% of energy of existing residences by reducing lighting, controlling efficiency of lighting and heating through significant upgrades in insulation.
- 75% of bikes can be stored and locked up
- Disability access on all floors of building – for visiting and washrooms
Disability occupancy on 2nd floor.

Questions/concerns raised by members:

- Do we see any more housing units happening in this particular quadrant in another 10-15 years?
 - Might be even sooner.
- Do you have a sense of where they might go in this area?
 - Wings could be added to existing buildings to increase density.
- In terms of accessibility at the main entry, is there a plan for an automatic door?
 - Yes. Re emergency exit onto the street, paving treatment will allow for wheelchair users to get away from the building without any barrier.
- In the accessible units, what is the distance between end of bed and closet, and is there a turning radius?
 - No turning radius at the end of the bed and closet. Sufficient radius within the room with general maneuverability to get into the bed. Furniture could be rearranged. Desk location at bottom of window. Window opener is above the desk. Kitchen area is wheelchair accessible.
- Has physical security to the structure – locks, window access etc. been dealt with at this stage?
 - A security strategy is in place. A decision has to be budget based, between the individual doors having electrical locks or electronic locks.
In external building – trying to incorporate landscape to prevent people from getting up-close to the building. That windows open in will help. Will also have UBC security look at the strategy, to see if all aspects have been covered. Emergency phones on the external doors. Total visibility and clarity at all exit doors.
- Larger overall plan : there are larger social issues that relate to the collective group that the university should be addressing in terms of larger outdoor space and how the

different shapes and volumes of those spaces might affect the way people use it. A larger overall drawing of that nature would have been very helpful. On a more specific point, was shifting the building to the south about 20 feet considered and was that a possibility?

- Keeping the building from intruding into the park space was key.
- Was there some other way of dealing with the fire access to allow more of a front yard? A backyard component seems to be emerging. Several service areas in the university are backdoor places and with a little bit of change to make that a slightly more front door feeling might be nice.
What is the long-term vision for the area in the context of pavilion and park diversification and invigoration?
- Why wasn't this project conceived as an opportunity to work with the older buildings first, to create these more intense enclosures by adding onto existing buildings or by creating connections between existing buildings, to create courtyard spaces versus open park spaces.
 - this issue has been discussed at planning level.
 - Peter Busby started out putting ten similar buildings to the existing in the whole landscape which would have added another one thousand units and then realized they had to start somewhere. This area of the site was picked for a variety of reasons. It had the least construction impact on the rest of the site, easy access from Marine Drive and servicing issues were easily resolved by putting a building here. The reason the building became 200 units rather than 100 units was because of agreements between UBC and Korea University. More factors than just site planning issues created the 200-room building.
 - Contingencies, practicalities and pragmatic issues are always compelling and any other process to reconcile those contingencies and practicalities with this might need more discussion
- Road alignment and night headlights – any study done as to how windows especially ground level are affected by that?
 - Have looked into visibility of approach from both ends. Existing landscape features block the direct light with the single exception in one particular area. Busby to look at it again and ensure something grows there.
- NS to get back to the panel about how low the ancillary roof is. Did not want to have it so low they had to increase the structural capacity. There was a fine line of how much water could be retained on the roof without incurring additional costs.
- Was the opportunity to use storm water for running inside functions like toilets etc. considered?
 - Was initially considered, but for cost and health reasons it did not go through due to process of taking it through GVRD. Too short a time to do that level of development. Have made a proposal for another building on campus.

Comments

- RF – This is an unusual situation of a panel coming in very late, with a lot of questions that would have been better asked in the beginning. Agreed that the master planning comment re densification is very important. Comments may be too late for this project, but hopes that another building would not just find another good spot to build, but address the very important issues.
 - FF - There was some discussion about how these tie into Planning Principles before the project was begun. Pragmatic and money-driven issues led the decision to build an individual building, since it would have less disruption on the whole community. At one point there was a decision to look at more additions and more wings. That would have made it impossible to do the

expected level of construction within a short period of time and it would be disruptive for an entire building for 10 or 11 months. The next phase has to do with how the whole site relates to itself. Planning to improve some of the play space. The commons block area needs expansion and refreshment. All these individual buildings require significant renovation work inside. They are 30-40 years old and have not received the attention they need. The institution is yet to decide what the admissions process is going to be - not sure of the emphasis in terms of housing and first year students.

- Master Planning - for a next phase, this task could even be seen as a project in itself rather than rush it when a project starts. This is a really big issue, as the university densifies, that goes beyond buildings - landscape, services, infrastructure and everything.
- DP – This is a very sensible, very straightforward very well worked out building for its price.
- RF - This is a very handsome modern cousin to the older buildings.

Decision

The project was unanimously supported by the Panel.

4. Presentation of Michael Smith Building

- History of project
 - Location – at the junction of University Blvd and East Mall, over Oceanography Annex, next to existing bookstore.
 - Primarily a laboratory building for genomics research. An earlier program and conceptual design was completed in 1995 but did not go as far as a full schematic and was shelved for money reasons. Reactivated in 1999. Fit with university and site was discussed as part of the criteria for selecting the architect. Looking for buildings that fit with surroundings rather than compete against them was the drive behind the design. Is a very tight site with a ground floor foot print about half the floor plate. In urban design terms has a very tight space onto Biological Sciences Road to the south. UALA established street and sidewalk widths with Henriquez Partners. It has a relationship to East Mall coming down into University Blvd and East Mall intersection which is currently part of the ongoing Neighbourhood Plan discussions.
- Presentation by Richard Henriquez with materials
 - Building is about 7,419 sq.m. Contains laboratories, a few offices with an auditorium and a multi purpose room on the main floor to have a permanent exhibition space to commemorate Michael Smith and also temporary exhibitions.
 - First decision made from a design point of view was to separate offices from the laboratories. This was done for economic reasons – didn't want to build heavy services into office building so that office section did not need air conditioning.
 - Exhaust system is 100% exhaust air. Have done thorough and extensive series of energy workshops and believe that the building will use approx 37% of the energy required for a conventional laboratory of this kind, which is a bonus.
 - Main feature of the building is the atrium, which will be the communal space for the complex where scientists will meet. Idea was to make it a home for scientists rather than a scientific building.
 - The building across the street of several generations earlier are of a similar model. Proposing to introduce artwork on the main façade in the form of coloured glass – details have not been worked out to date. Servicing happens from the existing lane, on the west of the building.

Questions/concerns raised by members

- Is the office component open in part to the atrium or completely separated?
 - the lower floor can be opened, but there has to be a separation of the second floor due to code requirements.
- What is the university policy with regard to acceptability of students and are all the labs accessible to wheelchair students?
 - Yes, 90% of the labs are accessible.
- What is the size of the doors at the entry into the labs? Need to have a 5 ft space for disabled access.
 - The big door is 3 feet and corridor is 5 ft. Both are wheelchair accessible and agreed upon with John Lane, Physical Access Coordinator, UBC.
- Within laboratories is there flexibility in the location of the actual lab tables for wheelchair accessibility?
 - This is currently being looked at so as to provide flexible lab casework for disabled use.
- Given that the bookstore is very much a part of the overall corner, has there been any attempts to tie them in together material-wise, or do you see them more as two distinct pieces?
 - Don't want any more concrete on campus. The buildings are separated with a deep recess.
- What about the arcade and what we are walking on and what is it like as a quality environment?
 - There are some services at the moment but assuming the position that they have to be moved because in time the arcade might get filled in with usable space. The only spaces that face out of the arcade now are some offices from Oceanography and it would be nice to have these more publicly accessible.
- Has a site plan for physical security been developed yet, as in people coming in and stealing?
 - Upper floors in the building will be by card access and therefore the Lab is quite secure.
- Is there a teaching lab in the basement ?
 - There is a graduate research lab facility in the basement.

Comments

- RF - really enjoyed the emphasis on meeting and socializing places as it creates places for people to meet informally. It seems a real trend in the most serious institutions to recognise that this creativity will happen to a very large degree in these sorts of spaces.
- DP - what he liked about the atrium is that the floor plan circulation keeps the atrium in mind, it is not around in the corner and is central to the image structure of the building.
- JD - important to ask the proponents in future to bring more contextual information and the 8 principles in the documents, so that there is some reference to them in their presentation.
- PC - suggested a 2-page response in future as to how these building projects came about. It would direct the conversation along productive lines.
- JC – normally a design panel would just look at the project as to what it is in relation to zoning byelaws and all the rest of the documentation and physical context, and they would not want to go into all the detailed background.

Decision

The project received the unanimous approval vote of the panel.

5. Presentation of TEF 3 Project

- History of Project
 - Project fits with planning principles and is a 3rd party project
 - Presented to Board 2 for information on May 14, 2001. As with the Place Vanier housing job, the project has an almost impossible tight schedule and a very tight budget.
 - Looked at a study that had TEF buildings dotted around the campus, mixed use with various other functions. That did not happen. Trying not to have a light industrial park ghetto in the middle of campus so the fit of this complex becomes quite important. With that in mind, TL asked Chernoff Thompson to look at the whole block, so they have conceptualized the whole block as a precursor to moving forward with the design of the particular building. Some of the things talked about in broad principle is the need for the university to start developing above the generally accepted 4 storey level. Need to densify but also need to look at going above 4 storeys and if we are going to do that how do we do it in terms of building, massing and placement. In previous discussion on Donald Rix talked about the ground floor visibility into buildings. When TL looked at the total block his thoughts were that it really is a 4-sided block that does not have a back, so he asked the architect to look at making all the buildings front onto the street. Servicing happens on the inside. This led to a fair amount of discussion about service yard versus amenity space, turning circles etc. Didn't want a view straight into a yard through to the sub station beyond. Talked about evolving from TEF's 1 and 2, and better quality masonry,

Presentation by Russ Chernoff with materials

- Located south of the campus, on the edge, part of an applied science precinct, Its an area of campus where theory is brought into actual application and use. That is the purpose of the building.
- Although its on UBC campus, the building has some unique characteristics that aren't quite the same as a normal campus building. Purpose is to provide leasable space for research companies having a relationship with UBC. UBC is not looking for companies that aren't going to augment the mission and purpose of UBC, but looking to have close relationships, places for students to work, and allow theory to be developed and grow into real life applications through these buildings, so that a person who teaches out here has business out here which grows over time. The program for the building is space that is capable of supporting a wide range of potential users from office to information technology, a full wet laboratory and biotechnology facilities, with a serious need for ultimate flexibility.
- Have identified a series of site and urban issues. One of the key things is the four storey scale. The campus by and large has the 4 storey scale throughout. Conceptually the idea is to maintain a 4 storey scale and at the same time breaking out and having a higher building and better usage of land.
- Transparency through the buildings and tendency to keep the blinds closed was discussed and needs to be worked on.
- Have looked at potential for how many and how buildings can be placed on the site. Actual site approved by Board was only corner. It is potentially 4 buildings with the ability to link to one another, to create a street wall.
- Explained common entry, presence at the corner, how the massing might work on the block.
- Service access - looked at having garbage enclosed within the envelope of the building so there are no difficult situations of having garbage containers with screening around them. Thinking of an overhead door to deal with the access issue for the garbage trucks as they really do dictate the design of your plan on campus. Fire truck turn around and service and drop off at the corners of the building.

Servicing was designed to give maximum flexibility for exhausting and economy of construction and minimal disruption

- Discussed building design, planning flexibility within the plans, potential for mixed use.
- Explained that a wet lab needs fume hoods and needs to exhaust. Dealing with those issues, maintaining flexibility and economy in terms of longer term use was discussed.
- Transparent ground floor. 4 storey scale - ducting from the first floor levels internal in first 2 buildings expressing the exterior exhausting and in the other building it is enclosed within the building.

Sustainability

- Worked with Freda Pagani, had team workshop and established priorities and goals. Three overall goals - highly energy efficient and resource efficient, user friendly and flexibility and adaptability.
- 2 levels of parking with bicycle parking in the basement. Access to parking is through courtyard

Ground floor

- leasable space in the corner, more commercially oriented. Access through the corner through the circulation system.
- Ducting/shafts are not in the center of the building – pushed to the outside of the building giving a completely open plan. Planning is very flexible as ducting occurs in the perimeter.

Lower floors

- has ducting coming up. Shafts are on the outside of the building. Levels 5 + 6 have express shafts
- Proposing to bring into the building, nurses on the Georgia Medical Dental building, since it is a life sciences oriented building in all likelihood and the nurses are looking for a home.
- Discussed south view, aerial view, Brick masonry, canopies, seating areas, brick colour.

Presentation by Don Vaughn – landscape

- Courtyard became important – for services and as private space for the users. Because of the nature of the user it will stay within its site. A lot of care had to be given to its integration into the building. Anticipation is that courtyard will be built in Phase 1. Some work will have to be done when the next building comes in, but the whole thing can be built at this stage. At a stage with the landscape design of dealing with concepts and programme. Courtyard was looked at on the basis that conceptually it's a space within itself. Received comments from Andrew Wilson that a) the radius was a meter short – has been expanded and b) circulation system where you arrive on the site - concern that people would walk through the lawn. There is a straight route between the arrival and the doors both from the parking lot and from the courtyard.

Questions/comments of Panel:

- What kind of analysis have you done with respect to discussions with the tenants of the Rix and McGavin building in terms of why the blinds are closed as much as they are? Was it too much light for the computers?
 - First issue is security. Not something they knew about when they did the first building, but it is becoming more and more apparent that these companies treasure their secrets and actually have this concern that people will be looking into the building and seeing secrets and seeing the people working in the labs. This is a major issue for them.

On first 2 floors occupied by WEB CT an IT company, they turn the lights out because they don't like fluorescent lights and leave the curtains open as they like the natural daylight. Buildings are treated as having a good amount of light coming in. However on the ground floor particularly, security and privacy is viewed fairly seriously. More so if it is a lab research company.

Questions are asked of the tenants from the beginning, they are surveyed as they move from one space to another within the building to get an appreciation for how they feel they should use the building and try to incorporate ideas into the next round of buildings.

- Are there any kind of performance standards in the leasable agreements with the university – for eg. one window of the building should serve as an information for people walking by and be user friendly about what's generally going on in the building. Are there those kinds of leasehold arrangements with these tenants today?
 - Nothing to date. All that 's happened is that they have been encouraged not to cover the windows. DPI has not put together an actual agreement or wording within the lease to constraint on the tenant to do that. Can be explored with DPI. As with any landlord they tend to be a little bit reluctant to bring too many constraints on their tenants. Have done tenant guidelines for these buildings and have some wording that encourages that, but perhaps even in the tenant guide could try to develop stronger wording about that.
- Is an interesting project to have watched evolve. While the illustration shows very well what will happen when the building site is consumed, it also indicates a potential problem. If the building does develop that way, it is really monumental. Part of the issue is site size and block size. Small block on campus is bigger than a standard Vancouver block and it is rare to have a building that covers a whole block. Talking about the University City as a long-term objective of diversity raises a question about whether that strategy needs to be examined. When the office part comes into the campus to create this University City does it express itself as a very large invention or is it more urban like?
 - TL explained that he wants a strong street wall.
In working with TL, they had no mandate to actually design buildings other than the one in the corner. As much as anything, massing and density was looked at. For simplicity the materials were thrown in just to get a sense of continuity of materials and see how it might all come together. They could quite easily be distinct buildings. UBC could in fact do the other two buildings. DPI was given the corner block and initial building will just be that. It was a fairly quick exploration to see if you really build that site, what sort of density you might get - if you had 4 storeys and intermixed it with 6 storeys, to get a feel of what's possible on the block. That was the context in which the study was done.
- For a residential building housing students there is a lack of green open space. There is a parking lot adjacent to Thunderbird which could be developed as open space but there is no ability for the student to relate to a homely feeling. Is this the right site?
 - Looking at open space strategy for the campus under separate cover, driven by UBC Properties. Also finalising the landscape plan for the campus. Understood BN's point that there was a possible opportunity for green space and its not happening. Good point. Only explored conceptually the building out of the block. Right now there's going to be a building on one corner of it.
- Don and RC felt the green base was really important since it carried the spirit of the greenness of the campus. Having a green base for the building makes a lot of sense. Don and RC were concerned about having a severe connection meeting with the rest of campus. If you have commercial and accesses, it only creates a sidewalk as opposed to removing the green base. The base actually is from East Mall to the face of the building, with the canopy held back to get the green base in.
- Even at the level of the one building, something about it causes concern relative to the ideas of a vibrant university city. What emerges in the conversation is still a lack

of clarity and consensus about what that implies. We have on the one hand office landscape where the coverage of the buildings is 15%. What green there is, is not useful at all because you cannot find a place that's attractive to sit down. The strategy that was talked about relative to the second building is to let the building come up to the street. JD agreed that the building was monumental and that no where else on campus do such big blocks of buildings exist.

- RF - had difficulty reacting to the Master Planning issues in this context, as there is no clear vision for this general precinct. Besides that, he has problems when a project of this size deals with its Master Planning issues in this very intriguing 3D computer form. Cannot understand these spaces without actually either cutting huge big sections or building a physical model. It is an inadequate way, if we are talking master planning, of dealing with master planning. No sense of what the scale of these spaces in between buildings are, with these tools. If we are serious about this, we need to get back to more serious investigations. Concerned about the building. Apart from its heaviness, the attitude that just basically deals with the facade element and stops just short. Because of the treatment of the aesthetic of the duct it makes it colossally heavy regardless of what the materials are. If serious about the Forestry scale, should actually look at a different way of treating the upper two floors in a much lighter way and then back to the Master Plan. If one is serious about dealing with these spaces between buildings, then even more so one needs to take the four storey material around as a volume, as an experience and then get back to master planning. Agrees with TL with regard to street wall being a good approach. In terms of designing the open spaces, the public space, the approach of looking at them as a collection of buildings would be a healthier one. Has concerns about this approach to master planning, does not think it goes far enough or does justice to the exploration of the master planning issues.
- Is there any way on a long term basis that you can put this much of this building type, essentially an industrial park building in one location without in fact creating a very significant black spot or hole in the quality of the campus experience? When you lost that kind of design panel, how can you get it back.
 - Commentary of Advisory Design Panel will be taken to Board. Confident that the presence of Joe Wai and others on the Board can add some weight and help to turn the thinking direction. Comments of this group are not wasted.
- What are the various sizes, do we have any sense of the range of square footage requirements? Is it typical for one firm to want one whole floor or get 3-4 smaller groups on one floor?
 - Can vary but probably looking at 2 per floor or one per floor, one may take two floors. Building is seen as a home for larger companies. But it becomes a family of buildings for the people who are going to occupy. May find corporate offices in one building and lab in another building. Growth patterns are very hard to project.
- Presumably these buildings are here for the university's intellectual benefit. Have we made any provisions for some university activities to occur within there? Spoke about issues of atrium and intellectual exchanges in last presentation but there is no hint of how intellectual exchange will take place in these places.
 - There was a push at the start of the planning process to make it a mixed-use building in accordance with the Planning Principles. However there was a big push back from the VP Research office not to have a mixed-use building and it is not a mixed-use building.
- To create a courtyard, which fundamentally isn't really visible to anybody except a few people around the edge, is an impossible task. It has no social presence, as it can't have one under the circumstances, has no access so it becomes a failure from day one.
 - The users are unique to the campus. Will not go to the elsewhere, this will be their outdoor space, their courtyard.

- There is a difficulty in getting to it – the extent to which a lot of them see it, is limited. People will walk out to the bread garden for coffee break instead of the courtyard. Not architecturally or intellectually integrated. None of current courtyards on campus work because there is no proper indoor/outdoor relationship – Faculty Club, McMillan.
 - Reason is because there is no food service.
- There were lots of great quadrangles and other examples of outdoor spaces that don't have food courts around them that get used. Stuck in this instance fundamentally and programmatically because of the nature of what's going on in the buildings and the controls to get in and out.
 - This building is not creating the master plan, it's the product of the one – the zoning, the guidelines. Tried to take the service into the center of the building rather than the side.
- Has never seen a building with this kind of inside/outside relationship with these kinds of access points into that space, ever work. Will look better and conceptually appear to be better but doubts it will work.
- Seems to be a contradiction between single use building of this size and the principles espoused here. Contradiction needs to be resolved since it is an enormously flexible building
- Encourage more architectural exploration without doing violence to the structural system.
- There is a problem with the relationship of the ground floor windows and the fact that people put paper and blinds. This needs to be addressed as part of the lease or knocked out panels that can come out when it becomes retail, so that the interim period doesn't become paper.
- Concerned about the continuous canopy. Emphasizes the colossal dimension of the building. Should we stay away from making it a continuous canopy?
 - Continuous rain protection was the wider strategy campus-wide to get as much covered walkways. Explained with presentation that the canopy was equal on the two streets, but broken at bay lines so that it may not be apparent and not continuous, is articulated more than it reads in the drawings. The canopy will be more articulated and lighter in the final analysis.
- Green glass does not go with the masonry and brick. With the increased use of masonry trying to get more towards a university looking building rather than an industrial park building, the green glass contributes to that kind of industrial look.
 - Will explore that and look at alternatives since glass colour is a major aspect of a building. Research has shown that most tinted glass changes the colour of the sky and environment around. Green glass seems to avoid that problem. There are one or two green glasses that actually don't do that or do so in a minimal way that is acceptable.
 - If there is a seriousness about the 4-storey scale being a significant scale in the area, the top 2 floors are not background, they don't fade away, they are rivaling with the brick base. Investigate making this a much more of a neutral field.
- Is there a possibility of pulling the exhaust elements into the face of the building instead of expressing them as an aesthetic? It is an expression that is very architectural and reinforces the heaviness of the building. Okay to express the lab nature, but there are other ways of expressing them.
- Four points discussed in detail:
 - Master Plan and concern for the totality of the block and the desire to break it down a bit and still respect the street wall but there would be some diversity and character and form.
 - What happens at the top end and base of the building – so that there is a lightness at the top
 - issue of covering the glass
 - Courtyard - whether it has a viability as a usable space or not.

Comments

- DP – should we continue to state a position that single function zoning on campus is problematic and works against the principles of the Legacy and Promise, the word Promise substantially so. If not confronted very early on as a design panel, and see future problems a year or 2 years down the way, it be useless at that point in time.
- PC – agreed with that view. Suggested a practical strategy and encouraged the design team to take a look at the Planning Principles again and what those against their programme and their ideas about how this building expresses itself and encourage the team to engage that creative question in recognition of this great opportunity. The building is in a less prestigious part of the campus but one that will eventually become more central.
- PC – applauds the generosity of the main entrance at the corner and also the generosity of the canopy. The corner can very easily be the lobby but its chosen to be a tenant space.
- JD – it pulls people who might otherwise be sitting in the courtyard out onto the street corner where the action is.
- RF – courtyard : talked about the nice axis of FSC. No other way of dealing with the car entry. The considerable slope, makes it somewhat difficult that it squeezes you against the side of this mixed phase building to actually get through – if the size of the next phase building actually happens. But it is a real barrier to a easy movement into that courtyard.
- DP – perhaps we could try to be more generous in actual physical space for people as opposed to the ramp down.
 - The options are limited and that seemed to be a reasonable place, but appreciates the limitation and also that it does feel constrained for pedestrians coming through. This way the gaping whole which is the parking structure entrance wherever you put it, is tucked in within the breezeway. If it occurred as part of the courtyard, it would have a far more detrimental effect on the people using it.
- JD – garages, entries need to be treated as front doors
 - Did study the alternatives which runs through the courtyard, but seemed to be a major compromise. To look around the edge of the block to find a ramp, through the building, would be a serious interruption to what would be a really pleasant ground space façade.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

UBC ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING

June 05, 2001 – 11.00 p.m. to 1.00 p.m.

The Gardenia Room



In attendance :

Members:

- Ms Bev Nielsen, Nielsen Design Consultants Ltd (BN)
- Mr. Rainer Fassler, Senior Associate, Architectura (RF)
- Mr Douglas D. Paterson, Assoc Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture (DP)
- Ms Jane Durante, Principal, Durante Kreuk Ltd (JD)
- S/Sgt. M.J. Clark, Regional Commander, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (MC)
- Kevin Hydes, Engineer, Keen Engineering (KH)

Consultants:

Chernoff Thompson Architects
Don Vaughan (DV)
Russ Chernoff (RC)
Naomi Gross (NG)

UBC staff:

Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (TL)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services (JC)
Fred Pritchard, Director of Planning (FP)

Regrets:

- Mr. Patrick Condon, Associate Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture (PC)

Purpose:

1. UBC Planning Issues – Fred Pritchard
2. Discuss TEF 3 options

Meeting commenced at 11.00 p.m.

1. **UBC Planning Issues – Fred Pritchard**

- FP addressed the panel on current planning process of UBC.

Questions/concerns raised by members:

- There was some concern as to how many of the planning principles are adhered to in terms of physical planning and buildings.
- 50% of problems were of a conceptual nature. How does a Design Panel deal with those issues?
 - In the midst of adopting a 5 year process. Board 1 approves the location and project in principle after considering issues related to height of building, density, etc. Not much information about design process and specific relation to the siting is available at this stage. The planning principles talk about a general application of the principles and does not deal with specifics.
- Important to have more information. Investment of time is better served if background information is provided.
- Would you find it beneficial to see this panel involved in new planning issues?
 - Panel is being asked to consider design issues of TEF 3. Have Board approval of the location and space but Board did not look at design details. As the project begins to develop, UALA is taking into consideration design principles. Board to consider looking at the site based on the requirement to produce 100,000 sq.ft. using a relatively limited amount of property with a footprint that will allow for going up.
- If we have an overall general plan for the university, which designates what type of building goes where, is there a more detailed urban related plan?
 - There is a Comprehensive Community Plan which sets out design guidelines, strategies and principles to be followed. Only deals with the institutional core. The Landscape Plan (which is not a land use plan) is a new document working from a premise that landscape becomes the canvas and buildings are fitted within the landscape. There are a number of documents that can be related to directly and indirectly.
 - Academic buildings are based on whether location meets the academic requirements. Important for panel to get information on prior commitments on location and building.
 - Some are based on replacement of buildings – important for the panel to get an insight that leads to some of the decisions.
 - Important for proponents and users of particular buildings to make their requirements and reasons for location known during the process. Selection of siting is critical to the process.
 - Would be useful to both panel and Planning to be part of the planning decisions.
 - Panel should comment on Landscape Plan before it is made public. In Vancouver when neighbourhood plans were being done, it is brought to the panel for discussion.
 - Panel will be given the opportunity of a presentation of the neighbourhood plan.

TEF 3 - Russ Chernoff

- The Chair summarized the four main issues that arose from the previous presentation as being -
 - concern for the totality of the block
 - lighter expression at top of building
 - planning principles
 - Courtyard - whether it has a viability as a usable space or not.

Russ Chernoff

- No further work on block study – focusing on the building.
- Discussed issue of mixed use - building has potential for flexibility.
- Briefly spoke on transparency, corner, bike storage, setbacks from the road, and 4-storey base.
- Looking at bringing the materials and expression of the Frank Forward and MacMillan into this side of the campus. Considering a granite base. Use of brick will be less dominant.
- Looking at reducing parapet height of building and putting frames.
- Canopy will be coloured for a little more emphasis.

Option B

- Same base, more background glass. Parapet height is the same. More variety instead of flat facade. Small outdoor yard.
- Discussed impact of ramp to parking, nature of courtyard, idea of making connection from west into courtyard. Makes the gap larger and gives a connection from the top. Option was to close the gap with glass entry as a second stage. Close and link it with a corridor in an enclosed space.

Questions/comments of Panel:

- Of the two options, idea of a curtain wall and de-emphasising horizontal lines is better. Use of neutral glass was suggested.
 - 40% glass. Goal is to design these buildings to create good natural light. Building has less shade than typical office building.
- Ground plane –concerns re: how eating inside/outside would work
- Display window near parking ramp?
- Display windows instead of nurses?
- Breezeway idea to pedestrians/parking idea – okay.
- Option A is least workable.
- Corner lantern has an element which is common and flat.
- RC explained with materials how the idea grew, the materials in curtain wall, glass.
- Installation of fritted glass to be looked into, for a lighter and delicate appearance.
- One operable window per bay.
- DP - changes seem to be going in the right direction.
- What is the public art policy?
 - There is a President's Advisory Committee on art. Advertising places for public art is one of the layers in the landscape plan.
- May need to revise shape of courtyard to relate to program change of ground floor tenant space on east.
 - Russ – possible to have doors from tenant space to courtyard, tenants might use area in courtyard for small experiment zones. Intent is this is interesting to those in courtyard.
 - Courtyard used by people who work in the building for lunch.
 - Square courtyard – intent : cobbles with grass between; concrete on driveway – covered or patterned – not asphalt.
 - Why third material concrete? Use brick at stair instead?

Summary

- Consensus that nurses are inappropriate.
- Ensure that sustainability issues are looked at.
- Openness in corridor to allow public access for interaction, meeting room and bread garden.
- Curtain wall is more appropriate but de-emphasise spandrels – use of plain or fritted glass.

- Look at shading of glass.
- Use brick on stair shafts.
- Concern re design of lantern on corridor
- 4 storeys at east (back)
- Courtyard changed to reflect access from building
- Breezeway okay.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



UBC ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING

July 11, 2001 – 9.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.
Campus Planning & Development Gardenia Room

In attendance :

Members:

- Ms Bev Nielsen, Nielsen Design Consultants Ltd (BN)
- Mr. Rainer Fassler, Senior Associate, Architecture (RF)
- Mr Douglas D. Paterson, Assoc Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture (DP)
- Ms Jane Durante, Principal, Durante Kreuk Ltd (JD)
- Patrick Condon, Assoc Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture

Consultants:

TEF - Chernoff Thompson Architects

Russ Chernoff (RC)

Don Vaughan (DV) Landscape Architect

TRIUMF ISAC II

Peter Dandyk, Architect (PD) - PBK Architects

Mark Koropecy, Architect (MK) - PBK Architects

Todd Gattinger, Project Manager (TG) - UMA Management Services

MDS Noridon

Peter Dandyk, Architect (PD) - PBK Architects

Mark Koropecy, Architect (MK) - PBK Architects

Eric Beers, Project Manager (EB) - Cochrane Engineering Ltd

UBC staff:

Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (TL)

Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services (JC)

Jim Hanlon, Manager, Human Resources

Dr. Paul Schmor, Division Head, TRIUMF ISAC II

Franco Mammarella, Operations Services Manager, TRIUMF ISAC II

Regrets:

- S/Sgt. M.J. Clark, Regional Commander, Royal Canadian Mounted Police (MC)
- Kevin Hydes, Engineer, Keen Engineering (KH)
-

Purpose:

1. TEF III
2. TRIUMF ISAC II
3. MDS Nordion

Meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m.

1. **TEF III**

Presentation by Don Vaughn

- Discussed access through the courtyard, and landscape issues, in response to DP's question as to whether form was really important and if it created use. Also discussed importance of that use of space and how the landscape could be made more interesting.
- Talked about the ring of trees, center of the space, retention pond and its overflow, storm system, access through parking, circulation, and glass wall.

RC presentation on sustainability issues

- systems concept and approach to design, methods to reduce the systems and decrease volume of the building.
- floor to floor height is 13 feet
- central duct system running down the center of the building, feeding sideways, electronic ballasts
- use of natural materials – granite, concrete and brick
- window shading, light penetration, light tint glazing above, clear glass at grade level for transparency
- bicycle storage and showers for bikers and joggers
- parking will promote small vehicles
- fly ash in concrete, recycled steel
- hot water boilers, minimize ductwork, low-flow plumbing fixtures. Mentioned low-flow fume hood introduced as a concept in BC. Air quantities needed to support these fume hoods are approximately half to two-thirds of a normal fume hood. Costs \$25,000 vs. \$7500 for normal fume hood.
- bus ducts – for economy of distribution and ease of change and flexibility for tenants.

Openness of building at grade.

- exploring idea of roll up doors, display wall for tenants, potential boardroom area.
- curtain wall system was more acceptable to the Panel. Premium \$250k. Low-flow fume hoods couple into this. If money is not spent on a full curtain wall glazing system can be moved to subsidise low-flow fume hoods. Could be a very significant gesture on the part of UBC and DPI, from an environmental point of view.
- infiltration of 1mm standard of rain per hour –is this UBC standard? Concern about sustainability standards to measure against like Seattle has.
- trying to source light blue glass. Prefers tint in the glazing.
- Kevin Hydes issue of south sun – introducing shading elements on south façade.

Corner

- looking at the main entry being a combined entry.
- curtain wall corner, very open with a much stronger definition of entry but with a completely different canopy – previous had curtain wall space with almost equality in those two points
- strip window that wraps instead of large glazed surface – building wraps the corner and removes large amount of glazing
- replacing exposed concrete with brick. 6-storey façade remains, but exploring the idea of carrying the sun-shading element, defining the 4th storey.

Tom Douglas – Nurses

- Nurses were presented to DPI by the Historical Society through CEO Mark Betteridge. Presently in bits and pieces in the warehouse. DPI provides buildings for research of all types and has evolved into specializing in providing facilities for research to life sciences companies, because of emphasis in that field at UBC. DPI became enthusiastic about the concept of incorporating the nurses in some manner to

emphasise the medical research aspect of their buildings. However, building will not be totally devoted to that. DPI also agreed to pay the Historical Society for the nurses and is not a low cost exercise since the nurses have to be assembled by an artisan. DPI really wants to make a subtle statement about the building and use the nurses in the design and appealed to the Panel to consider its request.

- Requested the Panel to reconsider changing from a glazing and panel system to a curtain wall system, due to high cost of latter.
- Ground floor visibility – is a difficult issue for DPI having to deal with tenants who are concerned about security. Had discussions with Angus Livingstone of the University Liaison Office and are considering putting the UBC research function of UILO (University-Industry Liaison Office) into the ground floor. Occupation of the whole ground floor is possible, giving them more control over tenants and thereby encourage more openness in design.

Questions

- Can we have more description of the envelope in terms of emphasizing verticality?
 - Store front on lower level, lots of glazing, no concern about transparency. With the good amount of shading, too much sun on the glass would not be a big issue. Colour of brick similar to Frank Forward and MacMillan buildings. Will take direction on that from the Panel. Darker colour will emphasise the stack. Upper portion – standard strip window with Alucabond panel, half inch revealed lines. Vertical emphasis will be strong. Stacks will have Alucabond fill and a slight curve similar to Donald Rix Building. Key aspect is the lightness in material.
- Is there a way that the tint of the glass and colour of the Alucabond could be a little closer?
 - May be possible to go with a bit of reflectivity – will be using low-E coating. Trying to find the lightest tint with the low-E coating which may give that reflectivity and play down the colour of the glass. The other approach is reflective films, but not in favour of the top of the building being highly reflective.
- Instead of Alucabond for the spandrels, can you have glass that can be matched with the other glass?
 - Once that is done, a curtain wall system should be used to get good enclosure for the building. Will explore this direction. Have looked at the alternative of rather than having the Alucabond the way it is, to put that panel into a curtain wall system.
- Are the columns on the west façade underneath the canopy also going to be brick?
 - Granite base except at the entrance, which would be brick.
- What is the material of the bases of the elements that carry the exhaust shafts on the east elevation?
 - Concrete bases.
- How does the water get from the roof of the building into the retention pond?
 - Although the plan does not show it, it is the intention that it comes down the shafts.
- What level of infiltration/storm will it handle?
 - Don't have that information. Need to look at it and maximize its potential.
- PC suggested using a 1mm/hr standard for storm management for infiltration of 90%.

- Agreed. DV to talk to David Grigg about general storm management plans.
- Does David Grigg and the university have a performance target for infiltration and do they recognize the value of that in any way?
 - TL was not able to answer that in detail, as he was not up to date with this.

PC wanted this on record, as if it comes up in other designs, it has no integration with sustainability.

JC - policy is not in place yet.

Comments

- TL: colour of brick was too dark
 - Drawn comparison of buildings on campus and felt Forest Sciences brick is too light and does not have enough presence. Tended towards a darker brick as too light might lose the feel of the brick.
TL and RC to take some samples to the site and decide on what is most appropriate.
- TL: towers – have brought old brick panels right to the ground without any interruption at the first floor level. Preferred to maintain the base through the first floor, as it would scale it down and not make the building look as tall.
 - Will study and see how it works visually.
- JD thought the eyebrow was weak.
 - RC will look at the detail of the brick and create more interest in the actual façade of the building.
- RF:
 - use of brick on vertical elements has tied the building together. Concern about ground level handling with granite, brick and concrete. Could it have all been brick?
 - Supports to the shafts on the east elevation are important elements in the courtyard – could these elements have been brick instead of concrete?
 - Concern about the curtain wall being blue glass. Suggested a tint leaning towards the champagne or buff. Bringing the two colours together would be in line with pushing verticality if we can't afford the curtain wall.
 - Would like to do that. Concerned about the tendency toward pink. Will try to unify the colour of the glass with the cladding.
- Panel was of the view that consideration should be given to having the nurses in the courtyard, where they could become artifacts.
 - They will need to be supported with actual bases. Exploring the idea of casting concrete behind them to be broken as though the nurses came out.
- DP – courtyard dramatically improved. Concern about garbage and loading from courtyard. Is there a way to maintain the special quality of the courtyard, while at the same time dealing with the reality of garbage and loading?
 - The way it's being incorporated with the building materials, the garbage is behind a garage door and will be opened for its function and closed.
- BV – use of nurses - ground oriented location is better than on the building. Has been great improvement on the front entrance, the openness created and the transition from the units to the courtyard.

- PC – needs justification of the decision to go with a 6 storey standard. Does not understand the rationale. Feels the building will compete with the Library. Is sensitive to the fact that the project is far-gone, but as the representative of the Faculty Association, needs to voice his concern.
In the absence of a standard, unable to comment on sustainability aspects of design, particularly in respect of energy use, water use and research consumption. City of Seattle has adopted well-accepted standards, which identifies energy use/cu.ft. It's very well described and buildings meet that by either meeting the gold, bronze or silver standard. Fears we are lagging behind the City of Vancouver. These are strong concerns and not criticism of the building.
- JD – likes the idea of nurses on the ground. Suggested there should be some description why DPI has them, what they represent etc. so people will understand it has a history and legacy. Re issues of sustainability especially in the Landscape Plan, the more it gets put into the minutes and discussed, the better for all concerned as eventually there will be more standards.

Summary of issues:

- ❖ Colour of the brick
- ❖ Alucabond and glass
- ❖ Piece at the edge of the courtyard
- ❖ General and specific sustainability comments

The project was passed with a 4-1 majority.

2. TRIUMF ISAC II

Overview by Peter Dandyk:

The project is on the South Campus and the facility is an expansion to the one that started 5 years ago. Its basic purpose is to look at the physics, and mechanisms of satellite findings of the origins of the universe. The facility is an accelerator, which allows the acceleration of isotopes to energies which are relevant to the formation of stars, and has a lot of applied physics and forefront fundamental physics associated with it. Because it is an accelerator hall it dictates what the building structure looks like. Have tried to fit it into a context, which is a little more aesthetic pleasing than other buildings.

Funding is from BCKDF and Ottawa through Industry Science and NRC. Is on a 5-year funding cycle and under a very tight time constraint with a deliverable date to the Federal Government by 2005.

Landscape overview by Jane Durante and Peter Dandyk:

- Discussed context of the group of buildings.
- Building will take out a group of about 100 trees and attempt is to put as much of it back, as possible, as per requirement by GVRD.
- Parking lot is gravel.
- New building comes right to the edge fence and is a security issue which will be addressed.
- Road that divides the existing woodlots remains intact.
- Front entrance is next to the corner of the existing ISAC building and will have a connection.
- Small courtyard for entrance.

- Talked about the fire lane, parking lot and location that had the ability to put back some of the trees. Parking lot to some degree drains towards the building, but no plan yet how to deal with rainwater off the roof.
- Plans for retention pond to be reviewed.

Main Floor Plan

- The high-energy experimental hall to be an open, flexible space.
- The equipment defines height of hall.
- Looking at possibility of extending the landscaping on the side adjacent to the service compound.
- Sustainability – looking at choice of materials and masonry.

Questions

- DP – how do we as a Design Panel deal with this kind of project in this location – giving the building an expression from the outside as to what is going on inside?
 - Building needs to say something about its character. TRIUMF is a world-class facility and should have world-class character to it. Employees must feel their work is important and have a quality environment to work from. A sod roof is not consistent with a world-class research institution but it does not mean that sustainability issues cannot be dealt with.
- BN – difficulty understanding the name lobby entry and how it is integrated to technical support. What is the section through the main floor mezzanine and where would the glazing be?
 - It's a second floor space. Notion for the entry lobby is that there is a portion of 2-storied glazed atrium space that interconnects the two and has the opportunity to create display elements like the existing TRIUMF offices. Partly because of funding and other issues the exact character of this space is not defined. It is future development. Exact character will be a combination of open workspaces, office spaces, staff amenity spaces and possibly lunchrooms.
- BN – why do we have the core area up against the glazing area?
 - So people share the space with a visual link.
- DP – in terms of security, are there distances for the fence from the building? Is the building wall not sufficient for security?
 - Wall could be used as security. Explored the notion of using the building as the security screen but functionally that causes problems due to code requirements.
- RF – what is the future expansion for Master Plan moving in the direction of where visitors park in the future? As other buildings come up, what is the position of this building in an overall scheme?
 - University is looking at the parking lot. A range of possibilities exist. No clear Master Plan for South Campus yet.
 - JC – a Neighbourhood Plan will be developed very soon.
- Are we likely to have a noise problem?
 - No. The noisy areas will be sensitivity and acoustically treated and dealt with internally.

Comments

- TL – concern about main entry to the building
 - Looked at putting the security fence at the bottom of slope, but it defeats the purpose. Not a matter of TRIUMF maintaining security but fence is a requirement of National Guidelines from Atomic Energy Commission. Front entrance is not a public entrance, but a secondary one.
- TL – should make the external circulation for the visitor clear – arrival needs to be clear by use of signage.
- JC – commitment made to GVRD to replace the trees that will be taken out and the university has to stand by it. GVRD Parks is very interested in the proposals and have asked to come to the Public meetings. Any impact on the park will be raised and therefore should be explicitly stated.
On Fred Pritchard's request, JC raised the issue of a letter dated June 21 from Fred Pritchard to Jim Hanlon regarding emissions. Reply from client was not specific to the questions. Needs to be addressed.
- DP – finds the project at a number of levels difficult to evaluate. What is the context of this building particularly in the issues of the research area? It has to be asked what are the other ways security can be handled, how we are going to collectively establish a larger attitude towards developing a research facility in this kind of location? Hard to discuss a proper building without that kind of context. Hopes in future reviews, that these conceptual issues will be clearly defined.
- BN – looks forward to seeing the project at the other stages and how it develops.
- PC – Musqueam Creek is Vancouver's last salmon bearing stream and the Ministry of Fisheries is quite concerned about Musqueam Creek and any other salmon-spawning creek. University has an opportunity here to do a better job of mitigating the storm consequences of this development and establish a precedent for future development at no additional cost to the project. Issue is reducing the overall discharge from the site. A project of this type can increase by 400 to 500% the amount of water discharged. Suggested considering the strategy of using porous paved surfaces, sod roof design to slow down the discharge of water into the site. A cheaper technology is to use slow release drains on the roof with a 48-hour delay in the discharge of water. University should not ignore the possibility of redressing some of the damage already done.
- Would the university be open to using material other than asphalt?
 - The university might be, but the City of Vancouver Fire Services is contracted to enforce those standards and are not broad in their thinking.
- PC – Knight Street has a stretch of permeable asphalt which seems to be performing well – open graded, no fine aggregates and honeycombed when set. Material and process costs are the same.
Threshold being looked at is to retain the 1 inch storm.
- RF – likes the approach but concerned about the Master Plan. In emphasizing the importance of the facility, permanent visitor parking approach ought to be important and given some thought. Concerned that the CAD drawing makes it difficult to understand massing of the building. This is an important enough facility to need both the drawings and physical model.
With these kinds of powerful geometries, would replacing the trees in such a narrow band – the natural landscape aesthetic, be the right one?

- JD to look at some other way of dealing with that.
- TL – configurations of the parking lot: could the fence be wrapped in the landscape? Does it have to form the edge of the planting belt in keeping with fence rules. It's a way of softening the fence without creating a security problem.

Summary

- ❖ More exploration needed on the issue of definition of public facilities space, arrival, circulation and approach to the building.
- ❖ Security
- ❖ Explore other directions for the landscape around the building.
- ❖ Physical model needed to understand the scale of this facility and massing
- ❖ Sustainability issues
- ❖ Major material choices

Expected Schedule:

Board 3 in September for approval of schematic design.
Site preparation in October, construction in January 2002

The Panel supported the general concept direction of the building – 3 to 1.

Architect to return on July 27, 2001 with the inclusion of the Panel's suggestions.

3. MDS NORDION

Overview by Eric Beers and presentation by P.Dandyk:

Is a total of 4000 sq.ft. building above grade with a new cyclotron facility. Nordion is on the TRIUMF site and is the third expansion in the plan and an extension of an existing building. Operates as an independent facility. Small expansion above ground to house offices and two small laboratories with 90% of development underground. Expansion is intended as a back up to the existing operation.

Discussed building expression.

Comments/Questions

- PC raised same issues of the Nordion project.
- RF – in an attempt to humanize these spaces, making the lounge more visible might add to quality of the interior environment. Suggested reducing the sill height of the lounge and make it more glassy and open.
- JD addressed PC's issues on sustainability of landscape and use of water, which could be applied to this project.
- JC advised the Panel of Fred Pritchard's letter re emissions and an impact on the park.

With an unanimous vote, the project was approved but should be reviewed with TRIUMF on July 27, 2001.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

UBC ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING

July 27, 2001 – 9.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m.

Campus Planning & Development Gardenia Room



In attendance :

Members:

- Ms Bev Nielsen, Nielsen Design Consultants Ltd (BN)
- Mr. Rainer Fassler, Senior Associate, Architecture (RF)
- Mr Kevin Hydes, Engineer, Keen Engineering (KH)
- Ms Jane Durante, Principal, Durante Kreuk Ltd (JD)
- Patrick Condon, Assoc Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture

Consultants:

TRIUMF ISAC II

Peter Dandyk, Architect (PD) - PBK Architects
Mark Koropecy, Architect (MK) - PBK Architects
Todd Gattinger, Project Manager (TG) - UMA Management Services

MDS Nordion

Peter Dandyk, Architect (PD) - PBK Architects
Mark Koropecy, Architect (MK) - PBK Architects
Eric Beers, Project Manager (EB) - Cochrane Engineering Ltd

Ramsay Worden

Doug Ramsay (DR)

Stephen Quigley

(SQ) - Colborne Architecture

UBC staff:

Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect, CP&D (TL)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services, CP&D (JC)
Jim Hanlon, Manager, Human Resources (JH)
Dr. Paul Schmor, Division Head, TRIUMF ISAC II (PS)
Franco Mammarella, Operations Services Manager, TRIUMF ISAC II (FM)
Jay Jethwa, Development Manager, CP&D (JJ)
John Percy, Development Manager, CP&D (JP)
Len Sobo, Development Manager, CP&D (LS)

Regrets:

- S/Sgt. M.J. Clark, Regional Commander, Royal Canadian Mounted Police
- Mr. Douglas D. Paterson, Assoc. Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture

Purpose:

1. TRIUMF ISAC II
2. MDS Nordion
3. Earthquake Research Facility
4. Main Library

Meeting commenced at 9.00 a.m.

1. TRIUMF ISAC II – Peter Dandyk

- Peter Dandyk presented a physical model of the building.
 - Briefly discussed summary of the 6 points that arose from the previous discussion - issues of approach to the building, public interface and landscape - physical model, sustainability issue and major material choices.
 - Discussed issues of entrance and clarity that were being challenged. A clear identification of security entrance was created, with added landscaping. Security fence was moved several metres to create landscape strip along ISAC II.
 - Pedestrian walkway between parking lot and enclosure addressed.
 - Building materials were revised. Masonry treatment, mechanical louvers, curtain wall system, metal skin under review.
 - Considering a variety of roofing systems. Idea is for appearance to be visually light and simple with high reflectivity. Concern about use of PVC to be addressed.
 - Floor finishes will be relatively industrial due to industrial nature of building.
 - Treatment of area adjacent to the park consistent with the OCP, was a significant change. Ongoing discussions with GVRD to have indigenous plants under power lines and entrance to park. Also reworking entrance to the Pacific Spirit Park as per GVRD requirements.
 - Functioning storm water detention pond is now within fenced area.
 - Created a lawn and landscaped area with pavers and picnic tables for workers within the building perimeter. Area is also depressed and serves as a detention pond.
- Addressed approach to orientation and signage and basic approach to the overall landscaping.
- Overall plan refined.

Questions/Comments

- JC - have you been working with the GVRD to resolve issues?
- Yes, but not finalised discussions. Have been provided a list of acceptable plant material. Still to get last word on planting and detention pond.
- PC – what watershed are we in, what is the impact on the stream and UBC’s policy on impact on Musqueam Creek? Issue has to do with retaining the habitat and the last salmon stream. Design Panel needs to get clear information on the extent of the watershed if the ground is in the Musqueam Creek watershed since there was no clarity internally about water shed, potential impacts on the stream and university’s policy about maintaining habitat function for Musqueam Creek.
- TL – university does not have an explicit policy on that at present.
- PC – believed it was a good opportunity to go on record that the university has it within its means to either destroy or protect the last remaining salmon stream within the city of Vancouver.
- TL – agreed that Musqueam Creek is an important issue, but not to be run through this Panel. Should be addressed separately.
 - **JC to take up Musqueam Creek issue with Fred.**
- JC – Does TRIUMF property extend to Park property line?
- > No – there is a UBC right of way for power line. Landscaping UBC property.
- RF - Will some sort of visitor parking exist in the area?
- Not aware of university policy on this issue.
- PC – expressed his continuing frustration that UBC does not have clarity on policies for sustainability. Panel needs to know if there are policies. This still remains an outstanding issue and is frustrated in terms of how to react to projects.
- TL - have talked to Freda Pagani. Policies she has put forth have not found a hearing in the university and have not translated into things such as storm water standards. Agreed on ambiguity. Freda is an advocate, and influence varies with projects. Should make progress with each project from the point of view of energy use, planning design and sustainability issues in general. Freda has acknowledged that we have fallen behind. Unable to respond on Musqueam Creek since so many people are

involved. Studies underway on storm water management. **Suggested that PC talk to Planning for a more accurate view of progress university has made in investigating this.**

The project received the unanimous support of the panel to proceed.

2. **MDS Nordion**

- Panel was of the view that only a brief look at the Nordion project was necessary since there were no major issues.
- Planning of the building was refined. Lunchroom has been opened up to create openness and brightness. Width of the accelerator has been narrowed to give slightly better separation from TRIUMF building.
- GVRD requirement along hydro right of way has been extended for length of Nordion property.

Clarifications and updates received and approval to proceed was given by the Panel.

3. **Earthquake Research Facility – Ramsay Worden Architects**

- TL provided a brief overview of the project.

Doug Ramsay presentation

- Explained project function and location which was partly determined by its proximity to the other structures. EERC fits between existing Rusty Hut and the existing High Head Lab, linking the existing building. Providing a firewall to make it a separate building from Rusty Hut. Because of the nature of its function and the innovativeness of Civil Engineering in wood and steel structures, the idea is to display inside activity to the street. Objective is to express the buildings structural system and use materials that relate to the existing buildings. Budget is tight and DR was still working with a structural engineer to produce an economical system but yet display the research aspect. Looking at heavy timber structure, which ties into the wood frame building beside it.

Questions/Comments

- KH : is there a pit underneath for the shake table.
 - There is a pit for access to run the cabling. Table sits above the pit. Pit will be reinforced by thick concrete so it doesn't move at all.
- How far deep will the excavation go?
 - 8-9 ft. Idea is to minimize the underpinning to the existing building by pulling the basement away.
- RF – had you looked at retaining the existing entry canopy?
 - Yes. Many liked it and the possibilities of that have increased. Contemplating adding a second floor office for space requirement of existing office behind canopy, but due to budget constraints they were now looking at turning the table and shrinking the building slightly which would eliminate the requirement for the 2nd floor. Exploring possibility of keeping the canopy there, but pointed out that once a building comes up and rests to it, the aesthetic aspect may be lost. Panel was in agreement that the canopy was a very nice expression of the structure.
- JD – what will be the normal access of people to this building?
 - Since the offices are located at the back, the front door will have a buzzer, which will be more ceremonial. Most of the entries are off the storage area. Research area will be self-contained and have a back door. Mentioned constraints of the EERC not wanting the general public walking by while tests were carried out.
- BN – disability access to washrooms through the entrance. : would the physically handicapped have to enter through the front door and through the big space to enter the elevator and the washrooms.?

- There is a much shorter route. DR was presently looking at accessibility issues, of being stair-less rather than elevator. John Lane was happy about the change but needs to sign off on it.
- JP – There was a discussion that Worker’s Compensation may have an issue around the accessibility of people who could work in that space. That would limit the need for more regular accessible requirements.
- PC – UBC Planning Principles is explicit about keeping people out of the rain. EERC is not close enough to the sidewalk. Can the building face be brought out?
 - Set back was chosen because of efforts to blend into the building. Bringing it out would highlight it and have some definite benefits, but would interrupt the rhythm of street trees. Also grade slopes down to the Rusty Hut and moving the sidewalk may cause some grading problems.
- JD – if the existing canopy is retained, it could provide a secondary route to escape from the rain, since there is an existing space next to it. A double sidewalk was suggested.
- JC - Translink is looking at East Mall as a future bus route. Some widening may be required and is something to think about for every project on the street.
- PC – suggested the need for an urban design study for East Mall and second sidewalk.
- JD - when the test is in process, how much does the table move?
 - No dynamic testing but there might be a few concrete blocks flying off. In case of catastrophic failure, a safety net would be built around it, as part of the apparatus. An overhead steel door would be used to protect the window during testing.

Commentary

- RF – encouraged retaining the canopy. Material choices are important; would like to see a sample board.
- KH – concerned about penetrating till cap and water settling under. Pit elevation may affect building elevation.

Summary of comments:

- ❖ Canopy retention
- ❖ Urban design study on Translink and buses on East Mall
- ❖ Exploration of second sidewalk
- ❖ Till Cap

The project was unanimously approved by the Panel.

Project to go to Board 1 +2 in September and come back to the Panel before Board 3.

4. Library Design Guidelines

Stephen Quigley introduced himself to the Panel.

TL presented overview of the project : project has been to Board 1, involves rebuilding around the core of the Main Library and contemplates the demolition of the 1948 – 1960 wings. Construction of new building will be called the University Learning Centre (ULC). Not reached the stage of Architect selection for the full job, which is scheduled for autumn. Overall project has a budget of \$60 M, a major part of which has to be fundraised. Before selection process Stephen was requested to draw up some design guidelines for the project (distributed to the Panel).

Stephen Quigley presentation

- JD explained to SQ the reason he was before the panel was because, as a newly constituted Design Panel, it was important to understand the context in which a project was being looked at. The sooner the Panel is made aware of the reasons why, the implications and criteria for

location, the better they could judge the project. It was also important that a project was before the Panel as early as possible.

- Colborne Architectural Group was retained by LBS to do a planning study to see if the Librarian's vision for the ULC could be achieved. The Librarian has determined that the Koerner facility expansion was not direction she wants the library to go. Her vision is to meet the needs of the Main Library for the next 15-20 years to incorporate a more active research learning and teaching component into the building, hence the name University Learning Centre.
- The Heritage building will be retained in keeping with the University's vision for the future, and Trek 2000. 1948 and 1960 additions to the building are not reconditionable. CA was asked to look at the possibility of retaining the central core, while removing existing buildings and reconfiguring with new construction on the same footprint, building about 200,000 sq. ft of new space that would meet the needs of the Library for their collection of storage and teaching areas.
- Major component will be the Learning Commons intended to be an informal learning space. Idea is to reconstruct the building on the existing footprint causing little disruption to the site and take advantage of new construction to achieve other opportunities that currently don't exist. For e.g. reorienting the building to East Mall and getting a major entrance there. A number of options have been looked at in a schematic way and determined it could be done with some construction phasing. Demolition and reconstruction will occur while the library remains functional.
- Space requirements of the Library will be met with a compact shelving system. Heritage building will be refurbished and seismically upgraded. Existing building is considered a seismic high-risk building.
- Project appears feasible within the budget.

Design Guidelines discussion:

- > New building will be in the 4-5 storey range
- > Discussed issues relative to the site and building
- > Urban design guidelines – views and open spaces, prominence of the building
- > Street frontages and setbacks
- > Pedestrian and vehicular access
- > Building entrances
- > Overview of landscape elements
- > Heritage issues, importance of the main library – seismic, infrastructure upgrade etc.
- > Building form issues – footprint
- > Space requirements of Librarian can sit on the existing footprint.
- > Sustainability
- > Brief description of construction phase and concept - north wing will be demolished reconstructed while the Heritage building and south wing are operational.

Comments

- PC – wanted to discuss the basic decision of diverting from the campus plan idea of two pavilion pieces away from the main structure to bringing it back to the footprint of existing building. Was the main motivation the preservation of trees?
 - TL – original plan had the library as a 3-sided courtyard; any tree needs to be looked at in its own merits.
- PC – there's been a shift away from the idea about creating the courtyard and it seems like it is timely to discuss this massing and urban design configuration.
 - TL - it was a good time to raise the issue.
- PC : ULC design should be a contribution to urban design of that part of the campus. Expressed frustration at seeing the blank wall of the Library when walking down the street.
- JC – need to look at the whole Library complex reconnecting historic axis – major/minor.

- RF – how should design guidelines go? Should they be brought in at a stage when they could possibly lead the exploration of this concept and concepts that are not yet discovered?
 - SQ – agreed and confirmed nothing was being ruled out at this time.
- RF – instead of moving the whole Library complex eventually on the other side to Koerner, we are going back to the notion which leaves some question of how the elements are ultimately serviced and connected. The plan has also not gone beyond the 10-15 years and beyond the 200,000 sq. ft. Looking at the history of the university, is this potentially another problem with expansion?
- JD – suggested an urban design study for the precinct to look beyond 20 years and also see how the access that has been broken down can be re-established over time.
 - TL - design guidelines are of value so as to reconcile the program of the building and the university Librarian’s vision. Librarian’s perspective is the building configuration has to match her program.
- PC – considered it worth re-examining the impetus that drove the campus plan to conceive of the massing of the area. It’s very diagrammatic, but does have certain urban design advantages that the existing footprint doesn’t have.
 - TL – does not have the resources to do an urban planning study. All agreed that the east face of the existing library is unlikable and the east face of the new development and its relation to the southeast mall is an issue of importance.

Sustainability issues were discussed :

- life expectancy of the building
- Upgrading of Heritage building
- JD - does the university have a policy on Heritage Policy ?
 - TL - Urban Systems is drafting one for UBC.
- PC – does the university use the Leeds standard under sustainability?
 - SQ – not aware if it was official policy, but confirmed the information came from Freda Pagani. TL understood there was no adoption of Leeds yet. **SQ to confirm with Freda Pagani.**
- KH - could the Leeds standard be imposed on a single project?
 - TL - yes, agreed to incorporate.
 - SQ – Freda had stated her approach that all buildings on campus should meet a silver standard, although gold would be preferable.
 - TL – standard to be decided. A silver standard was suggested – subject to clarification with Freda. To be revisited.
- TL - urban design criteria to be included in the document and the question of facing onto East Mall. Real issue is footprint of the building – whether it creates a courtyard, location of key entrances.
- RF – has a major concern with this proposition since it would require redefining budget and also may end up in a confrontation between this study and later work. Better chance to deal with this as a notional guideline package.
- TL – Director of Planning and TL are in the process of establishing planning and design parameters at this stage of the project in the project management process.
- PC- concern that Design Guidelines states “will be on existing footprint”
 - TL – Design Guidelines should set up the urban design parameters which have to be dealt with and brought back to the group at a later date. Suggested that rather a footprint we could work towards a recommendation of a desirable configuration, or options.
- PC – suggested inviting the client for a session with the Advisory Design Panel.
 - Suggestion was accepted.
- TL - will not be able to get political support for a precinct study.
 - PC – suggested presenting it from the point of view that the building was being advanced and want the setting to be appropriate to the building. Therefore the building project is expanding to include these acres.

- RF – suggested linking the Precinct Study to the commissioning, and **TL to consider how to address this issue.**
- TL gave example of Dentistry mixed-use project which has been held up because the chairman of the Board wants to make sure we get the university entrance right. Commercial timetable program imperative pushed to a side.
- RF – felt Tom’s suggestion could be convincingly supported, on the basis that on projects that are complex, one doesn’t wait for the other and has a two pronged approach.

Panel to make comments on the Design Guidelines and revert to Tom.

The meeting adjourned at 12.00 noon.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



UBC ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL

NOTES OF MEETING

September 18, 2001 - 10.00 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.
Campus Planning & Development Gardenia Room

In attendance :

Members:

- Ms Bev Nielsen, Nielsen Design Consultants Ltd (BN)
- Mr. Rainer Fassler, Senior Associate, Architectura (RF)
- Mr Kevin Hydes, Engineer, Keen Engineering (KH)
- Ms Jane Durante, Principal, Durante Kreuk Ltd (JD)
- Doug Paterson Assoc Professor, (DP)
Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture

Consultants:

Ramsay Worden
Bob Worden (BW)

UBC Properties
Jas Sahota, Manager of Development (JS)

UBC staff:

Tom Llewelin, University Architect/Landscape Architect, CP&D (TL)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services, CP&D (JC)
Dianna Foldi, Development Manager, CP&D (DF)

Regrets:

- Patrick Condon, Assoc. Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences Landscape Architecture

Purpose:

Faculty Staff & Housing – Phase 2

Meeting commenced at 10.30 a.m.

1. FACULTY STAFF & HOUSING – Phase 2

- TL briefly introduced the project covering context, need and existing buildings.
- BW explained the project, and covered topics of appearance, programme, colours, brick detailing, roof detail, entrance in relation to houses across the street, accessibility (with input from John Lane), secondary entrance to courtyard, and landscaping.

Questions

- KH – how many units and what is the square footage?
 - 36 units, 36,000 sq. ft. Bulk of the units are 02 bedrooms, 03 x three bedroom units and 04 x one bedroom units.
- KH - how many units are built and how many are fully intended?
 - 53 units in the 2 buildings currently built and are all rented with the exception of one 1-bedroom unit. Overall unit count for the 8 local areas is about 20%. Approximately they will be distributed in the same proportion as the units in the different areas with a slightly greater number of rental units.
 - JS - Infrastructure planning has received a lot of attention. There is a comprehensive servicing strategy by Aplin & Martin involving UBC Utilities – looking at storm water run off and servicing with water supply issues, sanitary requirements.
- DP - what the are values being represented ? Is there innovative treatment of infrastructure, sewage etc?
 - Did not come prepared to talk about the neighbourhood planning or overall servicing strategy. Was not directly involved with all of the planning issues. Prepared to only talk about the building and design.
 - TL - there are different opinions about how to treat storm water management etc., and there is consideration of different approaches going on. No plan, policy or structure at this point. Lots of investigations being done, lots of constituencies.
- BN - are there any accessible units?
 - Not in this building. 3 levels of accessibility in building B.
 - accessibility
 - visitability (washroom off entry is accessible)
 - adaptability (kick space under cabinets can be removed)
- BN - 2 ft - 8 in. door too narrow for wheelchair access. Should be 2 ft - 10 in. minimum
 - Difficulty renting accessible units in earlier buildings since disabilities take different forms. Can have adaptable units.
- RF - does the Neighbourhood plan have any design and material guidelines?
 - Yes, under development
 - TL - there is an open space and leisure services plan for the campus.
- RF - will there be too much similarity among the buildings?
 - Intent is to a) create a community that has a residential feel in a common sense; b) make as many units ground oriented but densely packed; c) maintain walkability of the campus.
 - Use of brick reflects other uses in the area.
 - TL - working on guidelines to keep project not too similar, not “like a project”.
- JD - where are the cars and how do they get in?
 - BW explained underground storage and entrance.

Comments:

- BN - likes project form and attempt to make project adaptable for access.
- RF - will support, but looking ahead to avoid monotony. Needs assessing.
- KH - concern about incremental development. Encourages early standards and guidelines about what is discharged from each site.
 - JS - UBC Utilities signed off on the earlier stages of the project and are receiving information on this stage.
 - BW - understands cliff erosion is holding up consensus.
- DP - agrees with most people. Has reasonable structure, feeling of home, public and private spaces.
Concerns - 1) not comfortable with what values of water management, energy, etc. are behind project. Need to integrate sustainability in projects. 2) concerned about project looking too similar. The end of the building could suggest future change.
- JD : Appreciates simplicity and elegance of landscape.

Project was unanimously approved.