



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2003

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - January 23, 2003

Time: 12:00 - 4:30 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, CP&D

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Jim Carruthers
Karen Marler (KM)
Bev Nielsen (BN)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Douglas Paterson

Regrets: Jane Durante (JD)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Projects reviewed at this meeting:

1. Iona Building Renovation
 2. AERL
 3. MacLeod 2
 4. Life Sciences Building
 5. TRIUMF House
 6. UBC Properties Lot 12 Mid Campus
 7. Faculty Staff & Housing
-

1. Iona Building Renovation

Address:	6000 Iona Drive
Dev. Appl.	Not applied yet
Application Status:	-
Architect:	Richard Henry Architect
Lessee/ Occupant:	Vancouver School of Theology
Review:	First
Delegation:	Richard Henry, Basil Davis, Keith Hemphill, Roger Moors, Jan Timmer, Joe Redmond
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, and Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION - Project to return

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect introduced this project as being part of the Theological Neighbourhood Plan and invited the Applicant to make a brief presentation.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Jan Timmer (JT) presented the proposed student housing with design drawings. The approach taken was in response to the mandate of the OCP to respect the character and form language of the existing Iona Building. Theological Mall will be improved; the space in front of the Iona Building will be retained as a large open space. The growth at the back of the Iona Building is a contemplated natural woodland. Appearance of urban spaces and resident spaces will be improved by landscape, etc. Some commercial activity is contemplated in the Theological Square.

Richard Henry (RH) spoke to the architectural approach to the student housing building. The building comprises a mixture of units, from studios to 1, 2 and 3 bedroom family and individual units. The project has a total of 68 beds. Most of the units have individual kitchen facilities and common kitchen and dining areas for the studios. Social functions are in the ground floor. The main reason for the location of the two common areas is because of its relationship to the future plaza and exposure to sunlight. Building has been designed without quarters with the intention to entice people onto the street to access the common areas. Building has been designed to meet LEED certification standards. The form of the roof is big monolithic and low sloping, with a view to collecting and channeling water.

RH also spoke to the materiality and importance of fit with the Iona complex. Trying to incorporate stone of similar quality granite; cannot stone clad the entire building due to cost factor; stucco can be used creatively, with the appropriate choice of colour. Introduction of wood elements such as laminated timber was proposed, to give it the texture and character of a student housing project.

JT addressed the aspect of the green roof.

Keith Hemphill (KH) spoke to the Iona Building. North façade will be preserved in its entirety. Changes will be concentrated on the south façade. Intent of the project is to revitalize the building since normal renovation is cost prohibitive. Structural skeleton, granite and roof of the Iona building are very solid and have good advantages. As part of the process everything that is not part of the concrete and stone will be stripped out of the structure giving the opportunity for a new project in the existing shell. Valuable spaces such as the oak balustrade, windows, ceiling treatment, boardroom, etc. will be taken away, preserved and retained. The goal is to have a new Iona building. Seismic upgrade, accessibility issues and effectiveness of the programme need to be addressed to bring it up to current standard. These issues drive the rehabilitation of the building. It is proposed to introduce a new elevator to achieve accessibility and recover access to the belfry. Current exits are inefficient and needs improvement to meet the current codes and improve the programme. A minor addition will be produced to the south facade at the west wing to achieve a second exit. The applicant's intent is to make additions that are contemporary and not to redesign the Iona. KH spoke to the function of the external elevator on the west wing, location of the main elevator and west tower and explained that the concept is to minimize impact on the building. The proposed programme in the 3 additions was described by KH.

Panel's questions: Questions focused on whether or not there has been consideration of taking the Iona green further, the umbrella roof, which was being driven by the green roof and split faced material.

Applicants Response: The Woonerf will be taken along the full street; each project picks up a bit of the Woonerf. Intent is to have parking under the entire Iona green. The umbrella roof has a number of functions; the simplicity of its form will play a part in the collecting and expressing water. There will be a visible redistribution of water at grade level. Split or design faced material would be coloured concrete block or concrete.

DP application next month - returning to the Panel in Feb/ Mar for vote

Panel's comments: Student Housing

- appreciation for making the sustainability aspect visible
- looking forward to seeing how Woonerf unfolds
- concern about the large umbrella roof in the precinct - scale will be in conflict with Iona building
- heavy timber expression is a concern; it is not structural
- lack of continuity between the Iona building and student housing building.
- concern about accessibility.
- appreciation for the idea of the street. Every effort should be made to make the areas to the front doors accessible.
- increase transparency, night lighting

Panel's Comments: Iona Building

- concern about how the material and glass would work
- reservation about the contrast with split face block and glass in the north elevation - shoulders will look strange

- concern about the amount of glass in the north elevation; stone could have been used in a more contemporary way in conjunction with the glass; need to study a larger model

Summary

- ✓ concern about the expression of both buildings and suitability of materials
- ✓ the sustainability drive was encouraged
- ✓ interest in seeing the Woonerf concept unfold

2. Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratory

Address:	To be determined
Dev. Appl.	DA03001
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Patkau Architect
Lessee/ Occupant:	TBA
Review:	Third
Delegation:	John Patkau, Mike Lenningham, Joe Redmond, Robert Brown,
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect,

EVALUATION : General support for the direction of the project

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect informed the Panel that the AERL and MacLeod projects were brought together in view of its relationship to each other. A context model was now available and he invited the Applicants to present their respective projects.

Applicant's Opening Comments: John Patkau (JP) presented.

- Characteristics of the project remain as described at the last presentation.
- AERL is the first stage of a larger development on site, which may include the potential Bio Diversity building; Master Plan for the precinct has been created.
- There is potential for a connection on one or more levels through the AERL to the Biological Sciences building.
- The next stage will see a 2nd storey interior connection to link Bio Diversity to Biological Sciences.
- Nature of the building in relation to the Main Mall was a challenge, the east and west ends of the building being shear walls. Proposal is to keep AERL quiet on Main Mall and allow the display function of the featured Bio Diversity building to be the main contribution to Main Mall.
- Proposed cladding material was presented.

Panel's Questions/Comments: AERL

AERL has delivered on the promises held out in the initial site and planning study. There was appreciation for the proportion of spaces and courtyard sequences. Concern about the shear wall on Main Mall - could it be broken/ could the stair be more open? Consider providing animation to the stairs.

One Panel member was concerned about accessibility issue in the courtyard (transition between the upper and lower level) since stairs were not feasible for wheelchair users.

Summary - AERL

- ✓ General support for direction
- ✓ More development of landscape, and particularly grading

3. MacLeod 2

Address:	To be determined
Dev. Appl.	DA03002
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Omicron Architects Alliance
Lessee/ Occupant:	Electrical and Computer Engineering
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Michael McCall, Adrian Di Castri, Joe Redmond, Robert Brown
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect,

EVALUATION : **General support for the direction of the project**

Applicant's Opening Comments: Building is intended to be contextual, not signature. User sees the building as an opportunity to make an address on Main Mall. Project presents the opportunity to complete the CEME courtyard. The building will extend entirely over the one storey piece of CEME facing Main Mall and down to the ground level on the north side. Main mass of the building is 4 storeys with a 5th storey penthouse on top. The Architects spoke to the organization of the building, materials and treatment. Main entrance at Main Mall will be marked with a canopy.

Panel's Questions/Comments: MacLeod

- The main entrance is too low in relation to the courtyard and too narrow and promotes a fortress feeling.
- The east/ west passage is too tight particularly the 4 metre passageway into the courtyard. Is it possible to relocate the adjoining classroom and/ or stairs
- Concern at the visibility of the entrance at Main Mall. Is there a possibility to provide visible penetration into the atrium from the street?
- There was discussion on the north/ south atrium and comments that it was very tight; perhaps there is an opportunity to get other users into this space?
- Suggestion to reface the existing CEME building at grade.
- The choice of material for the ground floor should be stone or brick, not metal
- Definite edge needs to be provided at Fair Grove.
- Lack of life on Main Mall. Could building have a restaurant?

Applicant's response:

- Position of stair in east/ west atrium is driven by user's wish for visibility from Main Mall entrance.
- Visibility of entrance at Main Mall will be assisted by the canopy projecting outwards.
- North/ south atrium wide - (Jim)
- It is proposed to have a Ponderosa type service in the common area of the atrium
- Consideration was given to covering the CEME elevation but budget will not allow it; the issue will be addressed by planting design.

No major reservations expressed by Panel.

Summary - MacLeod 2

- ✓ Re-examine placement of the stairs at east/ west atrium and general constrained nature of this space
- ✓ Ground Floor exterior material to be brick or stone, not metal

4. Life Sciences Building

Address:	To be determined
Dev. Appl.	DA02021
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Bunting Coady Architects Diamond and Schmitt Architects
Lessee/ Occupant:	Faculty of Medicine and Science
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Paul Szaszkievicz, Tom Bunting, Mike Woodbridge, Chris Phillips, Joe Redmond, John Cordonier
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : General approval

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect thanked the Applicant for returning with the project for further review. The Panel has seen the project on two previous occasions, but did not receive support of landscaping and site design issues. The UALA invited the Applicant to update the Panel on progress.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Paul Szaszkievicz (PS) presented and spoke to the materials, landscape and site plan.

Mike Woodbridge (MW) addressed the landscape and explained that the previously presented overall principles for landscape and site plan remained intact. They have worked at resolving grading accessibility and integration of finishes with the university guidelines; consolidating service area with the Detwiller Pavilion (shared loading and servicing area); re-grading and realigning the existing road, preserving most of the existing landscape at the back of the Purdy facility. MW also spoke to the central access of Health Sciences Mall, the two central atria, the matching lights on sidewalk; the addition of benches and the provision of 130 bike racks. Fire access issues have been resolved. Continuous pedestrian way around the east side for the handicapped and a 13 ft wide continuous street canopy along south side. This is intended to be a LEED certification building, targeting gold standard. Panel's previous concern regarding the NE corner has been resolved by lightening it keeping it more open. MW also spoke to proposed materials and lighting.

Panel's Questions & Comments: The Panel's initial questions focused around sun control devices, the atrium roof, and irrigation. To address landscape maintenance requirements, the UALA requested the Applicant to discuss irrigation issues with the university's Landscape Supervisor - David Smith (822-0014). One Panel member commented that the existing landscaping along the connection to the hospital (passing Detwiller) is badly neglected and treacherous and inquired if improvements could be made to make this journey more pleasant. There was discussion on the relationship/ grade of the building edge to the field on the east, drainage of sidewalk canopies, concrete slab benches, the bank on the north side and shading for the atriums.

Applicant's Response:

In terms of heat gain, sun control devices will not be beneficial to the building because of its use and the amount of air changes. The atrium roofs will have tinted glass. Project has irrigation to get landscape established. Irrigation will be terminated after 2-year start; for LEED certification it is preferred to minimize water use. No general landscape budget. The field grade is lower than the building. Canopies will be drained through a gutter. Concrete benches provide a more engaging edge and create a pattern.

Summary

- ✓ Applicant has met the recommendations of the Panel, no further submission requested
- ✓ more discussion of landscape detail required - David Smith to be consulted on the maintenance aspect
- ✓ colour matching mortar for inset paving detail

5. TRIUMF House

Address:	To be determined
Dev. Appl.	Not applied yet
Application Status:	-
Architect:	Integra Architecture
Lessee/ Occupant:	TRIUMF visitors
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Dale Staples, Matthew Carter, Joe Redmond
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : **Project to return**

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect explained that this project had previously been before the Panel for a preliminary review at which time concerns about the general place and siting in the Neighbourhood Plan, specific site layout and architectural expression were voiced. Since the DP application is expected to be made within the next week or two after hearing the Panel's comments at this presentation and further consultation with TRIUMF, the UALA informed that the Panel reserved the right not to vote.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Matthew Carter (MC) presented and initially spoke to the responses made to the Panel's comments on neighbourhood functions at the last review. He explained the planning context including the Sorority House.

Dale Staples (DS) addressed the architectural aspects of the building and landscape and discussed options for the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. The neighbourhood open space is now more of a forest. Ramp was deleted and now connects to the open space. Given the context, DS believes the siting is appropriate. Intent is to integrate the parking to the underground parking structure that will occur with the development in the south. Common spaces moved to the south verandah and courtyard. Bike racks relocated to the ground floor. DS also spoke to the architectural expression and stated that the project is not a modern building, but a traditional one. Roof elements were simplified by eliminating trims and the false fireplace and had basic elements of siding, shingles (Hardy plank and Hardy shingle) and a neutral colour scheme. Based on the Panel's reference at the last presentation that the Fraternity Village project had an acceptable level of roof form and character, the Applicant had spent some time comparing the Ramsey Worden drawings with this.

Panel's Questions & Comments: One Panel member questioned the reasoning behind the traditional approach to the building and observed that the relationship to grade seemed flat; the Applicant was requested to describe the landscaping concept in more detail. The area between the building and the street had the feel of being a backyard and one Panel member asked if this could be improved. Porch needs more work at ground level with landscape, and pavement needs detailing. The lack of accessible units was discussed. Generally, a building should aim to provide handicap accessibility for 10% of the population and to have only one unit within 35 units is low. A suggestion was made to have 3 ft doors into bathrooms and grab bars in adjacent toilets to allow handicap access into standard toilets. This way, the obligation to meet the full accessibility requirement for handicap access can be bypassed. General agreement that disabled people should not lose the opportunity for housing due to unavailability of disabled access. The Chair commented that he does not see the gulf between modernism and residential architecture and did not agree with the idea that residential cannot be modern and that a residential building has to be derivative to be warm. This was an opportunity to set an example to the rest of the west side.

Applicant's Response: The approach to a traditional building was the client's preference; there was a strong desire to have a building that was residential in character. The site is relatively flat; there is an existing boulevard with street trees and the intent is to have a row of trees to create a pedestrian path. Tried to respond to removing detailing rather than adding it. Out of 35 units, one unit on the ground floor is designed to be accessible and this was by client request. The plan has opportunity to have units on each floor that would be accessible. Although 10% is the right ratio, this project is intended to function as a guesthouse/ hotel type operation and the requirement may be less for this type of building. Since there is significant lead in time

in bookings, this could give the TRIUMF management some ability to avoid the crunch of more than one person needing the facility. The suggestion to have 3-foot doors and grab bars in adjacent toilets was a good one and was noted for consideration.

Summary

- ✓ increase accessible units
- ✓ landscape and site design needs more work particularly as it relates to street
- ✓ fake-traditional details still in evidence; e.g. porch. More work needed.

6. UBC Properties Lot 12 Mid Campus

Address:	To be determined
Dev. Appl.	Not applied yet
Application Status:	-
Architect:	Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Lessee/ Occupant:	Faculty and Staff
Review:	First
Delegation:	Ray Letkeman, Jason Letkeman, Grant Brumpton, Bruce Hemstock, Matthew Carter, Joe Redmond, Jas Sahota
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: Project to return

Applicant's Opening Comments: Matthew Carter (MC) presented an overview of the Mid Campus and current status of developments. UBCPT is the Development Manager for the project. He made address to the Main Mall greenway link, which is the key feature of the neighbourhood and provided some background on the working of the co development. The building is being developed for faculty and staff members to buy a home rather than rent, and to be able to buy at a discounted price. The land is leased and is at market value. He explained the discount structure. The development comprises 52 units in total - 44 townhouses and 8 apartments.

Ray Letkeman (RL) presented the design aspect of the project. UEL residential character as reference. He explained the formality and symmetrical elevation of the building and spoke on the use of materials, colour, roof, and form and character of the building, expression of main entry, sidings and trims.

Grant Brumpton (GB) of Phillips Wuori Long explained the landscape. The project has two buildings - apartment and townhouse. He addressed the landscape to these two buildings and the attempt to reflect the same contextual issues. Formal entrances and exits to the building were discussed; formal public entrance to townhouses is off Main Mall. Units have a masonry peer and gate structure and low hedging to provide privacy and define the edge. Public nature of the street and semi private nature of the backyard was addressed, also the rhododendron forest to the south of the site, the new park on road B and north of the site, and community centre for the neighbourhood. Proposing a convenient store in the new barn building.

Jason Letkeman, Architect (JC) explained the building plans for the townhouse building, and the importance of addressing these buildings on Main Mall. The building has been orientated to access Main Mall

Panel's Questions & Comments:

- Was the opportunity to have a building that was not strictly market explored?
- lack of amenities
- Is there provision for accessible units?
- the approach to traditional style as opposed to contemporary, especially in an intellectual institution, was challenged.
- the creation of a continuous edge down Main Mall for the housing components was a concern
- Building was not dealt with in a way unique to UBC and the design is derivative and average

- The Panel was in agreement that UBC should set the example in innovative housing and lead the way, and not bring Surrey architecture onto campus.
- A building with symmetrical layout on top of a hill could be over imposing
- the building sets the tone for the termination of the Main Mall and from an urban design point of view, this is an important place.
- even beyond the matter of style, the approach to symmetry of the large building, relationship of the two different scales of the buildings, and the incorporation into the slope were questionable issues
- This is a highly desirable area; it should be able to stand a bolder approach to design
- Challenge assumptions as to what the market really wants or will bear

Applicant's Response: UBCPT was trying to strike the right balance in making the building as usable and functional as possible in response to market perception. It is important to make it marketable should the need arise to sell. Marketing is driving the methodology of this project. No specific amenity space as they see the users being attracted to outside UBC amenities. No accessible units in existing design. UBCPT was aware of the new Vancouver by-law re visitability for washrooms and the building design will cater to the by-law. The mid campus Design Guidelines state the use of traditional materials, (e.g. no vinyl) and contains some language to promote traditional forms of construction. The design is entirely in compliance with the Neighbourhood plan. Market research was conducted by way of speaking to many people and obtaining their preferences for form and allocation of space and financial preferences.

RL holds the view that UEL character is appropriate for UBC.

Joe Redmond (JR) explained that every market housing project will have these issues and suggested that instead of debating architectural style, the AUDP should provide design guidelines to guide future development. The university should be clear if it is to impose certain requirements on the developer. That the conditions suggested by the university should be reconsidered by this committee are not defined within the design guidelines presented to the developers.

Summary

- ✓ huge concern at the architectural expression and style
- ✓ issue of the scales of two buildings relative to each other
- ✓ relationship to the Main Mall
- ✓ symmetry of the building
- ✓ relationship of the building to the future community centre right to the north

7. Faculty Staff & Housing - Phase 3

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl.	Not applied yet
Application Status:	-
Architect:	Integra Architecture
Lessee/ Occupant:	Faculty & Staff
Review:	First
Delegation:	Dale Staples, Jas Sahota, Joe Redmond
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : Project to return

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect invited the applicant to present the project.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Jas Sahota (JS) introduced the project and context. He spoke to the 14 foot grade separation across site, its relationship to park and the two challenges of trying to relate to the institutional feel created by the two buildings along Thunderbird and maintain a sense of a softer courtyard.

Dale Stapes (DS) explained landscape and courtyard and architectural treatment. Building and plan is similar to Thunderbird residences, providing 60 units of faculty staff rental housing. Parking access is at the lowest point of site. DS spoke to the articulation of the building; detailing kept modest, simple and functional. The residential character will be retained. JS commented that the parking ratios in the underground parkade, storage lockers and bicycle storage, would be on the pattern of the 89 existing faculty and staff homes.

Panel's Comments & Questions:

- Relationship to Thunderbird is good.
- could the Boulevard ground level units open on to the street?
- massing gives impression of thinness - base needs to be brought up and made a little more simplified but robust; this will tie in with terrace.
- is there another way to express the balconies?
- suggestion to manipulate the roofline to avoid repetitive gable.
- corner entry offers the idea of a portal to the back and provides an opportunity for a connection through the lobby to the courtyard.
- being an apartment context it lacks the sense of a front yard/ back yard connection and visibility into the lawn; lawn is a privatized place at the upper level, as opposed to the possibility of having a gathering place outside that works collectively for the group of residents.
- landscape design should consider programming rather than just decoration.
- concern at length of corridors, corner entrance and having one elevator for 60 units. Was the possibility of having an entrance at each street explored? Exit stairs could be more inviting and useful and reduce the sense of a long corridor; also two entrances might make the building more user- friendly and optional.
- concurrence on the lack of opportunity to facilitate sociability and relationships of housing units; a secured social area should be created at the current entry; courtyard should be more accessible to children and provide space for them to play close to home and in a semi independent way.
- pulling apart the stairwells to create access through was suggested.
- greater definition of semi private space needed; create demarcation with a low wall?
- space to facilitate sociability and relationship

Applicant's Response:

The approach to the building was taken from the Neighbourhood Plan and each project is viewed in its context. The Applicant was appreciative of the Panel's comments, which were valid and totally supported, especially the idea of private entries off the street. The reason for this presentation was to receive feed back from the Panel. JS assured the Panel that work would continue to incorporate these ideas and suggestions. The Neighbourhood Plan's interest is to have grade-oriented housing and the design will move in that direction. The point about working on the courtyard re position of walls and accessing the courtyard from the outside was appreciated and will be addressed. Comments on the issue of façade were positive and good. Will be looked at in more detail. JS also referred to points re circulation of the building which he said was important and will be looked at. He did make the comment that whilst one of the requirements of these projects is they are self-financing, they will ensure that the space relates to the building.

Summary

- ✓ general slenderness of the shape and floating nature of gable roofs - make it more robust by increasing the base; longitudinal hip roof?
- ✓ concern about internal circulation and the possibility of making more exit stairs at each wing to become more of a building entry; more front doors on the street where the opportunity presents itself
- ✓ improve design of the building and the site to give the opportunity to use the landscape in a way to build the neighbourhood
- ✓ symmetry of the building
- ✓ relationship of the building to the future community centre adjacent to the north

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - February 27, 2003

Time: 12:00 - 4:30 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Karen Marler (KM)
Bev Nielsen (BN)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Douglas Paterson (DP) - present for two projects
Jane Durante (JD)

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Projects reviewed at this meeting:

1. The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre
2. Maquinna Pointe Lot 11 Mid Campus
3. Ledingham Mcallister Lot 7 Mid Campus
4. Intra Corp - UBC Theology

1. The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre

Address:	1956 Main Mall
Dev. Appl.	
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Downs/ Archambault & Partners + Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates
Lessee/ Occupant:	Library, Archival & Info Studies, Graduate School
Review:	First
Delegation:	Ron Beaton, Stephen Johnson, Geoff Doorn, Stephen Quigley, Joe Redmond
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION - Project to return

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect introduced the project and referred to its previous informal presentation when design guidelines were under preparation by Colborne Group. Early draft guidelines were blended into a further set of guidelines which were produced by Perry + Associates during the architect selection process. Downs Archambault & Partners + Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates with Colborne Group were selected as architects. The presentation is an informal viewing, in advance of a formal DP, and will not require a vote. The building is deliberately called a Learning Centre, as the principal donor (Ike Barber) wants to make knowledge and information widely available to the public of BC and beyond. The project involves demolishing the 1948 and 1960 wings, leaving the 1925 core. The new building footprint is roughly equivalent to the existing one, but has particular issues.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Stephen Johnson (SJ) of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer presented the project with the aid of a working model. The finished concept plan is expected to be completed in March. All but the 1925 core

will be demolished. New building will be about the same size as existing, but have different functions. Half of the building (270,000 sq.ft) will be usual library services. The other component will be classrooms, seminar rooms, project rooms, lecture theatres and academic components. Part of the project will be a Community Concourse, and part of the overall program involves the development of an Automatic Storage and Retrieval system (ASR). A significant amount of books will be stored in this vault-like system with robotic devices for retrieval of books. This element is cost effective and saves 70-80,000 sq.ft of space. The intent is to build the ASR early, in order to place the existing books and proceed with the remaining demolition. Having considered various notions, it was concluded that a good place for the ASR (160' x 45') would be on the north side, partially below grade, and have a window looking into the activity. The applicant has had several steering committee meetings and met with user groups. Based on feedback, the basic notion is to build a library and learning centre that creates a very active and visible elevation along east mall. Whilst the library is to the north, the element called the Learning Commons (academic component) is to the south. SJ discussed overall planning of the building, organisational aspects and ground level pedestrian circulation and massing. In order not to compete with the 1925 core, the building will be kept at 4 storeys. Discussions are ongoing on the importance of developing a precinct plan to help recognize the connection this building will have with its surroundings. The East Mall side presents an opportunity to create a contemporary elevation, entrance, with a corner component to reflect a 21st century building. DJ presented picture boards of various design approaches used on other campuses and some that could be used on this project.

Panel's comments: The Panel complimented the architects on the quality of their presentation. Members appreciated the clarity of the overall planning concept for the building, especially the intent for a strong connection from East Mall through to the plaza on the west side of the building. The Panel broadly agrees with the approach to massing which seeks to avoid the overpowering of the existing heritage core, and the intent to consider different forms of expression, appropriate to both internal functions and building setting, for the different faces of the building. One member asked for explanation of the ASR and whether it contains room for expansion. One member expressed a wish for a high degree of transparency from East Mall through the building's connection with the west side space and to the Koerner Library. There was a comment on the importance of treating some of the landscape as a heritage element as well as the 1925 building; older alumni have seen a lot of change on the campus. There was a question as to whether thought had been given to future connection of the libraries, a concern that Sedgewick might need reconfiguration. The Chair mentioned the call in the Design Guidelines for retention of five existing trees, and noted that the west side of East Mall is intended to be pedestrianised. With regard to site planning and public realm the Panel unanimously emphasized the need for a precinct study.

Applicants Response: 4 or 5 ASR systems have been installed in North America. 1.2 million volumes (10% of total library collections on campus) will be available on the ASR, immediately accessible on site. This system is becoming a more widely accepted option and proving to be a good solution. The ASR program allows for a 10-15 year growth. In order to get the ASR positioned, one of the 5 trees must go. The beech tree will remain on the north west corner. Site plan not yet developed. Budget is not adequate to address many of the east mall issues, but the intent is to bring the notion of the community concourse into the east mall. The building has been planned in a way that none of the library systems will interrupt the flow. Applicant is very mindful of the importance of a strong precinct study, especially in relation to Koerner, although not in present scope. This recommendation was made to the steering committee at its very first meeting on January 6.

Summary:

- ✓ Support for the zoning planning concept - it is clear and will work well
- ✓ Importance of getting the design out into the general precinct
- ✓ Support for the exploration of varied architectural treatment on different sides
- ✓ Don't under emphasise the importance of the south east entrance

2. Maquinna Pointe Lot 11 Mid Campus

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl.	DA 03007
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Brian Hemingway Architect
Lessee/ Occupant:	TBA
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Joseph Fry, Chris Phillips, Jim Hancock, Martin Bruckner, Rene Rose, Andre Chilcott, Brian Hemingway
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : Support, project to return

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect informed the Panel that the project is a designated high-rise site and part of the Mid Campus Plan. Applicant has submitted a DP application and the project will require a vote. The Applicant has had a meeting and an exchange of ideas with the UALA and Director of Campus and Community Planning.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Brian Hemingway (BH) presented. He discussed the concept of the building as a lantern and a beacon, a landmark on the approach from Marine Drive. Intent is to push the building close to Rhododendron wood to minimize effects of shadow on neighboring sites. Massing approach is towards a slender and articulated building. The building is largely glazed interspersed with solid mass of walls; timber trellis extends to the street; 2 levels of underground, unobtrusive parking; pewter-like colouring is suggested; ground surface will have concrete/ granite mix of materials. Applicant likes to see more urbanity.

Chris Phillips (CP) presented the landscape plan and spoke to the inner garden, outdoor spaces, connection to Rhododendron Woods, contrast of urban with natural materials; the entry experience; the changing grades in relation to the street.

Panel's Questions: One Panel member questioned the future use of the adjacent site to the south. Accessibility questions were raised in relation to the landscaping and northeastern garden. The corridors appear to be very narrow in the visitor handicapped access from the parking garage into the lobby. The Applicant was reminded of the 5 ft minimum requirement. One panel member questioned the location of the high rise. There was a question about the driveway court finishing material and density of the neighbouring property to the north. The Panel also questioned the strategy for LEED. The Chair stated that LEED is an office building system and referred to the green building guidelines section in the Mid Campus Plan. After some discussion the Applicant was informed that the point of the question is to make sure that when the project returns, the sustainability policy is addressed. One member commented that the building is probably not far off LEED in any case.

Applicant's Response: The south site is presently a 45 ft. research facility but could change to residential. Disabled access into the landscaping behind the building can be accommodated. Driveway material will be pre cast paver and the FSR of the neighbouring property is below one. Main focus is on ground plane. Only standard efficiency requirements are being addressed. Joe Redmond, UBCPT advised that a residential sustainability rating system from UBC Prof. Ray Cole was expected. This is a voluntary system, which this building will test out. It was hoped to use this for residential construction.

Panel's Comments: One Panel member said the building is well articulated and proportioned but remains essentially a downtown building. Suggestion that we aspire to make sustainability visible, as in European countries, or else an intellectual fun-piece; the Panel member expressed disappointment from that perspective. One member liked the idea of urbanity with the wild and the ground plane treatment. Would like to see the development of the notion of making sustainability visible, especially in terms of having water on the ground. Another member congratulated Polygon on designing a light and airy building and commented that this building makes a statement for the campus in terms of residential having more glass. This same member requested that handicap issues be given consideration. General comment that this was a well-crafted and well thought of building, particularly the ground plane. However one member commented that he would have

liked to see images of a vertical garden and images of terraced penthouse gardens, to play on its setting and play down urbaneness. There was appreciation for the articulation of massing. One Panel member commented that as a Design Panel they were trying to push the development community to be more innovative and make a statement about UBC.

Summary

- ✓ The ground plane and idea behind it has been very well handled
- ✓ General sense that the building mass has been very well thought of and well crafted
- ✓ Whilst notion of urban versus sub urban was welcomed, this is not an urban site and the Applicant should have tried to push further with an innovative approach
- ✓ Sustainability aspect
- ✓ Accessibility
- ✓ Neighbouring south lot (an issue for UBC not the Applicant)

3. Ledingham McAllister Lot 7 Mid Campus

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl.	DA 03006
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill & Associates Architects
Developer	Ledingham McAllister Properties Ltd.
Lessee/ Occupant:	
Review:	First
Delegation:	John O'Donnell, Ward McAllister, Keith Hemphill, Kim Perry, Jonathan Losee, Camille Sleeman
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : 3-1 support (subject to adapting to underground parking)

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, UALA introduced the project as also part of the mid campus neighbourhood which did not make last month's agenda for a preliminary viewing. DP application has been made. After speaking to the location of the site, he introduced the delegation and invited John O'Donnell to make the presentation.

Applicant's Opening Comments: John O'Donnell (JO) addressed the bid process and background of the project. The goal is to create a high-end market neighbourhood in the mid campus area in order to generate revenue, which in turn will be used to fund student, staff and faculty housing. In preparing the bid, the Applicant became familiar with Mid Campus Plan documents and the site-specific development controls summary. The bid was based on the quality of housing and type of housing preferred by west side buyers. He spoke briefly on the profile of future residents and the factors influencing site design and home types stating that town homes with attached garages are the most desirable form of housing. Reasons - issue of security, underground parking garages are less sustainable as car use declines, deeper excavation would be required, large amounts of concrete and high energy operating costs. This design allowed for higher projected revenue, which in turn allowed for a higher bid to be offered. During the process of the bid and detailed design, UBCPT bid documents and Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan were carefully considered.

Keith Hemphill spoke to the architectural planning of the 28 townhouses in 7 buildings. He spoke to the mews style auto court to avoid display of cars to outer campus, the urbane street frontage, opportunities for landscaping, lower floor and upper floor materials, character of building - large open window forms, and colours at the entrance to the unit. It is proposed to have an access off the new road, which allows for an entrance and pedestrian connection.

Jonathan Losee spoke to the landscape issues and explained the landscape in relation to the adjacent stream, auto entrance, adjacent pathway, grade access along park edge, courtyard. Garbage is individual pick up.

Panel's Questions: One Panel member inquired if any investigation was done on the underground parking and expressed a big concern at the space given to cars. There was general agreement that a parking underground would provide more space to the residents. Another Panel member questioned wheelchair accessibility at the front yard and asked if providing accessible units for students or visitors was considered. This member expressed the opinion that underground parking could provide an elevator to the main level of the unit and deal with the approach to accessibility. There was concern at the height of the building on West Mall and if it could be dropped down to avoid the many stairs? One Panel member referred to JO's example of Whistler and asked how he sees this project as adding variety to the precinct. The Chair referred to the green guidelines in section 3.4.12 of the Mid Campus Plan and inquired the sustainability and energy conservation strategies that were being looked at.

Applicant's response: All units are wheel chair accessible from the east side, but this is a dilemma in a 3-storey town house form; municipalities recognise that the accessible entry standards cannot be applied to a 3-storey town house form. Although it is possible to have entries off a central commons, this will not serve the broader need; individual garages are more secure. All the ground floors on West Mall contain suites, as being one of the goals of the Mid Campus Plan. Attempts were made to minimize the stairs by dropping the entry, but this would make the lowest floor uninhabitable. The applicant has attended LEED seminars and some of the strategies towards sustainability are included in site planning and selection of materials. Appliances for energy efficiency will be selected at a later date. The variety of building forms is due to lack of guidelines. However, the applicant also stated that UBCPT's bid documents for the site call for "traditional" architecture (which is contradictory to the Mid Campus Plan). Ward McAllister mentioned his previous understanding that the project would not have to go through this approval process.

Panel's Comments: The Chair referred to the documents the Applicant had visited in preparation for the bid and observed that the UBC Planning Principles was not one of them. He commented that one of the main points of the UBC Planning Principles is that UBC is a unique place and clarified the point that whilst this does not mean prescribing a style, it was unique by way of setting, taking advantage of the west coast and not being derivative.

There was general concern that livability and the useable soft private space outdoors, was compromised by the courtyard devoted to cars and that the space would be more successful as a central landscaped court. Also the units on the angle (particularly the end unit) are not successful as it could block pedestrian access. Use of the automobile is not the dominant factor in the precinct.

One Panel member liked the urban edge along West Mall as well the split entry.

There was agreement that the architectural treatment should move closer toward contemporary expression and that the forms need to be simpler, more "of the place" rather than "off the shelf". One Panel member expressed concern at the symmetry at the end of buildings - needs more variability to assist orientation.

One Panel member expressed conflicting feelings - likes townhouse form, but it does not contribute to accessibility. This is a big issue and the delegation was reminded of the City of Vancouver requirement on visitability of units. This was something UBC should be adopting.

During the discussion on LEED, it was suggested that simpler strategies could be used in housing to achieve more sustainability/ LEED requirements, such as designated areas for recycling, storm water management and use of local materials.

JOD commented that the UBC Planning Principles, being a governing document, should be mentioned in the Mid Campus Plan.

Summary

✓ Big question over the rationale of using the internal court as a surface parking courtyard versus having the

- underground parking; support vote is subject to reexamination of this matter
- ✓ Simplify the architectural approach
- ✓ Look at going further with accessibility - City of Vancouver requires a certain percentage of units to be accessible
- ✓ Appreciation for the edge to West Mall
- ✓ Sustainability strategies could include provision for recycling and consideration of locally made materials

4. Intra Corp UBC Theology Building

Address:	TBD
Dev. Appl.	No application yet
Application Status:	-
Architect:	Ramsay Worden Architects
Developer	Intracorp Developments Ltd
Lessee/ Occupant:	TBD
Review:	First
Delegation:	Doug Ramsay, Roger Koodoo, Tom Miller
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : **Unanimous support for the project**

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect informed the Panel this was the first informal meeting and a DP application had not been made. He introduced the delegation and invited the Applicant to open make the presentation

Applicant's Opening Comments: Tom Miller (TM) spoke briefly and explained that the building construction is scheduled to get underway in late August. The project comprised of 55 homes - 49 condominium apartments and 6 duplexes.

Doug Ramsay (DR) presented an overview of the project and with a site plan explained the context, including the Iona Building and the overall Theological site plan. The project was described using section and elevations.

DR spoke to the use of granite on elevation to relate to Iona building, the lobby and the design, which is aimed at reducing solar heat gain on the west side. The pedestrian street between duplexes and apartment building was addressed, as well the below grade parking for the 6 duplexes. The entry in front of the building is important and needs to make a statement; it will be lit at night and the plan is to have a seating area and fireplace. He also addressed the east elevation along Theological Mall, ground plane, individual entries to lower units, large balconies, commons area and side elevation of duplexes. Sustainability strategy - natural ventilation, designing healthy buildings, storm water management

Kim Perry (KM) presented the landscape site plan and explained that the building had the opportunity to link with final design of Theology Mall. The location was excellent and the intent is to maximize views. He explained various components of the plan and the idea behind keeping the mews a garage free environment. He spoke to the landscape of duplex units and the sidewalk access along west side of apartment building.

- Placing the public sidewalk on the private site allowed for a double row of trees
- The grade conditions at the edge provide ways to have a low wall element, providing grade and distance separation from the street
- Underground parking, arbour over the parking garage
- South entrance to the building will have a pool and bridge into the lobby
- Stone wall elements on the south face
- Pond on west side captures storm water from roofs. Site location does not permit percolation into ground; overflow will connect to storm sewer. May have a water make up and two of the outdoor patios will engage with the water in the way they do at the lagoon on the way to Granville Island.
- Strong front and back door to the duplex units

- 40% of homes have ground elevation

He further discussed the patio spaces in-between the units, the turnaround space and roof/ balconies which will be equipped with precast planters to provide privacy, but not to block views.

Panel's Questions: Questions from the Panel focused on the retention of the existing trees along the edge of the parking garage, visitor parking, materials on the duplexes, the market and connection to the Chapel.

Applicant's Response:

Two existing trees will remain; most of the trees are not worthy of being saved. Below grade visitor parking on Theological Mall; preference is to have the stalls designated to the duplexes. Public parking is also available in Theological Mall. Primary materials used - gloppy dash stucco, cedar shingles for gable roof component, metal on modern townhouse roof, architectural concrete on main building, aluminum glazing system, natural wood on large overhangs on the front door entry, big wood soffit in the lobby entry, wood soffit overhangs. Units are high end, in the range of 800K and up. There was discussion on unit sizes, configurations, socio economic groups and ground-oriented units. There is an informal pathway to the Chapel.

Panel's Comments: One Panel member liked the urbane edge to Theology Mall and softening on Chapel side. This member also likes the main building balance between symmetry and randomness, but Chancellor side townhouses are symmetrical. Also likes the "two in one" configuration on Chancellor but could symmetry be modified to make them slightly different? There was overall appreciation for the Woonerf, underground parking, non-traditional attitude to architecture and the approach to the street. Other comments - the different character to the image behind was very attractive, wonderful contextual response, very good example illustrating that we can be contemporary and respond to traditional elements. Green building initiatives were highly appreciated and Intra Corp was commended for this project. One Panel member requested that consideration be given to balancing the piers between stone and concrete and providing more detail on the entry at street level.

DR - there has been much debate about the duplexes and whether it should be 3 different designs rather than 2 and 1. Possibility of using details to distinguish the two identical designs from each other. Various roof forms were considered with the use of models and, given the relationship of the forecourt to the chapel, the roof bowing down seemed to work very well. Although there are a number of good reasons for keeping the present form, DR agreed that minor adjustments are worth considering.

Given the stage of development and the fact that the DP application was scheduled to be submitted the following day, the Applicant requested for a vote from the Panel. The Chair agreed, subject to conformance with the overall development review process.

Summary

- ✓ General reception is very positive because the project has given a good contemporary, yet contextual response and shows that work can be contemporary and still respond to a traditional context. It is exemplary.
- ✓ Great appreciation for the parking being underground and the mews space being left to be a mews space rather than a lane with garages
- ✓ Appreciation for the proactive consideration of green features
- ✓ While the different forms and treatments of the townhouses on the main road and the building behind work well together, need to look at the symmetry of the townhouses and consider minor adjustments.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - March 27, 2003

Time: 12:00 - 4:45 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Bev Nielsen (BN)
Douglas Paterson (DP)
Jane Durante (JD)
Sid Siddiqui

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Karen Marler
Rainer Fassler (sudden family emergency)

Projects reviewed at this meeting:

1. University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan
 2. The Irving K. Barber Learning Centre
 3. Multi User Facility for Functional Proteomics (MFFP)
 4. TRIUMF House
 5. Faculty & Staff Housing - Lot 14H (Phase 3)
-

1. University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan

Review: Second

Delegation: Dennis Pavlich, (VP External & Legal Affairs), Geoff Atkins, (AVP Land & Building Services), Linda Moore, (Assoc Dir, External Affairs and University Town), Joe Redmond, (VP-UBC Properties Trust)

UBC Staff: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION - Panel and UALA to provide further contribution to the Plan

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect noted that the Plan has been seen before in its very early stages and is now set for general public feedback and input. TL invited Dennis Pavlich to make his presentation.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Dennis Pavlich (DP) thanked the Panel for its participation in the consultative process of the University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan. He spoke to:

- the context of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan in the sense of where the university would like to see itself over the next few years.
- evolution in terms of getting to the Plan
- issue of concept - to create a university town. UBC's large day population created transportation issues and underground transit is to really deal with the existing university community. UBC is looking at the broad based community, the GVRD and wants to offer the general community the opportunity to live in a university town.

- chief characteristics of a university town - high concentration of young adults, huge number of highly intelligent people, variety of cultural facilities - Library, MOA, Chan Centre, Belkin Art Gallery. The kind of community envisaged is one that is compact, dealing with issues of sustainability, and pedestrian and transit oriented
- immediate neighbourhood need - arteries are clogged with traffic and this is being addressed by trying to make it more transit oriented
- introduction of the U-Pass. This presents a challenge in dealing with a 30% extra load by transit user.

University Boulevard is to be the main entrance to the campus. DP elaborated on the thinking behind the direction the Neighbourhood Plan is taking. There is a need for a strong entrance, and for a commercial aspect to the street that will attract students and others beyond the limited hours of use reflecting the current “commuter” campus. A way to do this would be to provide university oriented commercial facilities such as cafes, clubs, bookstores, dental clinic, continuing education, etc. Creating a university atmosphere in the town will also meet another institutional need by attracting more faculty and staff to live on campus, which in turn will ameliorate traffic issues and environmental concerns and help create what the OCP describes as a compact community. Transportation, creating a plaza and a place with a lot of atmosphere, housing with community life after hours, were some of the factors considered in assigning space along University Boulevard.

Joe Redmond (JR) presented and spoke to the following slides of the University Neighbourhood Plan.

- Creation of a University Town
- University Boulevard and other campus entry points
- Main Campus Plan 1992 - envisaged University Boulevard as the heart of the campus. Currently 30K users, 30K more anticipated
- University Boulevard Neighbourhood Planning to date
- OCP Land Use Plan with eight neighbourhoods. OCP, CCP and Draft Neighbourhood Plan have been to the Board; the Plan will be revised with comments and input from various groups.
- CCP Land Use Plan - University Boulevard
- University Boulevard - existing condition
- Conceptual section through Plaza and Transit Centre looking south
- Development of plan over 5 year, 10 year and 15-year period. Three changes to the previous plan - buses relocated underground with a ramp starting in front of the Dentistry building, relocated swimming pool to face McGuiness Field, introduction of a residential tower. Amendment required to the OCP for extra height - the Applicant would like to see the tower as a market residential building.
- University Boulevard section looking east at underground bus entry - 15+ year plan: 9m wide transit tunnel, 1m landscape area, 3m travel, 1.5m bike lane, 2.5m parking lane. Buildings under current CCP allows 5 storeys, but heights may be varied; residential may be transferred into the tower.
- University Boulevard section looking east at widest point - 15+ year plan
- Character
- Identity
- Next steps
- Neighbourhood Planning Process - chart
- Background on Neighbourhood Planning Process. Public meeting to be held on April 1, 2003 at 7:00 p.m.

Discussion:

The Draft NP went through a public consultative process and then to the Board; the Board required more study of the entry. A new Entry Committee was formed and all entry gates were identified. Buses were proposed to be moved underground as one way of making this a pedestrian friendly neighbourhood; storage area is designed to accommodate 40 buses. Section on University Boulevard looking east at underground bus entry - character and relation to rest of the campus to reflect memory point of the university. Entry Gate - study underway.

Linda Moore advised that they had been engaged in intensive consultative process over the past 6 weeks and had a total of 10 open houses in addition to 25 special meetings and presentations with different stakeholder groups. Feedback is being assembled.

Geoff Atkins input:

- Currently 1500 buses over a 24 hour period along University Boulevard, 5,500 vehicle trips.
- U-Pass will create 1000 more bus trips over a 24-hour period, and 1000 fewer vehicle trips.
- Underground option takes us down from 12,000 vehicle lengths to about 3,000-4,000.
- Transit increased 50% in past 6 years. 30% more increase expected. Will have more buses with U-Pass.
- UBC wants Translink to serve the rest of the campus. Translink looked at options and decided on the underground bus loop.
- Design guidelines to be developed for University Boulevard area, with input from the Panel.
- With regard to issues re security, lighting, etc., other examples of similar facilities will be considered.
- Primary criteria - has to be financially neutral for UBC. Discussed options of how to make this happen.
- \$300 million for UBC deferred maintenance.

Panel's comments:

- Unanimous support for the intention of the plan, although one member fundamentally disagrees with its resolution.
- Question about the precedents to this plan; D. Pavlich replied that the precedents are eclectic and "borrowed" which nevertheless presents an unique opportunity
- Those who have followed the plan, and who were present at its brief and early presentation to the Panel some time ago, commented favourably on direction and progress.
- In response to D. Pavlich's request for comment on the high-rise buildings, there was support in principle, no disagreement, with the proviso that they should be "exceptional buildings".
- Panel members noted the importance of the building design guidelines to come. The architecture should reflect the nature of the university, both as institution and as innovator. Universities push the boundaries of knowledge, so too can architecture when done appropriately.
- The intent to protect the War Memorial Gym is noted and appreciated.
- The relocation of the pool is supported; one comment concerned ensuring it is not shadowed by the buildings.
- There is concern about the design character of the entrance gate at Wesbrook, and a desire to participate in a fuller exploration.
- The sub grade transit terminal can work if handled well; concerns include personal safety and air handling/ exhaust. Members raised the positive implications of including retail below grade, enhancing the experience, the space and its potential links to the SUB.
- Criticism included the lack of an academically oriented or public realm focal building, the plaza in itself does not provide and adequate focus.

University Architect's comments: (summarized after the meeting)

- Generally in agreement, although concerned that quality of space in general will be compromised as the components of the plan get pushed around.
- Welcomes the acknowledgement of importance of sight lines to the mountains as a determinant of building locations.
- Does not support the proposed removal of part of the bosque of trees to the west of the SUB.
- Concern that the grade difference between the plaza and East Mall is too great, creating an awkward, dysfunctional and ugly separation between the two. Closer alignment of plaza and Aquatic Centre really does not have that much value and should not be presented as a justification if short term cost consideration is the real driver.
- Echoes the panel in emphasising the importance of architectural guidelines. Let's do this rationally, inclusively and without artificially manufactured haste. Involve the Advisory Urban Design Panel, as Geoff Atkins undertook to do.
- Concern, as this has moved on, about the effectiveness of the single storey building in front of the Gym. It may look incongruous compared to the rest of the street, and may still block the elevation of the building from many angles. Notwithstanding the economics of it all, the UALA would like to consider the idea of a small and open plaza between U Blvd and the gym, with clear pedestrian connections leading to and from.

The Panel and UALA look forward to providing further contributions towards making this plan the best it can be.

2. Irving K. Barber Learning Centre

Address:	1956 Main Mall
Dev. Appl.	N/ A
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Downs/ Archambault & Partners + Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates
Lessee/ Occupant:	Library, Archival & Info Studies, Graduate School
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Ron Beaton, Stephen Johnson, Geoff Doorn, Stephen Quigley, Joe Redmond, Joe Wai
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : **Project to return**

Introduction: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect informed that the Panel had previously looked at the overall planning concept of the building and it was well received. Some progress has been made in the design of the building. TL introduced Joe Wai, Architect who is working with UBC on the public realm aspect of the project.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Stephen Johnson (SJ) presented. Since the last meeting there has been more work to the programme, planning and architectural character and integration with its surroundings. The project retains the original heritage building (including the Chapman Learning Commons Room) and builds about 200,000 sq.ft. of new space.

With the use of a model SJ spoke to:

- the opportunities for multiple entrances, including Main Mall and south east entrances; could have south-west entrance
 - central east-west axis through from East Mall
 - loading in northeast corner.
 - new 2-storey space on 2nd floor north similar to Ridington Room
 - open, student-oriented space on perimeter
 - ground plane context plan for pedestrian circulation for whole precinct
 - historical issues around possible new terrace at main front door
 - connections to East Mall - need to create "events" on East Mall - (trees, light fixtures, groupings etc)
 - developing front façade and character - piers integrating pre-cast, stone and glazing. This is a building that would glow in the evening and have a relationship with the Koerner.
- DP application will be submitted in April.
- Joe Wai will manage the overall precinct study
- Design is developing in a compatible way - importance of consideration of major axis and connection at both ends is noted.

On the invitation of the UALA, Joe Wai informed the Panel of his role as facilitator, coordinator and general mover. On request of the Director, Campus & Community Planning, he will be involved in the public realm/ public spaces and a precinct study on the area immediately adjacent to the new Learning Centre. As part of the study he will also look at the East/ West access to Library Gardens and University Boulevard development. He finds the design compatible in broad based terms. Chris Phillips will be on board as the landscape architect.

Panel's Questions: The Panel's questions focused on the handicapped access from the west side and East Mall, sustainable goals, LEED certification and site issues. One Panel member raised the question of programming and if it was constrained by budgetary restrictions. Other questions comprised the location of the future underground connection to Koerner, the difference between the "vertical" east elevation from the "horizontal"

west elevation and only one shower area in the northeast corner.

Applicant's Response: East Mall leads to an elevator vestibule and the west side ramp is half a level down. No direct access from the centre court into the building, but it was possible to bring a ramp to the west side. Stephen Quigley referred to a conversation with John Lane, Physical Access Advisor, who did not see this as a major concern at this point. The project is programmed in a unique and exciting way and is able to preserve a wide interior component of the community concourse. It has a mix of elements and treatments including an up-to-date library, acoustical privacy and visual openness. Re green issues - Applicant is considering two approaches to the mechanical system - conventional and use of aluminum piping - no decision yet. Radiant piping system will be cost effective. Building also has natural air circulation and as much furniture as possible will be reused. Stone on existing addition will be reused and incorporated into the interior to give a sense of heritage core. No initial assessment for LEED - will be addressed in the future. No vegetation grey water system, but an initial watering system is being looked into; groundwater servicing infra structure plan for the university requires it to be piped. Servicing area and function was explained; 2-3 trucks a day. Future connection to Koerner would occur through lower level. Joe Wai to look at this through a workshop in 2-3 weeks. At one point in design, the elevation was broken up to some degree, giving a different look to various parts. Re difference in elevation, the Applicant received strong feed back from steering committee about having it unified as a learning centre and library. There were no showers programmed in the building, however a split facility was put in as a courtesy.

Budget amount for site works (landscaping and underground) is approximately \$600k

The UALA appreciated the Applicant's proactive consideration of an end of trip facility, which is now a rule for all new buildings.

UALA Comments - At the last presentation, the idea of varied architectural treatment was considered an interesting idea, and met with favour. Present design is going too far, pieces are getting too big and the 4 sides of the building are too different from each other. The whole concept is too restless and has no rhythm; west face is getting massive. It is unfortunate that the design group meeting was held without the University Architect being present. Concern that the building is becoming an attention grabber rather than a fit with the existing building and the rest of the campus. Strong reservations about direction of the project.

Panel's Comments: One Panel member semi-concurred with the UALA's comments; finds many aspects of the east elevation compelling. This member had concerns about human scale items - effect of outward slope (rain protection) and plinth along basement. Would like to be able to see from Memorial Road into north reading room. Appreciation for the internal circulation, but reading commons is a bit claustrophobic and high.

One Panel member expressed concern at the handicapped access going down and the series of west side ramps. Creating a space like this is deadly and unsightly; needs a vestibule and an elevator. This member recommends a stronger entry at east elevation and a break up of the elevation to create more rhythm. Has difficulty understanding the rationale for strong verticality of one elevation and horizontality of the other.

One Panel member strongly recommends the project sets goals and guidelines for LEED certification and establish energy targets using LEED as a guide. Suggestion to develop check lists, as there are plenty of opportunities. There is an opportunity to use the building mass; as well the radiant cooling system can be taken advantage of. Building could achieve LEED Gold.

One Panel member expressed appreciation for the existing Ridington Room and hopes the new reading room would have the same feel. This member referred to the previously presented simplicity and elegance of the shell of the building and concurs with the UALA that there are too many elements and ideas. Appreciation for the southeast entrance, spaces between the old building and new, but the front and back differences are too complex. Base of building lacks sufficient transparency and the windows seem too high up. Suggested bringing the transparency further down. This member was pleased to see the public realm and precinct study being addressed.

Summary

- ✓ general support for overall organization of the planning
- ✓ appreciation for the planning and the entrances ; it works well with the public realm.
- ✓ reservation that the Learning Commons is too tight
- ✓ major reservation with the handicapped access; it threatens not to work well with present direction
- ✓ appreciation for the imitative to provide an end of trip facility
- ✓ general reservation about architectural expression: too many elements and too many ideas - scale, transparency, over complexity
- ✓ support for the expression of the Ridington Room element at the north, and also for the south east entrance
- ✓ needs more cohesion, transparency and campus fit
- ✓ great appreciation for the quality of presentation

3. Multi User Facility for Functional Proteomics (MFFP)

Address:	2222 Health Sciences Mall
Dev. Appl.	DA03012
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Maples Argo Architects
Lessee/ Occupant:	Biomedical Research Centre
Review:	First
Delegation:	Alan Maples, Gerry Vagelatos, Rob Brown
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : **Support subject to resolution of MRI project conflict**

Introduction: The advance submission explains the background of the project very well. This is a research-intensive project located at Health Sciences and has an interesting juxtaposition to the patient park courtyard. DP application has been submitted.

Panel member Sid Siddiqui excluded himself from comments on this project due to his company's involvement.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Alan Maples (AM) presented. The MFFP project will be designed as a direct extension of the existing Biomedical Research Centre and will closely match the existing building in form, character, materials and colours. The MFFP addition will take its massing cues from the existing building, including a straightforward expression of structure, and a predominantly horizontal expression of concrete beams and window bands. External sun shading will be provided for the MFFP addition's south facing windows. The existing building has concrete sunshade beams protecting each level. The MFFP addition will have aluminum sunshade louvres at level 3 only, since the mature landscaping protects level 2. An appropriate clearance from the Koerner Pavillion will be maintained, to avoid unduly blocking hospital windows. Exterior materials of the MFFP addition will match those of the existing building. Interior materials will include exposed architectural concrete, painted gypsum board walls, sheet vinyl flooring, suspended acoustic tile ceilings, wood doors, and wood trim.

An open lab concept will be provided where appropriate, to allow spaces to be reconfigured as large open work areas or closed equipment rooms. Level 1 of the MFFP addition will be entirely below grade, level 2 windows look out to the pump house, level 3 windows look over the waterfall to the Patient Park and level 4 mechanical room will be articulated to reflect the horizontal lines of the existing building.

Site access, construction and elevation:

- site access for construction is through the Patient Park
- 8 sycamore trees in openings in the pavement will be removed to open up the area in front of the waterfall and create an area large enough for the construction.
- all of the existing planting and irrigation will be removed due to excavation

Gerry Vagelatos spoke to the schematic landscape design. The design concept for Patient Park stems from keeping nature in the campus and close to people. Although the concept has worked well and despite the beautiful rhododendrons there is a need to bring back light and introduce year round colour and seasonal interest. The park is an enclosed space with current access from the walkway and this could be improved by creating a new access from Health Sciences Road. A new walk through the mature trees will be constructed of compacted granite screenings. The improved access will bring the park to more people.

The boulders are a natural material being added to Patient Park. It will add contrast and help counteract the loss of the Sycamore trees. At the waterfall area a large boulder and flowering shrub will be placed at each of the eight openings where the Sycamore trees were removed. The grade at the back of the pump house slopes towards the new building and the design concept includes a stone wall to reduce its steepness. The area will require new planting and irrigation. Plantings will consist of low to medium flowering shrubs and groundcovers.

During the presentation, reference was made to the proposed new Koerner MRI project, which is a single storey, underground (30 x 7.6 meters), and overlaps the footprint of the MFFP by a couple of meters in width and 10 metres in length. This is an animal MRI facility that detects low magnetic fields in the brain. Due to the production of enormous magnetic fields, it is ill advised to have these buildings right beside each other. At a recent meeting with the other team (CEI Architects) the question was raised about building under Patient Park with an animal unit over a much bigger scale. The scientists involved have discovered this proximity and discussions are underway to find out if one facility has to move and how far away. On the plan, magnetic lines of force extend deliberately under the landscape as a safer place to put them.

JC - MRI project was issued a DP on the basis it was a totally underground project. The AUDP was not consulted for this reason. However if changes have been made to the design, it will require a new DP.

Rob Brown (UBCPT) informed the Panel that the MFFP would proceed with the building as shown. It has to be considered independent of MRI; adjustments will have to be made by MRI.

Applicant has had one meeting and received minimal information on the MRI project. Assumption is that MRI building will appear at or above grade. In response to Applicant's question re landscaping, the MRI team indicated there are no current plans. May have a flat roof (roofing membrane) or grass. JC recalled the project having a budget of \$30,000 for roof landscaping and referred to initial concern that some very mature landscaping was to be removed. One panel member commented that \$30k appears inadequate for the build up of the landscape/ greening the roof with mature materials.

UALA - the project is done through the Vancouver Hospital and this is a reason for the disconnect. JC to follow up.

Panel's Questions: Questions focused on wheelchair accessibility and the possibility of greening up the roof in the existing building and reducing the impact of the immediacy of the view in the new building.

Applicant's response: One washroom, but not on each level. Given the actual population, there is no plan to expand the washroom capacity in the existing building. One end of trip facility. No plan for the green roof. When the plan was for three floors, the user group requested a roof deck, but the idea was resisted for 3 reasons - 1) it would not be on the correct level for use; 2) cost, and 3) adjacent mechanical penthouse. Another factor was the park outside the building and encouraging its use. A counter proposal to add a balcony off the meeting room is being considered, but no current plan.

Panel's Comments: Landscape needs to be carefully done, in relation to Koerner Pavilion, given the unusual roof deck. Appreciation for the cross cut through Patient Park. Interior and floor plans are very straightforward, efficient and workable and link in well with the existing structure. Appreciation for the care given to the construction and fit of the addition and it is hoped the protection of the landscape could be controlled.

Summary

- ✓ planning of the building is well done
- ✓ appreciation for the care over the fit of the new piece and thoughtfulness over access
- ✓ appreciation for the crosscut through Patient Park as it makes a huge contribution to the use of the space
- ✓ control over landscape restoration needs to be carefully worked out
- ✓ MRI project conflict to be dealt with

4. TRIUMF House

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl.	DA03014
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Graham Crockart Architect Inc./ Integra Architecture Inc.
Developer	Polygon
Lessee/ Occupant:	TRIUMF
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Mike Patterson, Matthew Carter, Anne Bancroft-Jones, Dale Staples
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : **Unanimous support**

Introduction: This project has been seen before. DP application has been submitted and a public meeting is fixed for April 11, 2003. The project would require a vote. UALA referred to the previous concerns of the Panel regarding landscaping, site planning and architectural expression and invited the Applicant to bring the Panel up to date.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Matthew Carter (MC) introduced the team and Anne Bancroft-Jones from Polygon Homes. TRIUMF is in the process of appointing Polygon Homes as the Development Manager of this project. He referred to the three previous concerns of the Panel in respect to architectural expression, landscaping in relation to Wesbrook Mall and accessibility of washrooms, which had been considered and addressed. Instead of the previous one unit, 4 units within the building are now handicapped accessible.

Dale Staples spoke to the architectural expression.

- created more of an entrance off Wesbrook
- bike storage relocated
- south elevation changed to simpler and more contemporary
- more containment in patio
- added conifers on south and east side

Panel's Questions: There was a question about the type of heating and energy conservation features and if it was possible to make the entry doors automatic.

Applicant's Response: Installation of automatic doors would be a TRIUMF decision. Heating will probably be electric, again, final decision by TRIUMF. Low flush toilets and showers, good insulation.

Panel's Comments: Bathroom in handicapped suite is not completely accessible. Need more separation of public walkway and private space along south edge. General agreement on the substantial improvement of the elevations. One Panel member is still concerned about how to deal with the forest on the north side. There was appreciation for the approach to the handicapped units.

Applicant - intention is to have a wall mounted sink in the handicapped bathroom, but support may be a problem. Will review.

5. Faculty & Staff Housing - Lot 14H (Phase 3)

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl.	DA03009
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Graham Crockart Architect Inc./ Integra Architecture Inc.
Developer	UBC Properties Trust
Lessee/ Occupant:	Faculty and staff
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Dale Staples, Jas Sahota, Mike Patterson,
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : Non support for the project

Introduction: The project has been seen before and is returning after reviewing the recommendations and comments of the Panel. DP application has been submitted and a public meeting is scheduled for April 11, 2003.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Dale Staples (DS) and Mike Patterson (MP) spoke to the previous concerns of the Panel and the incorporation of its recommendations with regard to entry issues, courtyard access and character.

- main entry will retain the arch
- arch element introduced to individual units facing Thunderbird and new road
- access to courtyard - new entrance introduced to mid-level semi private area
- defined main entry
- trellis added to entrance
- brick base raised up to 2nd floor balcony level
- raised main roofline up to allow gables to butt into it
- added entry gates to provide separation
- landscape retaining walls on north street line
- reduced west building façade by berming up
- created semi-private courtyard with access
- wants to rework southwest corner landscape
- board and batten in upper storey
- greenway/ walkway connection to the park

Panel's Questions: There were two questions from the Panel about the surface of the semi private open space and sustainability approach to the building.

Applicant's Response: The semi-private open space is not directly accessible from the building but access could be provided from the sidewalk; middle semi-private space is not wheel chair accessible.

No sustainability guidelines. Some of the features are- wood frame building, air quality (fresh air vents into the units), providing an active make up air system. Major part of the project is over slab, automatic irrigation system in place, no discussions about collection of rainwater.

Panel's Comments: Landscape is still a concern, especially the location of the door into the collective semi-private space; it gives the appearance of semi-private space to 6 units at that level, compared to others. This member appreciated MP's comment about looking at the corner and maximizing the green but is yet concerned about the indoor/ outdoor social space. It still needs a gathering space on the site for families and children. Other concerns are - 1) long corridors with no daylight 2) Need of an amenity space within the building 3) 6 suites on crotch get own private outdoor space. Concern that steps leading to individual units from the street lead to bedroom windows.

Whilst the building has improved dramatically, one Panel member had difficulty with appearance of entry at top of steps leading to individual units from the street. Lintel suggests an entrance but the room is a bedroom. Given its narrowness, the effectiveness of the patio space is questionable. Strong concern at the site planning outdoor issue, particularly the outdoor social space and access which needs improvement. Present indoor/ outdoor connection does not meet spirit of University Town. Needs a stronger connection and circulation system that is more inviting and visible. Needs more site planning, not just a better barbecue location and landscaping.

One Panel member concurred with the above comments. Amenity space on main floor would draw people in. This member suggested sacrificing the corner unit at south end for amenity space, as there is a strong concern that this rental faculty housing has no opportunity for integration of residents. Need to add a patio to maximize use of semi private open space - having grass is not enough; suggested a trellis that defines a private/ public entry. Great appreciation for the wheel-in shower at the parking level. Building form is excellent in that it has a streetscape but also an interior corridor allowing wheelchair access. Parking is well done and elevations have improved.

One Panel member requested the Applicant to submit documentation on sustainability aspects as required by the Mid Campus Plan and as done by market developers.

Applicant's response : The Applicant is of the view that the grade separation of the patio on Thunderbird increases privacy and the space is quite generous - 6-7 ft wide off living room. The idea is not to compromise the quality of light to the rooms.

Re indoor/ outdoor concern, the Applicant did not want to compromise units by taking walkway through the centre, but will continue to work on the Panel's concern.

Re sacrificing south end D unit for amenity space, it was explained that the existing buildings are on a self-financing basis. There is pressure that rents are too high already and to increase the common amenity space would further add to the problem.

DP + UALA - this is a UBC wide problem and needs to be addressed. Panel is given criteria by the University, which they are expected to use to evaluate projects.

JS referred to comment at the previous meeting re having one elevator for 60 units. Changes to the stair detail in the lobby reduces load on elevator and 1st + 2nd floors can now be accessed by the stairs.

Re long dark corridors, DS responded that light could be introduced through stairwell to corridor.

Summary

- ✓ need documentation of the sustainability approach
- ✓ general feeling is that the language and massing of the building has improved, with some reservations
- ✓ overall problem is with indoor/ outdoor social space, access and visibility to outdoor space and the lack in the drawing of making the space usable - patio, wheelchair access
- ✓ awkwardness of the access to the patio from the street and long dark corridors
- ✓ Panel is unconvinced about the internal circulation, particularly the access to the outdoor space.
- ✓ lack of commitment to address social indoor or outdoor space is at odds with what the Panel has heard about building the University Town, to make it a more livable and inviting space for all.
- ✓ appreciation for the handling of the parking level and wheel-in shower, from an accessibility point of view

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - April 24, 2003

Time: 12:00 -5:00 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Bev Nielsen (BN)
Douglas Paterson (DP)
Jane Durante (JD)
Sid Siddiqui

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Bev Nielsen

Projects reviewed at this meeting:

1. VST Student Housing Building
2. Iona Building Revitalisation
3. Irving K. Barber Learning Centre
4. Chemical & Biological Engineering
5. Place Vanier Commons Block
6. UBC Main Mall

1. VST Student Housing

Address:	TBD
Dev. Appl:	DA03014
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Richard Henry Architect/ Jan H. Timmer Architecture Ltd
Lessee/ Occupant:	Vancouver School of Theology
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Jan Timmer, Basil Davis
Landscape Architect:	Jackie Hoffer, Perry + Associates
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: **Unanimous support subject to reconsideration of how underground parking is configured to allow for tree planting**

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (UALA): Both projects have been to the Panel before and Development Permit application has been made. Both projects needed work and since the last meeting Roger Moors and Keith Hemphill have had discussions with the UALA and Fred Pritchard regarding general direction of the Iona Building. UALA invited Jan Timmer to present the Student Housing project.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Jan Timmer (JT) thanked the Panel for its input at the January 23 meeting and spoke to the design response to the comments and recommendations.

Roof shape: the wide and shallow umbrella roof has been altered and the roof edge lowered to the waistline of the fourth floor level. The resulting steeper pitched roof shape is more in concert with the rooflines of the St. Andrews Hall residences across the Woonerf. The dormers of the fourth floor rooms reflect the rhythm of the dormers in the roof of the Iona Building. Roof has changed from green to reflective.

Roof supports and stone columns: the large timber V shaped roof support struts have been eliminated. The stone support columns at the wall face have been moved forward as freestanding columns and now support a timber trellis. Together these elements clearly define the semi-private outdoor patio spaces and entrances for the ground oriented residences.

Building materials: stucco cladding, prefinished metal roof, clear stained smooth fir timbers, prefinished metal windows, stone cladding, painted steel water channels

Jackie Hoffer spoke to the landscape:

- plant selection - native/ nearly native and will accommodate both drought and water; no automatic irrigation - hose beds for supplementary water
- filtration of roof water into the storm system
- 12 space bike racks outside for visitors; underground bike parking for visitors
- parking garage entrance - 56 parking spaces in keeping with the Neighbourhood Plan
- improvements to Woonerf edge
- connections to Iona Green

Panel's Questions: The Panel's questions focused on the level of LEED, Iona courtyard, garbage handling, choice of metal roof and features in the building that respect the neighbourhood, particularly the Iona Building. Explanation was called for on the ramp into the parking and how it works.

Applicant's response: LEED Silver, green initiatives have been submitted with the DP application. Will be a very green building but accreditation process too costly to pursue. Heat recovery system was explained. Iona courtyard is under development. Current ramp design was explained. Garbage handling and recycling was explained. VST maintains the project. Choice of metal roof is for durability and LEED points for reflectivity. Grains from asphalt shingles tend to clog drains; could be asphalt - does not need to be non-combustible. JT explained finish materials and how it relates to Iona Building - use of granite, grey colour of building, dormers etc.

Panel's comments: One Panel member encouraged the Applicant to pursue LEED certification; sustainability needs to be emphasised. One Panel member appreciated the present direction, but was concerned about material relationship to existing projects. Suggested the Applicant looks at material palette of Carey building. Some confusion about the indications of wood in the rendering; needs to be handled with discipline. . There was some discussion about one Panel member's comment on the north accessibility between Columbia house and residents. Concern and disappointment over planters on top of underground parking - needs resolution.

KH referred to the underground parking at Hampton Place where the landscape features work successfully and recommended that the Panel members visit the site. Roger Moors responded that they were restricted and had no other alternatives for parking.

Summary:

- LEED certification is encouraged
- refer to Carey College buildings - material relationships and palettes
- particularly consider the use of wood as a valuable element in the composition; more design discipline suggested
- site plan to allow for long term wheelchair accessibility
- concern at the configuration of the underground garage; does not allow for tree planting that would enable the public open space to happen as shown in the illustrated plan

One Panel member had a conflict with this project and abstained from voting.

2. Iona Building Revitalisation

Address:	6000 Iona Drive
Dev. Appl:	DA03022
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Richard Henry Architect/ Rositch Hemphill + Associates Architects
Lessee/ Occupant:	Vancouver School of Theology
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Keith Hemphill, Roger Moors, Basil Davis
Landscape Architect:	Jackie Hoffer, Perry + Associates
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: **2 support/2 non support subject to reconsideration of form and massing of the building and outdoor spaces**

Keith Hemphill spoke to the additions to the Iona Building Renovation.

Previous proposed character of the additions has been reviewed by the AUDP and directly with Tom Llewellyn and Fred Pritchard. The Panel's previous response was that the modern character proposed was not in keeping with the character of the Iona. The Applicant sought the advice of a specialist Heritage Consultant, Robert Lemon and revised the character in order to better meet the university's goals. The primary image of the Iona is to remain unchanged - i.e. a person's first impression is to be one of the Iona Building first, and not one of the additions. The form has been simplified and the massing adjusted so as not to project beyond the existing tower form and fenestration changed to pick up cues directly from the existing Iona window. In response to another Panel comment, the additions have been adjusted to make the overall massing as symmetrical as possible around the tower.

He spoke to the elevator lobby entrance at southwest corner, the new elevator above 4th floor on east side of tower and the new stair tower on west side of tower.

The structure of the additions is intended to be sealed architectural concrete. It is also intended that the colour will be close to the average colour of the existing granite stone cladding so as not to draw attention away from the original.

The most significant aspect of the approach to green buildings/ LEEDS is derived from the keeping of the original building. In addition, the building will be upgraded to vastly improve its energy efficiency through the replacement of the windows with double-pane, thermally broken vinyl frames, introduction of internal insulation, carefully designed heating and air conditioning to minimize energy use and obtain "free cooling" as well as high efficiency electrical systems. Every effort will be made to use "green" building materials for the interior construction.

Apart from the small additions, the balance of the Iona will remain unchanged. This includes the existing roof, perimeter landscaping and parking adjacent to the building on the south. As part of separate applications, the landscaped forecourt of the Iona is being modified relative to the construction of the realigned road system and landscape plans, already in progress. As part of a separate application, there will be consideration given to future underground parking facilities associated with the construction of "Building G1" as noted on the master plan.

Jackie Hoffer spoke to the landscape. Landscape design evaluates the existing vegetation surrounding the Iona Building with recommendations for maintenance and preservation, including the Iona Forrest to the south of the east wing. In addition, the landscape design integrates small areas where new handicap accessible ramps leading up to the main entries at both the north and south as well as at the southwest corner, have been added. There is direct underground access to the building.

Panel's Questions: The Panel's questions focused on material of the window frames and muntin bars, the west side access ramp, the detail of elevation of new ramp to north, material for tower, upgrade to mechanical and electrical systems during renovations and preservation of heritage items.

Applicant's Response: All of the windows except one heritage window will be replaced. Window frames will be vinyl, structurally reinforced with double-glazing. No intention to replicate window materials, intent is to make them visually the same. West side access ramp is part of the rehabilitation of the Iona, south ramp is temporary. Handrail is glass, and stone up to ramp level. Tower material is concrete; idea is to make it a durable and

permanent quality. Mechanical/ electrical systems are all new. Main building will be stripped and seismically upgraded and main mechanical + electrical systems will be replaced. Natural ventilation (constant volume system) that blends fresh air with circulated air depending on outside temperature. Stained glass window, oak balustrade and interior finishes of the current boardroom in the tower will be preserved.

Panel's comments: Some concern about the treatment of outdoor space on either side of the tower when the grade level is increased. Ramp integration at arrival into Iona Building is anticlimactic, relative to the rest of the development - looks weak in context. Spaces around the building are the heart and soul of the precinct and should be understood as such. Central space needs trees, not mounds; this is a paramount issue. Building massing elements cannot be understood - three dimensional examination is needed. Additions are complicated and complexity of forms is shaped by mundane functions. North elevation indicates complications of form - should simplify to show off the form of the tower; this important element needs more development and study. Sloping line does not fit in this façade; glass should not be used. Important to have horizontal lines for ramp. UALA shared concerns about elevations and agrees with comment that tower massing needs work. Concern at vinyl windows. (In response, Applicant referenced the Sinclair Centre).

Summary:

- serious concern about forms of the new elements and how fenestration will work within them - more explanation needed
- concern that spaces around the building be recognized as setting character for whole precinct
- specific concern at the front ramp - it will not work well in general scale and approach - sense that it is weak and anticlimactic; sloping lines and glass will not work - ramp should be reexamined - horizontal simpler line will work better with the building
- concern at configuration of underground garage (as with Student Residence)

One Panel member commented that his vote would be subject to how the courtyard is treated. Whilst he appreciated the problem, quality of courtyard affects the whole precinct over the long term. UALA referred to the drums Sedgwick has for big trees. Roger Moors is willing to revisit this with the Landscape Architect.

3. Irving K. Barber Learning Centre

Address:	1956 Main Mall
Dev. Appl:	N/ A
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Downs/ Archambault & Partners + Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Colborne Architectural Group
Lessee/ Occupant:	Library, Archival & Info Studies, Graduate School
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Stephen Johnson, Stephen Quigley
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : Project to return for vote in May

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect: The project has been reviewed previously and has returned for a report on progress in response to the Panel's comments. DP application will be made in May. Stephen Johnson (SJ) was invited to bring the Panel up to date.

Applicant's Opening Comments: With a new model, SJ spoke to the adjustments made in response to the Panel's comments. He referred to the issues of handicapped access to the building, architectural expression including the various elements, scale, transparency, east vs. west elevations, cohesion and campus fit.

- working to make the building sustainable - mechanical systems, reduce west side and skylight glass areas, added sunscreens
- Reading Room glazing dropped down for more transparency from outside
- East Mall side now reflects bay forms from west side, although more glass on east and all bay roofs slope toward west
- added glass arcade along East Mall
- need more work on southeast entry before coming for approval, also more work on arcade and corners
- use of stone from wings to clad inside walls of heritage core building. Also other uses for stone inside

- reviewing ramps to west entrance; may have a ramp at southeast corner
- glass wall above central East Mall entrance being developed
- more cohesion and transparency needed
- budget incorporates required sustainability features
- campus wide working session on whole precinct urban design with Joe Wai on April 25th

Panel's Questions: One Panel member inquired if the integrity of the concept has been maintained and another member questioned the target of LEED and type of glass.

Applicant's Response: Development and improvement of the elevations have been discussed. The important notion of "reaching out" has been achieved. Design team goal is to move toward LEED; target would be up to UBCPT.

Panel's Comments: General agreement that the design responses to the Panel's comments are appropriate, especially improvements to pedestrian content, the sense of invitation, scale, difference in east and west facades. One Panel member was pleased with the environmentally friendly design approach and suggested setting a LEED target. He cautioned that a radiant cooling system has limitations due to solar gain and stressed the importance of deciding on the appropriate type of glass. One Panel member felt the saw tooth roof shapes are becoming too common and sees conflicts arising with the wedges. Agreement that fenestrations at the corner and ground plane need more work. Concern that the large glass plane above main east entrance could rival the old building; suggested development. The Chair was pleased by the responses to the Panel's comments; it is looking like a better fit with the campus. Moving the rain shelter on the east down to the first floor level was appreciated. Re: substitution of ramps with lifts - should be at least one ramp into the building.

SJ explained how square glass east façade was generated and agreed it needs development for focal point in east façade. Will be using a typical ducted system in the ARS, book collection area and large lecture halls. A more traditional supplementary system will be used where there is a major collection of offices.

Summary

- ✓ project is moving in the right direction
- ✓ appreciation for quality of the presentation

4. Place Vanier Commons Block

Address:	1935 Lower Mall
Dev. Appl.	DA03013
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Toby Russell Buckwell & partners architects
Landscape Architect	Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.
Lessee/ Occupant:	UBC Housing & Conferences
Review:	First
Delegation:	Matthew Carter, Pat McTaggart, Richard Findlay
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION : Non support - 4/0

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect: This is not part of the neighbourhood plan and not a major capital project. As the building is from the post war UBC modernist period, attention must be paid as to how it gets modified. Development Permit application already submitted.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Mathew Carter presented. With the completion of Korea House and Tec de Monterrey House the Place Vanier residence community will expand its student population by some additional 400 students in the 2003 fall session. To better accommodate the increased population and provide proper support services and amenities, renovations and additions to the Gordon Shrum Commons Block are proposed. At the moment the Place Vanier Residence community lacks a sense of arrival and place particularly with respect to its entrance off Lower Mall Road. The need to improve the Common Block facilities is seen as an opportunity to address the issues of identity and arrival for the community.

The project consists of:

- A reconfiguration of all three floors along with new interior furnishings and finishes
- An enclosed floor area expansion onto the existing second floor balcony.
- A two storey plus basement entrance foyer addition and associated multi-purpose meeting, study and music rooms
- Volunteer seismic up-grading and sprinklering
- Improved universal accessibility
- New landscaped boulevard and entry plaza.

Pat McTaggart spoke to the exterior alterations. Both the renovations and additions have been designed to give the building a revitalized appearance. The materials and form chosen match or enhance the character, finishes and colours of the existing buildings. Cues for the design and details for the additions have been taken from the existing Commons Block and the two new residence blocks, Korea House and Tec de Monterrey House. The additions and the resulting interior spaces have been designed to provide a light airy feeling that along with an open plan, encourages student interaction with each other and staff.

The expansion onto the balcony is designed using deep revealed windows framed with brick columns. The large windows provide much desired light while still respecting the heritage of the existing balcony balustrade. The foyer addition is designed to be light and transparent. The landscaped entrance plaza ushers the students under an inverted glazed canopy leading to the primary building entrance. A three-storey atrium connects the three levels of the existing building and provides access via a new elevator or open stair. Re-grading the exterior landscaping and creating a light well at the stair enhances the access to the lower level and introduces light into the lower foyer. PM spoke to the exterior materials of the additions, brick and stucco colours, roof and soffit, and glazing.

Richard Findlay (RF) spoke to the existing landscape design which takes advantage of large masses of native coniferous plantings with some understorey rhododendrons interspersed with flowering cherry species for specimen plantings. The area is largely retained masses in and around the footprint of the various student residential blocks, with the pedestrian and service vehicle routes cutting through and linking the buildings with each other and to the Common Block. The existing landscape approach and entrance to Gordon Shrum Common Block is woefully inadequate as far as creating a sense of space, identification of the building's entrance and the overall creation of any "sense of arrival". The vehicular parking area has largely driven the current design.

RF also spoke to the new landscape design which seeks to improve these aspects. The realigned parking lot and walkways create a more integrated central allee. The sense of arrival is enhanced with a row of flowering tree species along the central allee. Bench seating will be provided understorey to the new trees. The new landscape creates a new large open plaza area outside the proposed entrance foyer, and will be enclosed by new plantings and seat walls. The old style covered walkways will be cut back and enhanced with new terminal harbour elements and create a link with the newer architectural treatment and glass canopy of the building. There is opportunity to utilize the salvaged pre-cast balcony balustrades of the existing building.

Appropriate vehicle and pedestrian scale lighting will be introduced to provide a controlled, pleasant and safe level of illumination. The driveway loop will now be balanced with angled parking on both sides of the allee with the current number of parking stalls for the residences retained. The new drive through loop area will be raised flush with the plaza to create speed control and strengthen the impression of a pedestrian dominant area using detailed paving material leading to the main plaza. Outdoor covered and uncovered bicycle storage and motorcycle storage areas will be more sensitively detailed to integrate with the new landscape and architecture.

Panel's Questions: Questions focused on insulation of the envelope, response to sustainability, rationale for expansion of the parking, universal accessibility in whole entrance plaza, wheel chair access, circulation of the 2 walkways, function of copper eyebrow, seating relocation, whether the porch would be retained, and if so, would the concrete piers help the building.

Applicant's Response: Existing glazing is being replaced. Roof has been refinished and insulated 6 years ago. Windows are operable, no air-conditioning, low voltage lighting and balustrades will be reused. Parking change is due to realignment of fire access route, updated to 6m. Access into land scape is for aesthetic reasons more than a functional one and also to strengthen the route. Universal accessibility in whole entrance plaza. Adding an elevator and accessible washrooms on ground floor, as well adding unit washroom on upper floor.

Lower floor washrooms are up a half level and are not accessible. Re walkways, shrubs at patio could be left open to allow for walk thru onto grass. Second floor steps do not presently exist but there is 95% intent to consider adding them.

Panel's Comments: One Panel member questioned the value of the copper eyebrow and termination of exterior columns without continuing up to roof level. Lower aluminum canopy entry feels out of character. Shrubs should not be installed at patio, instead allow people to walk out to grass. Concern about adding circles on ground and modernist rectilinear context - suggested rectangles or squares. One Panel member agreed with the comment about finding the right idiom for landscape that goes with the building; finds the formality overbearing. One member has fundamental problems with the project; feels some of the moves may change the character of the building completely. More respect for modern architectural heritage on campus needed - example of Buchanan. Building is a classic and the move to enclose the 2nd floor porch will change the building completely and make it flat; this was a huge concern. Problem with copper soffit. Suggested the use of brick instead of granite for landscape wall. Moving the columns to edge of porch changes the building making it look totally different in character. Support for having steps off second floor terrace - allowing the inside/ outside relationship suggested in the sketch. Suggestion to have parking on exit side to allow pedestrians a car-free entry. One Panel member urged sustainability target setting - sees opportunities without heavy cost.

Applicant agrees with the comments on flatness and rhythm of columns, but reminded the Panel of their mandate and budget. Tried to respect the horizontality by adding an eyebrow on the roof. Matthew Carter pointed out the issue with the balcony is one of finding additional seating capacity for more students at Korea House and Tec de Monterrey.

Summary:

- fundamental realignment of the entry area and consideration of the paving pattern in detail, eliminating shrubs to allow entry into the landscape
- fundamental question about respect for the building and era
- enclosure of 2nd floor porch needs to be reconsidered
- stairs in rendering to be added to drawings
- treatment of the external overhang needs more work as well the character of the canopy on the ground floor
- brick instead of granite for the landscape wall
- glass curtain wall expression does not reflect the rooms and functions behind
- serious sustainability target setting

5. Chemical & Biological Engineering

Address:	TBD
Dev. Appl.	DA02028
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Bunting Coady Architects
Landscape Architect	Philips Wuori Long Landscape Architects
Lessee/ Occupant:	Chemical & Biological Engineering
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Bruce Hemstock, Tom Bunting, Mike Woodbridge, Ana Netkin, Graeme Silvera
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : For information

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect: Project has been to the AUDP twice, received unanimous approval and approved by the Board. The project was back in response to its commitment to return to the AUDP at a future date, for an update.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Tom Bunting spoke to the reasons for design changes. The project has undergone cost reduction. This is a core department building and will lose its accreditation if it is not built on time. Major material changes proposed within the same 6-storey tower. Interior spaces, requirements, equipment, details of the building and envelope materials were areas looked at for cost reduction. Programming has not changed, but area of landscape has reduced. Whole industrial works area is now

enclosed behind the wall.

Ana Netkin spoke to the massing changes and elevation changes.

1) Atrium : It is a bright 2-storey space with a continuous skylight over. The east and west entrances are located at the ends of the atrium and it is possible to see from one end of the atrium to the other. The stairs are located at the ends of the atrium adjacent to the east and west entrances. South of the atrium, there is a lobby space in front of the classrooms. Doors on the south will allow for access from the exterior south walkway as well as a means of egress from the classrooms.

2) Vertical cores: Two vertical cores have consolidated all vertical circulation and mechanical vertical services. These elements have a strong presence in the massing of the building and define the main entrances on the east and west.

3) Configuration of the low-rise area to address future phasing: The workshops are now located on the northeast corner of the site, along Health Sciences Mall. The future research labs will be located above the workshops area. The exterior storage has been consolidated into one central zone. There will be a wall separating the parking zone from the storage area, so that most exterior storage will be concealed from public view. The future High Head Space has been relocated to the central area behind the exterior storage area. During Phase 1 of the project, all street edges will be defined. If Phase 2 does not go ahead or is substantially delayed, the building massing will be complete - there will not be visible unoccupied areas of the site. The new configuration of the massing of the low-rise component of the building has brought the building edges to the sidewalk on the north, running east west, and all service areas are now located in the central area between CERC and the shops. This change has improved the pedestrian experience on the north as well as the massing of the building when approaching the building from the north.

All offices will have operable windows except some on 2nd floor and on west side. Only offices that will be air-conditioned are the ones on the 2nd floor facing south. Mechanical penthouse deleted, all equipment consolidated in the basement. Height of the building has been reduced due to reduced floor-to-floor height.

Material changes : **High-rise:** masonry, glass and spandrel glazing have replaced the curtain wall system on the six-storey volume. The current elevations and material choice is within the range of materials found throughout the campus. **Low-rise:** the low-rise component of the building has also changed and the proposed cladding is based on tilt-up concrete construction. The concrete will have an integral colour. Samples displayed.

Existing service court: Early in the process it was determined that the existing service court did not offer enough space for vehicle access for CHBE and CERC programs. The exterior yard and loading requirements for the facility are intensive. The relocation of the existing garbage was studied and it proved to be very costly and difficult and even with the potential relocation, this yard still remained inappropriate. The current design of the landscape along the south walkway contains a row of benches, bicycle parking as well as a continuous row of trees and access to the parkette on the southwest corner. This area has been designed with the intent of accommodating pedestrian traffic as well as an area for rest or a place to have lunch, very much as an extension of the parkette.

Bruce Hemstock presented the landscape plan and spoke to:

- entry plaza
- east/ west movement
- plaza space and benches
- street tree treatment

Panel's Comments: Budget issues give sense of diminishment; building was always too big for the site and is now more so. Building is harder and tougher. Budget issues need to be fixed before the process starts. Landscape design is well done in less space. The redesign has improved the building, especially the east/ west connector - it is more interesting and animated.

Applicant's response: Project has gone through budget cuts - budgeted a \$300/ ft @200/ ft and there aren't enough funds to build. Applicant was seeking the comments of the Panel as many of the previous comments were incorporated into the redesign. The building will still be a high energy building, meeting a 25% energy saving over standard model. The redesign has helped energy efficiency.

Due to a conflict one Panel member did not provide comments.

Summary

- ✓ internal axis has improved and saved entrances and canopies
- ✓ large building has been dealt with as well as possible

6. UBC Mainway

Address:	N/ A
Dev. Appl.	N/ A
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg
Review:	First
Delegation:	Chris Phillips, Marta Farevaag, Eva Lee
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services, David Smith, Patrick McIsaac

EVALUATION : In progress - presentation for feedback

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect: The team was introduced to the Panel - Chris Phillips, Marta Farevaag, Eva Lee; and UBC staff members David Smith and Patrick McIsaac. Some background information was provided and the concept explained: the Mainway is part of the UBC Landscape plan and is a defining part of the landscape. The project will start in summer as part of the roads programme. Part of the project will be fundraised. UBC Board of Governors decided in 1982 that Main Mall would become a pedestrian precinct. Chris Phillips (CP) was invited to present.

Applicant's Opening Comments: CP shared the present directions of project and requested for feedback from the Panel. He spoke to:

- the landscape - 1992 Campus Plan, existing red oak trees, spatial order
- circulation - existing public road access, President's office transit, design criteria
- analysis - views, revealing culture
- principles (6)
- options 1 and 2 - opportunities and constraints
- site elements - paving

(see attachment for details)

Panel's Questions:

- what discussions have been held about the ceremonial functions of the Main Mall?
- what rituals will remain and what deleted - nature of discussion as part of the design?
- changing face of the Mall in terms of street wall of buildings
- issue of programming in the buildings and impact along the edges - restaurants and museums not built in yet
- issue of trees and importance of saving them - can the walkway take weight?
- possibilities of improving the dismal stretch in front of Commerce and Angus building?

UBC staff response: Road should remain where it is; will be raised to get rid of curb. Other areas would affect trees negatively. Trees on Main Mall are diseased and currently sprayed to be kept alive - should this continue? Putting the roadways outside of the trees would shorten the life of the trees; campus community may look at this project as being the demise of the trees. Engaging the edge at Commerce and Angus has not been looked at in detail. The path between the trees and the building is 15 ft.

There was general discussion on the health of the trees, requirements of the Fire Chief, and lighting, fixtures and location.

Panel's Comments: Placement of the walkways on the outer edges is desirable. Sidewalk on the west side is the preferred edge. Would be interesting to see a comparison of a Mall in Washington, to get a sense of the scale and photo manipulations. Suggested a collective walk along the Main Mall before the next meeting. Re President's Plaza, option 1 was preferred, with increased formality.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - May 22, 2003

Time: 12:00 -3:30 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Jane Durante (JD)
Sid Siddiqui
Karen Marler

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Bev Nielsen
Douglas Patterson

Projects reviewed at this meeting:

1. Place Vanier Shrum Block
2. Panhellenic House
3. Lot 5 Mid Campus

1. Place Vanier Shrum Block

Address: 1935 Lower Mall
Dev. Appl: DA03013
Application Status: In process
Architect: Toby Russell Buckwell & partners architects
Landscape Architect: Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.
Lessee/ Occupant: UBC Housing & Conferences
Review: Second
Delegation: Matthew Carter, Pat McTaggart, Richard Findlay, Andrew Parr,
Fred Fotis
UBC Staff: Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim
Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: 1 support/3 non support -project to return (subject to more review of exterior treatment)

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (UALA): The project, which was seen by the Panel in April, raised many questions and concerns. Pat McTaggart was invited to make the presentation.

Applicant's Opening Comments: The Panel's comments at the previous review of the project were given serious consideration and in response, elements of the building and landscaping have been redesigned, incorporating both the intent of the comments and the program set out by the user group.
Detailed design and landscape rationale attached.

Panel's Questions/Concerns

- How would the covered walkway connection with trellis gateway work?

Applicant's Response

- Details not fully worked out yet; idea is the covered walkways would be cut back and the new structure would stand independent of it. May be some staggered overhang between the sections of the covered overhang.

- Relationship of new Tec de Monterrey and Korea House to Shrum Block
- Introduction of shear walls blocks light through existing windows; is there a way to shorten the shear wall?
- Describe new brick piers on edge of balcony
- Certain sustainability elements are in place, Are goals and targets being set?
- UALA referred to his request for a review of 2nd floor plan to see if balcony addition can be avoided.
- Ceiling height in the new multi purpose room was questioned.
- Configuration of Tec de Monterrey was explained.
- No way to shorten the shear wall; windows added on east elevation to compensate for it. Concern for light is acknowledged.
- New piers protrude out beyond the glass line. An additional horizontal element added underneath.
- No specific goals - only the mandate to be reasonable in respect to sustainability.
- 550 additions to occupancy at Place Vanier. Added 55-60 additional seats to get to 28% ratio of seating to population. Layout is still inadequate. Servery had to be expanded - some dining room space lost as a result.
- Ceiling height is 10 ft. Floor to underside of structure is 11 ft.

Panel's comments: There was appreciation for the responses to the Panel's comments, particularly the brick rather than granite in the landscape. Concern about the circular piece outside the front doors; rectilinear building character would be better responded to with square paving pattern at entrance, to give the feel of "connection". Appreciation for the opening up of the view and connection between the existing covered walkway and new gateway structure - well detailed. Present design for drive in and drive out has to be accepted due to fire access codes. New proposed canopy has lost strength. Added columns do not support anything - needs a stronger horizontal line at the top. Concern that the tops of the two groups of columns (stairwell and cafeteria) are different heights.

One Panel member emphasised the need for Heritage Guardians/ Heritage Commission on the campus.

One Panel member strongly recommends elimination of the west side extension. Proposed brick fins are not convincing and would be contrary to existing architecture. Strongly recommends making the balcony more pleasant/ inviting to encourage outdoor seating. Consider adding skylights over cafeteria if darkness is a concern. Consider heat lamps to make balcony more usable. Butt glazing is creating a glass box enclosure rather than solid to void relationship; height of the glass box is questionable. As well, this Panel member referred to previous concern at articulation of the glass mullions. The proposed front expansion of the building could be a solution for additional seating needs.

One Panel member appreciated the fact the Applicant recognised the importance of the building to the precinct. Agrees that balcony should remain and encouraged seeking creative ways of using it. Should try to make it work with heat lamps, skylights etc. Consider reducing 2-storey space in entrance to increase usable 2nd floor space. The building and precinct deserves more effort and a model to study massing; elevations are inadequate. Concern that fins may be a strange element - it will not create the same feel of a strong radiant building. Concurred with previous comment on butt glazing and height and disparity with existing brick piers vocabulary.

One member appreciated the operable windows and would like to see more of them; overheating could become an issue; setting of sustainability targets for water, energy, recycling etc. is encouraged.

UALA called for reconsideration of the use of flat overhead glass in a public place, cited Forest Sciences building problem. Concurred with one member's comments on landscape - rectangular paving pattern instead of circular - building character is more important; short term seating layout appears to be driving changes to the 2nd floor plan changes. Re: butt glass in addition, versus existing architecture of solid and void - have other alternatives been considered? Canopy proportions and construction too light.

Applicant's response: The facility is used between September and April and for the majority of this time the weather is not conducive to sitting outdoors. Patio has not been well used or furnished, due to the time of year it is occupied. It does not get a lot of sunlight and is an under utilised space. Glass addition/ butt glass joints are in line with the intent to create transparency. Glass will be Low E, green. Does not find the architecture disrespectful to the building. Brick fins will be looked at again. Re: green initiatives, Andrew Parr explained the compost program and the inclusion of items such as real dishes, post consumer items etc. in the operation.

Summary:

- landscaping - general welcome of attention to previous comments and changes; rectangular paving layout is felt to be more in keeping with the place
- canopy - issue of overhead glass and sense that it is too light and airy compared to the idiom of the rest of the walkways; should try and relate to the weight and spacing of the columns of the other walkways
- west façade - further work needed
- height of addition to be reconsidered
- energy - concern for overheating and strong recommendation to set energy targets
- strong recommendation to look at a massing model as well as drawings and elevations

2. Panhellenic House

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03023
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Roger Hughes + Partners
Lessee/ Occupant:	Sororities
Review:	First
Delegation:	Karen Marler, Matthew Carter, Roger Hughes, Jonathan Losee, Joan Grant
Landscape Architect:	Jonathan Losee Ltd.
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: **Unanimous support (Panel member Karen Marler did not vote)**

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (UALA): The Board of Governors approved the facility's programme and site location in July 1999.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Karen Marler presented and spoke to the site location, context, programme, parking, access routes and handicapped accessible units. Jonathan Losee spoke to the landscape. Detailed design and landscape rationale, materials and green initiatives attached.

Panel's Questions

- Gates for security to garbage/ recycling area
- Primary materials and colour
- Will there be air-conditioning?
- Was geothermal heating considered?
- Was noise from Wesbrook considered?

Applicant's Response

- Gates and lights at the garbage recycling area; will also serve as an exit path for bikes
- Brick and siding, dark brown
- No air-conditioning
- Geothermal heating was not considered due to budget; every unit will have their own hydro bill
- Not aware of noise being a concern; low front wall would shield some of it.

Panel's comments: There was appreciation for the clean elegance and simple approach to the landscape. Security along south walls is a concern. Appreciation for contemporary approach to building along Wesbrook. Height of building needs careful soffit treatment. One member was pleased to see environmental strategies spelt out.

Applicant's response: Re security concern, glazing on south side will create an inside/ outside visibility.

UALA concurred with Panel members' comments and appreciated the landscape treatment matches the building.

There was discussion on whether to continue the granite wall instead of breaking the symmetry at the entrance. The notion of ending the wall on either side of the front walk is the preferred choice.

Summary:

- appreciation for the clean, simple elegant approach to the landscape which matches the building
- appreciation for seeing more clean design approach on Wesbrook
- environmental strategies are welcomed
- further consideration on how to finish the wall

3. ~~Lot 5 Mid-Campus Townhouses~~

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03025
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market
Review:	First
Delegation:	Matthew Carter, Ray Letkeman, Jason Letkerman, Mike Patterson
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services

EVALUATION : Unanimous support

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect: A previous project for co-housing had been seen by the Panel and was not well received. This project is based on the same idea, on a different site within the mid campus. Applicant has had advance discussions with the UALA and Director of Planning.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Matthew Carter introduced the team and spoke to the background of the project. The proposed development consists of ten townhouses located on Hawthorn Lane. Each of the townhouses will comprise:

- 3 bedrooms plus a self contained, secondary suite (authorized for rental) on the lower floor. The design will permit the suite to also be used as a fourth bedroom or an office.
- Approximately 2,150 sq ft of floor area (including the suite).
- A south facing back patio and garden overlooking the new neighbourhood park.
- Underground parking for cars and bikes.
- Relationship of site to the park was a key factor in planning and developing the design
- Comments on economic model and marketability to staff and faculty

Jason Letkeman spoke to architectural expression and presented a brief summary of the programme:

- 10 townhouse units - 3 storey on common parkade
- building responds to the nature of the sloping site (14 ft drop from east side of complex)
- front entries grouped (every two units together)- with the intent of celebrating the entry
- in terms of building materials and exterior colour palette, taken cues from existing context; primary material is brick
- underground parking is out of view
- accessibility unit (at grade - western most unit); principal entry and parkade access was explained

Mike Patterson addressed the landscape plan and briefly spoke to:

- perimeter of the project - site is adjacent to the future community centre and park
- street trees; street frontage landscape pattern will be a yew hedge in front of a metal fence
- granite wall - will connect to park entry harbour
- maintenance access
- south patios made more generous and lawn has been deleted
- privacy screen, evergreen hedge

Detailed design and landscape rationale attached. A 4-page preliminary analysis on sustainable building initiatives was handed out.

Key sustainable initiatives:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| - location of site | - flexibility of programme |
| - proximity to campus | - storm water management, irrigation system |
| - extensive use of pavers | - geo thermal system being tested on this project |

Panel's Questions

- How would success of sustainable features be

Applicant's Response

- No specific sustainability targets, but Developer

measured?

- Bike storage, space under the entrance

will respond to potential clientele's high sustainability standards

- Bike storage allows for 26 bikes; space under entrance is for storage

Panel's Comments: Appreciation for the consideration given to the development of the sustainability criteria and the approach to sell these homes to faculty and staff members. Security of bike storage needs thought. Parking stalls could allow electrical plugs for potential electric cars. One Panel member found the precinct well defined and appreciated the scale, siting and simplicity of traditional elements. Attention to detail could add to the interest of the variation on the existing architectural theme in the Hawthorn precinct. Likes integration of parking structure and transition to the park.

One Panel member is concerned that bike storage may become an issue. Lower level unit may well house students and may cause conflict between visible mess in lower court vis-à-vis expensive housing above. Likes the south side, terrace, planting and getting rid of the lawn. Rental unit windows seem deficient - consider reconfiguring the entrance to get a larger window. Concern that size of upper units is too large - 1100 sq.ft is standard in Fairview slopes.

One Panel member agreed with comment on inadequate lighting of lower level. Neighbourhood has its own architectural character. This project has bridged the traditional and contemporary expressions in the neighbourhood context. Likes materials, stucco. Landscape edge to the park needs to be explored further - there is an opportunity to make the building typology and park typology interact with each other in a more interesting way. Liked the increase of the patio in place of the lawn.

UALA: general comment on need to define "traditional" and "contemporary". Concerned about backyard design and bicycle storage. Preferred the lawn to the growth of the patio. Bike parking in the basement must be realistically adequate and made as secure as possible.

Applicant's Response : UBCPT is encouraging car cooperative use. Would like to have some stalls in every development. Detailed pricing of housing still to be done. Working on a module that will enable the Developer to build these homes for faculty and staff at about \$248/ sq.ft. Must achieve an FSR level with a fixed number of units - GVRD driven.

Summary

- ✓ favourable response to initiative on sustainability features and setting targets
 - ✓ general acceptance of architecture, but continue to explore opportunities for interest through detailing
 - ✓ mixed feelings on stucco use and texture, generally favourable
 - ✓ security and bike storage issue
 - ✓ issue of insufficient lighting in lower suite
 - ✓ avoiding messy use of lower front yards should be considered
 - ✓ go further with relating the complex to the edge of the park and make it still more interesting
 - ✓ concern at connection through backyards; allow people to do more with own back yard space
-

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - June 16, 2003

Time: 12:00 -1:00 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Jane Durante (JD)
Sid Siddiqui
Karen Marler
Bev Nielsen
Rainer Fassler

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Douglas Patterson

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. Irving K. Barber Learning Centre

1. Irving K. Barber Learning Centre

Address:	1956 Mail Mall
Dev. Appl:	N/ A
Application Status:	No application yet
Architect:	Downs/ Archambault & Partners + Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Colborne Architectural Group
Lessee/ Occupant:	Library, Archival & Info Studies, Graduate School
Review:	Fourth
Delegation:	Stephen Quigley, Ron Beaton, Joe Redmond
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: 4 support/1 non support

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (UALA): Project is at DP application stage and requires a vote. Basic layout and architectural form has been previously discussed; process with regard to the exterior realm is ongoing.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Ron Beaton (RB) presented. Application for Development Permit and Temporary Works Permit in preparation for phase 1 demolition has been submitted. Had meetings with user groups, selected manufacturer of the Automatic Storage & Retrieval System (ASRS) and library groups. Internal planning in terms of spaces is getting defined. Demolition of the north wing in August, excavation for phase 1 in October/ November.

Stephen Quigley (SQ) spoke to the external fenestration and developments during the last 2 months. Process development phase is underway. Issues will require further refinement; design development phase to be complete by the end of August. Mr. Barber is taking an active role in the process. Basic organisation of the building remains unchanged - library component to the north and academic component to the south. Basement level is on three suspended slabs. Focus will be on heritage building, maintaining the west entrance in the heritage building and introducing another major entrance on East Mall. Secondary concourse will

connect to a major stair in the southeast corner. He spoke to architecture, elevations and materials (sample of precast panel and window section presented).

West façade:

- approach is to give prominence to the heritage building
- window bays will be introduced to articulate the reading spaces of the library and relate to the proportions of heritage building windows.
- a heavy gridded system of mullions will provide the sun shading requirement to the punched windows at the northwest corner
- bays articulated with aluminum clad roof elements
- building will be illuminated and act as a lantern at night

Southwest corner: SQ briefly spoke to the articulation of the stair, the canopy at pedestrian level and series of punched windows with built in bench element.

North façade: visible ASRS system

South façade: projecting terrace, raised balcony, treatment of windows for sun shading and large corner entrance at south east corner. Some use of stone, terraced element will be precast. Architectural elements at the finer level are not fully refined yet - process is under way.

East façade: SQ spoke to the centre component. Intent is to have a major focus at the entrance to the building and this element is under discussion with the donor. The glazed element provides an opportunity to meet the donor's objective to get some art in the glass and make it a very inviting interest in the building.

A brief overview of the precinct study underway in parallel by Joe Wai and Chris Phillips was provided. The idea is to look at the whole zone, with the Learning Centre as the centre. Major issue for the Learning Centre is the desire to have a view to the East Mall main entrance and this raises the issue of uprooting trees. Approach is to reorganise space outside SUB and make it a more significant arrival area. SQ also spoke to the library gardens issue - the southeast corner is expected to be an active exit to the building. All major entrances to the building will be accessible.

UALA provided more background on the external realm. Want to reinforce view of building from Wesbrook. May lose 3 of the 6 rows of trees in the bosque; removal of other trees under discussion with the donor. Have presented university's position on not having vehicle access all the way through from Student Union Boulevard to East Mall. There is agreement that the existing library garden can be better utilised. Idea is to fill in the lawn to bring it up a level; the light well at the Sedgewick thus becomes an interesting design issue. Staircase connecting Main mall to library garden will be of a scale befitting its setting and use.

Panel's Questions/Concerns

Applicant's Response

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the size of the wall on the south elevation?• what would be screening the windows on the south elevation? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• About 15 ft. It is a solid rock wall; the ramp occurs from the south west corner• horizontal fins/ projections for sun shading, about 18" deep. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Choice of materials being precast, what is the relationship to the context/ UBC. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applicant is seeing the material for the first time today. There is a relationship between the stone and precast. In terms of UBC context, Buchanan and Belkin Art Gallery are light buildings. There will be more discussion on the material. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Describe the larger moves on sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have submitted a basic LEED checklist with DP application. Could achieve a high silver standard, will be looked at further. At this stage, intention is not to make application for accreditation, but only document the building components to demonstrate the sustainable elements of the building. Main elements are the radiant slab cooling system, 3 element glazing system, opening windows, and mechanical systems. |

- Given the clear glazed window, has a simulation been done in a worst-case scenario for overheating, whether window performance could combine with what the chilled slab can deliver, given the limitations on the use of this system?
- What is the shading capacity of the window
- Is chilled slab the only system relied on for cooling or is there a secondary system being planned?
- What are the LEED energy goals?
- The terrace on the west elevation and the entrance on East Mall were questioned.
- How do the canopy on the east side and bench elements work? Do they take up space beneath the canopy?
- Has progress been made at the north east corner where loading service and garbage occurs? Seems to be a conflict between the two functions.
- Low screen around garbage should be part of the building instead of the landscape
- Currently being looked at in detail, don't know exact performance yet. Anticipated it will work with radiant slab cooling system. West wall is the problem area. Intention is to keep clear glazing throughout the building.
- Not aware - will respond with information.
- There is a secondary system in some spaces
- 50% - LEED check list was handed out.
- Users wanted space around the lower level of the building. Terrace sits above the rooms. One heritage tree will be maintained. East side is entirely glazed, with the centre element slightly more prominent.
- Canopy extends out 8 ft and the benches may be 18 x 2'. Benches are within the overall circulation route. This will not be the sidewalk anymore, but a wider pedestrian concourse
- Loading area is covered. Only 3-4 trucks arrive at the building each day. Only issue will be the garbage, intention is to have the garbage holding in the corner, behind a screen. Scheduling can be done.
- will have a low wall around it, probably stone

Panel's comments: One Panel member is very pleased with the resolution of accessibility issues - a huge improvement that has led to improvements in other parts of the building. Design has moved forward, especially the detailing. Concern at south end wall height.

There is concern at the scale of the project - difficult to relate people to it. North elevation is questionable. The only two materials being glass and precast, it would require a lot of detail to create a sense of human scale on this elevation. Concern at the east elevation: main entrance lacks articulation - more demonstration of how the art component will become a part of the architecture, will be an interesting consideration. Southeast entrance seems to be competing. Visibility of activity along east elevation is a concern. Continued development of the pedestrian level is important. Precast material to be looked at. Skylight at either end of existing building seems too large for function.

One Panel member appreciates the response to the Panel's previous comments and likes the scheme. Not entirely satisfied with the treatment at the corners, needs to be considered more. Concurred with previous comment on south end and ramping re height of wall - suggested transparent handrails. Art should be part of architecture at east entrance. Encouraged by the direction of the public realm and suggested a walkabout to review public realm.

Appreciation for the focused approach to sustainability. Since certification is not being sought, there is a need for follow up to ensure features are carried out. Would prefer the project to be LEED certified, although UBC does not have a policy. LEED BC is now in place.

One Panel member has a problem with scale - more detail needed. There is a drastic change in proportion of the bay windows - model and earlier drawings of west elevation suggested a delicate verticality of elements. Concern that elevation is now emphasising horizontality by the addition of deep metal blades. Needs exploration with larger detailed drawing/ 3D model and more detailed study. Concern at super scale of glazing above east entrance and "zippers" on either side of the heritage building.

UALA: Concurred with some of the Panel's comments. Precast looks creamy in colour. Detailing is very important, as is scale at ground level. East entrance still looks featureless and massive.

Applicant's response: The grade at the south end results from the new building. No detailed landscape plan yet. Windows could be lowered. Administrative offices and storeroom functions and work areas along east elevation

will need natural light. Glass may be textured or opaque. Visibility will remain, creating the opportunity for a seating function. Agrees with comment on skylight, but it needs to be that high for structural reasons. Re corners, SQ explained that the design is still under development; vertical window treatment will ultimately tie in with the horizontal element. Joe Redmond explained there would be a requirement to report to the Board of Governors on how LEED goals are met. Glazing above east entrance has verticals and silicon horizontals. Glazed portions between old and new building would be a clear glazing system.

Summary:

- Panel is generally pleased with the development of the project and response to previous comments, particularly the resolution of accessibility.
- Focused approach to sustainability is welcomed. Encouraged to stick with the principles and documentation of targets
- Concerns: lack of discernible scale on the elevations and use of limited material palette, particularly the precast concrete. The building expression needs interest and detail.
- Concern at the southeast entrance and accompanying ramp on more than one front - handling and resolution of entrance; should not compete with the main east entrance.
- Detail at main floor level - consideration of the pedestrian experience particularly on the east side, and visibility through windows. Opaque glass might be too repelling.
- Concern over application of sunshades and whether it will negate the emphasis on the verticality, which was the previous direction - modern way to relate to the heritage gothic style. Needs more detail work.
- East entrance - suggestion that the art should become part of the architecture
- General support for the direction of the public realm thinking
- Given the extent of detail work to be done, the Panel would like to see the project again

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - July 31, 2003

Time: 1:30 -2:30 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members

Tom Llewellyn (TL) - Chair
Jane Durante (JD)
Sid Siddiqui
Bev Nielsen
Rainer Fassler

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC)

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Douglas Patterson
Karen Marler

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. Journey - Lot 12 Mid Campus

1. Journey - Lot 12 Mid Campus

Address:	Main Mall & Road "B", South Campus
Dev. Appl:	DA 03035
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Jonathan Losee Ltd
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market, potential co-development
Review:	First
Delegation:	Dale Staples, Norm Couttie, Darren Chung, Jonathan Losee
UBC Staff:	Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/ Landscape Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Dev. Services

EVALUATION: Unanimous support

Introduction by Tom Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect (UALA): The project is a market housing development on the same site previously intended for a co-housing project. Concerns at the formerly proposed architectural expression and style, issues of scale, relationship to Main Mall and relationship of building to the future community centre to the north, still remain. Applicant has had discussions on these issues with Joe Stott, Patrick McIsaac and Fred Pritchard. Intention is to retain existing trees on Main Mall.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Norm Couttie and Dale Staples presented. This project is located at the center of the new Mid Campus neighbourhood. Four significant public realms form boundaries for the site – Main Mall to the east, a proposed new community facility to the north, the Rhododendron Wood to the south, and Road B to the west. Main Mall is the formal pedestrian axis that links this neighbourhood to the academic core and the amenities of Thunderbird Stadium and Rhododendron Wood. Three main building entrances as well as individual entrances to ground oriented units will enhance the life and security of this significant pedestrian path. The main entrance off Main Mall occurs at the glazed bridge that connects the north and south buildings. Expansive glazed balconies combined with traditional West Coast post and beam framing are used to articulate the façade. The upper floor has additional glazing combined with vaulted ceilings to create a lantern effect lighting pedestrian travel along Main Mall.

The site of the former Horse Barn is to provide a community focus for the ‘University Town’. This new community center, in addition to other campus facilities will provide an abundance of amenities for the Mid Campus neighbourhood. The end of the building facing the community facility is articulated in a similar manner as the main mall elevation. Large balconies and windows of the residential units engage the diagonal pedestrian path that provides a linkage to main mall. The building is set low relative to the existing grade adjoining Main Mall, which is a high point in the site. Combined with the terracing back of the upper storey the scale of this end of the building is sympathetic to the future community facility. Soft and hard landscape treatment will be used to make a further connection between the two sites.

Rhododendron Wood currently exists as an island of forest. At the south edge of the Lot 12, conifer planting is to be introduced to create the impression that the building is nestled into the edge of the forest rather than separated from it. Road B, which has yet to be named, provides the main road access and frontage for the buildings. The buildings are intended to have a strong street presence and ground orientation similar to Main mall. The two storey exterior lobby creates a dramatic entrance and provides an opportunity to bring the landscape into the building. Stone is to be used at the corners of the site, at the entrances for the ground-oriented units within the landscaping, at the main building entrance and at the parkade entrance to anchor the buildings to the site.

The two buildings include a total of 80 residential units, with a mix of two bedroom (28), two bedroom & den (34) and three bedroom (18) units. Additional in-suite storage is to be provided in all units. Bicycle parking has been provided at the ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit. Adera’s security specification that has been developed over many years is to be applied throughout the building. Natural light is to be introduced into the parkade by means of light wells at the two storey exterior lobby. The buildings are contemporary in character, with strong clean lines emphasizing horizontality. Hardiplank siding is used at the lower three floors and hardipanel used at the fourth floor. Large roof overhangs as well as an additional cornice above the third floor level are also used to emphasize the horizontal character and enhance weather protection of the rain screen walls. Post and beam balcony elements and high vaulted ceiling at the upper levels create a complementary vertical rhythm to the horizontal nature of the buildings.

Jonathan Losee spoke to the landscape. The streetscape along ‘Road B’ will be of an urban nature. A 20” high cultured granite wall with separate unit entries will provide separation between public and private realms, along with layered mass plantings of low maintenance and drought tolerant plant material. A cedar hedge will provide privacy and separation to the patios from the street edge. Small native and native appearing trees such as white flowering Dogwoods Serviceberry, and Cascaras will provide privacy and shade, while still allowing views out to the ocean. Larger trees between the unit patios will provide more shade to the building. Landscape along Main Mall will be in keeping with the overall project theme; shade-loving plants will be planted in an informal fashion. Native Douglas Firs and Cedars will be used to provide impact at the corners of the site, as well as at the lobby entrance.

The size and scale of the gardens and selected plant materials are in proportion with the scale of the building, providing ‘street appeal’ and privacy. While some of the project landscape is ‘on slab’, the slab will be designed to minimise the need for retaining walls, so that the building will appear to be set into the landscape. Natural materials such as sculptural boulders and weathered cedar fences will be used to further emphasise the native West Coast theme of the project.

Panel’s Questions/Concerns

- Are there specific plans for the community centre?
- Are the posts holding the decks and structures at the front and back entrance the only natural wood?
- Description and use of back porch?
- Are there water conservation features in the building?
- Has a green roof been considered?

Applicant’s Response

- Not at this time
- Yes. Soffits would be in a dark aluminum. Penthouse structure will be in hardipanel.
- It is a two- storey space with timber columns and beams, has water feature, light wells in parking below. The main pedestrian entrance is off Main Mall.
- Not discussed yet. Mandated by UBCPT to put in irrigation. Selection of plant material is best effort.
- There is an opportunity. Need to have discussions

- Which units are designated for adaptability and how many?
- Any thought given to amenity space?
- Who is your market?
- Would there be trim around the windows?
- Explain glass connector
- What will be the price of these units?
- Will “walk in the woods” experience be realized?
- Is metal picket fence consistent with the “walk in the woods”?
- Will visitor bike storage be covered?
- Re Fred Pritchard’s concern at entrance to the parking garage, how has this been addressed?
- with client and end user.
- D block, 08 units
- Had discussions. With all the facilities on campus, it was not necessary to include amenity space within the building.
- Asian professors would buy these units for their children
- Still under discussion
- Connection between the two buildings was explained. Can walk through 2nd and 3rd floors through this connector.
- Starting at \$300-400K, top floor units may be sold at \$500K. Approximately \$300 per sq.ft.
- Yes, at the north end and along Main Mall, where edges will be softened. Vision of Main Mall being a straight clear line will be maintained.
- Yes, will have narrow transparent pickets. Which will disappear in foliage on both sides.
- 12-14 near entrances, but not covered. 36 inside will be covered and secured.
- Fred was concerned about the exposed concrete which will now be covered in stone.

Applicant presented alternative on the northeast corner.

Panel’s comments: Significant project surrounded by traditional housing forms. Modern take on post and beam seems more like a marketing cliché - project could go much further. Posts look appliquéd - needs more wood in a simple way - refer European examples. Due to size of the lobby, functionality was questioned. Get rid of curved beam-ends and brackets.

One Panel member is pleased with sustainability in intent, but recommended setting targets in specific areas - saving water and energy. Eliminating up lighting was strongly proposed.

The use of adaptable units is highly commended. The Panel member would also like the use of wood to be taken further - e.g. more wood on upper floor. Windows should integrate more with the architecture. Planning of units is excellent.

One Panel member felt the glass link needs going further to produce a “jewel-like” feeling. Given that the garage entrance is the doorway for most people, it should be made as attractive as possible. Likes exterior lobby space and landscape. Re sustainability, green roofs are becoming more common, and the project is an ideal location for it. Unfortunate that the university mandates irrigation. Since the system only needs to last 2 years, it could be cheaper and less sophisticated.

The proposed alternative of a stronger corner expression strengthens the building along Main Mall and is accepted by the Panel.

UALA: Ensure that coherent line of Main Mall is distinct from “walk in the woods theme”. Supports the idea of bringing the rhododendron wood out. Re architectural treatment, the Applicant was encouraged to follow their idea and take it further. Agrees on the alternative corner.

Summary:

- Significant move in intent to go with a West Coast modern post and beam treatment, but take your own idea further.
- Some support, some questioning about interior/ exterior lobby; consider the best use of it.
- Welcome move towards sustainability in general, but recommendation to set specific targets. In doing so and meeting them, may be a good selling feature.
- Eliminate up lights - waste of energy, light pollution
- Accessibility and adaptable units - agreement with direction
- Garage doorway is the front doorway for people; make it as attractive as possible

- Green roofs are becoming more common, encouraged to give it further consideration.
- Support for the new alternative corner treatment
- Specifically on the architecture, go further with the restrained but rich use of wood. Current amount of wood threatens to be overpowered by the other materials.

Project will go to the Development Permit Board on August 20, 2003. Applicant considers the Panel's comments very positive and will make every effort to incorporate them. The Panel is very interested in seeing how its comments will be incorporated, as it would set a significant direction on housing. Without a requirement for a further formal submission, and without holding up the Development Permit process, the Applicant agreed to send a copy of the final drawings to the Panel.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - September 25, 2003

Time: 4:00 -6:00 pm

Place: Gardenia Room, C&CP

Present: Panel Members:
Sid Siddiqui (SS)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Karen Marler (KM)
Douglas Patterson (DP)

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC), (Acting Chair)
Geoff Atkins (GA), AVP Land & Building Services
Byron Braley (BB), AVP Treasury
Suzanne Poohkay (SP), Assoc Dir, Facilities & Capital Planning
Mike Champion (MC), Project Manager

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Regrets: Jane Durante
Bev Nielsen

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. Huts M-17/ 18 for Faculty of Arts

1. Huts M-17/18 for Faculty of Arts: AHVAT, TFCW & Music

Address:	6373 University Boulevard
Dev. Appl:	DA03038
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	The Colborne Architectural Group
Landscape Architect:	Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg
Lessee/ Occupant:	Fine Arts & Theatre Departments
Review:	First
Delegation:	Stephen Quigley, Joseph Fry
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins, Byron Braley

EVALUATION: Unanimous support

Geoff Atkins provided historical context of the project: A package was put together to address the major issues affecting UBC's accumulated deferred maintenance problem. It was proposed that \$60M would be raised out of university funds, which amount the Province would match. The proposal has been approved by government, as well the \$60M by the UBC Board. \$120M worth of deferred maintenance is now available. Part of the deal is to locate the major problems on campus, and fit it in with other plans for changes - e.g. the Arts, Science, Medical, and in house precinct. Hut M-17, the sister hut to M-18, will be part of this initiative.

Jim Carruthers, Acting Chair, then invited the Applicant to present the project to the Panel and changes taken place since the Development Review Committee.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Stephen Quigley of The Colborne Architectural Group presented. Between 1999 and 2001, Hut M-18 was renovated in two phases to accommodate deficient academic space needs by the departments of Fine Arts and Theatre. As part of the full code upgrade of M-18, it was determined that the adjacent Hut M-17 with its derelict north portion, could be similarly improved

to create badly needed space for theatre, creative writing and possibly film. Hut M-17 totals 16,100 sq. ft of usable area. Originally slated for demolition, the north portion of the building has been derelict for several years due to mould contamination brought on by lack of maintenance to the antiquated steam heating system. As a result of a feasibility study carried out by The Colborne Architectural Group, it was determined that despite the poor condition of the north addition, value remains in the base building structure and therefore there is a cost benefit to UBC in retrofitting M-17 for basic 'studio' uses.

The current design proposal envisions significant removal of building interior partitions to allow for re-planning of space for theatre rehearsal, AHVAT darkroom and faculty office/ studio uses. This permits for hazmat removal and reconstruction of major elements to achieve a full seismic upgrade of the structure. The building's mechanical, electrical, lighting and communication systems will be substantially replaced with new, energy-efficient systems. The building envelope will also be upgraded with new roof, perimeter insulation, double-glazed windows and, where necessary for seismic upgrading of perimeter walls, in-fill of existing window openings. Heritage elements will be retained wherever possible.

Building interiors will also see retention of 'heritage' elements where practical but generally, all new floor, wall and ceiling finishes will be incorporated. New washrooms, student 'social' areas such as lounge and green room as well as secure storage will be provided. The building will be made fully accessible to disabled persons, including provision of a new hydraulic elevator.

The building exterior will retain its existing heritage 'form' rough stucco finish (patched and re-painted) and fenestration, even where windows must be in-filled. These will be clad with 'galvalum' corrugated metal or flat sheet in-fill panels with colour trim accents - (samples provided). Loading doors, which are used infrequently, are provided at the north and south ends of the building with direct street access.

The work required at Hut M-17 is linked to renovations in the adjacent Hut M-18 where existing interior space will be reconfigured to create new studio and shop space for AHVAT and a large rehearsal studio for Theatre. The wood and metal shop proposed for a central ground floor location requires construction of a new exterior enclosure for sawdust extractor and air compressor equipment. Located in a narrow landscape strip separating the east wall of M-18 from an existing service lane, this one storey concrete block building with metal service doors and stepped flat roofs will be trimmed and painted to match existing building colours. This building will be designed to meet rigorous sound attenuation standards to contain any equipment noise to adjacent buildings.

When the building is complete, the objective is to bring it into another life cycle. This is expected to be achievable.

Joseph Fry spoke to the landscape. On the building's main south frontage, loading is integrated with newly created landscape areas. Hard and soft landscaping are introduced into the current open space separating M-17 & 18 with a gently curved, sloping walkway providing direct access from University Boulevard to the main public entrances to the buildings. A new curvilinear bench surrounded with plant material will offer students and visitors a pleasant, south-facing courtyard for student project display, events and informal gatherings as well as the public activities, which the refurbished arts complex hopes to foster. Funding does not permit extensive landscaping.

4 issues with Development Review Committee:

- Sound problem (from equipment) in laneway from entrance: worked with acoustic consultant and made improvements with solid metal doors, sound seals, lining enclosure with sound absorptive material, and solid filled concrete block. Test shows an ambient noise of about 56 decibels from steam generator. The acoustic consultant confirmed to the committee in writing that the design should make the problem acceptable and will not generate more noise than already exists.
- Traffic - only normal drop off and pick up
- Electrical - addressed by Engineers
- Public safety in courtyard space - concern has been addressed by the introduction of a public walkway, exterior building lighting and also by making it a through space. Existing entrance will remain. (Mike C - RCMP has confirmed the 3rd option of the CPTED report is acceptable).

At the DRC meeting, Freda Pagani suggested that more respect should be given to the way in which doors are added to the building. Suggested detailing the two doors that service the two rehearsal areas to create the appearance of a single door.

Panel's Questions/Concerns

- Are there end of trip facilities?
- What is being done in terms of emissions from painting studio? Mechanical ventilation may be required
- Are there energy/ sustainability targets?
- Could extraction facility be put inside or could it be buried?
- Could the fan be located remotely to alternate sound?
- Given the importance of the location of the building and investment, couldn't the courtyard be enclosed and used as a workshop space. This would increase the usefulness of the building and solved the security issue. Why not go one step further and give these buildings a new life, beyond fixing of the walls and the roof?
- Is there any other way to seismically upgrade the building, without losing the quality of the windows?
- What is the status of the University Boulevard project?

Applicant's Response

- Yes, in upper floor of M-17 for theatre students (unisex shower). M-18 has full male and female showers. No lockers.
- Some solvents being used. No special ventilation in M-18, no mechanical ventilation, but there are opening windows.
- General approach only. Proposing to replace high-pressure steam system with hot water system in M-17. Limited ventilation, relying on opening windows. In M-18 part of the scope of work is to retrofit the steam system with a hot water system. Overall, the improvements will achieve better levels of efficiency. Building envelope in M-17 will be vastly improved - wall insulation, double glazed windows, new roof, etc. Engineers will provide quantitative targets.
- Noise affects rehearsal practices. Cannot be buried due to cost factor; it will also prevent access
- Would involve more duct work and cause sound separate issues
- SP spoke to this question. Such expansion is not allowed within the context and parameters of the UBC Renew process. Can only fix what is existing (deferred maintenance and intensification). Expansion will not be funded under this package. Negotiations with the Ministry are underway.
- The windows all stay in M-18. Closing off windows in M-17 for dark room and in other sections for stiffening of walls, for seismic reasons.
- University Boulevard project extends only up to Main Mall. Next stage (if at all) will be undertaken after addressing the underground fuel tanks outside of M-17 and M-18.

Panel's comments: One Panel member felt the renovations could be more useful and was concerned at the landscape concept in the narrow space

Directions to main entrance of this building will require a lot of signage and lighting. This Panel member commented it would be more beneficial to have the main entrance at M-17 off University Boulevard. Concerned at the treatment of the existing and new windows; Applicant to consider the fact that the existing windows are a white mullion system and additions are anodized aluminum. There is disjointedness between the two solutions; suggestion that the whole complex be painted to give the effect of being more aesthetically connected. Concern at the galvanized metal being added to old building with the green, and into white mullion systems. Also concerned at the use of galvalum with the colouring of the two buildings. Encouraged the applicant to go with the double doors and repeat the old window pattern.

One Panel member commented that the buildings have the quality of being fixed up in a temporary way. This would not be a bad thing if some Arts students really "took possession" of part of the building and the outside, thereby creating the energy to enliven University Boulevard. The building has the quality of being alone. Suggestion to put a canopy over loading dock to the two theatre places. If it cannot be a front door, it should be a door that opens generously into the street and thus enlivens the journey. Suggestion also to have some vines on the building or small trees in front.

Applicant's response: The idea behind the colouring of the two buildings is to get the students involved and have fun with it. Willing to restore the front façade.

Summary:

- Encouraged to have main entrance off University Boulevard
- Concern at the inconsistency of the window treatment
- Concern at the disjointedness between the two buildings and suggestion to paint the whole complex to make it more aesthetically connected
- Concern at the use of galvulum with the colouring of the two buildings
- Encouraged to go with the double doors and repeating window pattern.
- Concern that the building had a sense of loneliness and needs enlivening
- Mechanical ventilation may be a code issue - Applicant to speak with Mechanical Engineer
- Engineer to provide quantitative energy targets
- Lockers to be added to end of trip facility

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - October 30, 2003

Time: 4:00 -7:00 p.m

Place: Board & Senate Room

Present: Panel Members:

Bev Nielsen (BN)
Byron Braley (BB), AVP Treasury
Douglas Patterson (DP)
Jane Durante (JD) - Vice Chair
John O'Donnell (JOD) - Observer
Joost Bakker (JB) - Observer
Joyce Drohan (JD) - Observer
Karen Marler (KM)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Sid Siddiqui (SS)
Stephen Quigley (SQ) - Observer

UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers (JC),
Geoff Atkins (GA), AVP Land & Building Services

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. UBC Theological Lots 43 & 47 (D & E)
2. Lot 10 Mid Campus

1. UBC Theological Lots 43 and 47 (D & E), East and West respectively

Address: TBA
Dev. Appl: DA03042
Application Status: In process
Architect: Ramsay Worden Architects (RWA)
Landscape Architect: Perry + Associates (P+A)
Lessee/ Occupant: Market
Review: First
Delegation: Tom Miller (Intracorp), Doug Ramsay (RWA), Jackie Hoffer (P+A),
Stanley Hsu (RWA), Roger Kodoo (Intracorp)
UBC Staff: Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins

EVALUATION: Non support (Project to return)

Jane Durante, Vice Chair and Geoff Atkins, AVP Land & Building Services welcomed the new and existing members. **Amendment : John O'Donnell notified the Panel of his conflict of interest in the second item on the Agenda.**

Applicant's Opening Comments: Tom Miller (TM) spoke to the type of units and Doug Ramsay to the building form/ architecture. The two projects form two "bookends" on either end of the Iona Building. Both sites are then separated by a parking lot to the adjacent student residences to the east and west. To the south of Building E is a new student residence, which will be under construction soon.

The Iona Building with its cut granite stone and large central tower dominates the surrounding Theological Neighbourhood/ Precinct. Thus this strong and diverse context has led to the design, which attempts to mediate, respond and interact with its neighbours.

The projects are composed of 84 units total in the two separate apartment buildings. The massing, footprint and floor space ratios of the buildings are prescribed by the “UBC Theological Neighbourhood’s Site Design and Development Guidelines and Requirements”.

The main entry to the apartment buildings adjacent to the Iona Building attempts to reinforce Iona Commons as an active central feature of the Theological Precinct. A two storey glazed entry lobby on the apartment building will contrast the smaller individual entries found leading to all of the ground oriented units. The ground plane on apartment building fronting the streets will consist of private landscaped yards with 13 of the homes in each building being ground orientated - “City Homes”. The apartment building materials and wall-to-window opening ratio on the lower levels of the elevations facing Iona Drive relate to the Iona Building in massing and use of stone cladding. Granite is the main exterior cladding on these elevations at the lower level. The stonework is continued around the corner on the north elevations, becoming a landscaping wall at the base.

The southern two-storey granite clad portion of the building adjacent to the Iona Commons echoes the exterior stone cladding on the Iona Building. The architectural concrete on the rest of the building complements the stone. The character of the building is derived and grows out of the respect for the Iona Building using complementary materials. It is designed in a timeless modern vocabulary using a west coast vernacular.

Jackie Hoffer spoke to the landscape of the scheme. The guiding principles for the landscape design for Lot D are derived from two important sources - the site context as part of the Theological Neighbourhood at UBC, and the desire and opportunity to provide an environment that is comfortable for its residents.

In order to integrate Lot D into its setting, special attention was paid to the public/ private realm, where stonewalls define the residential development as well as provide a pleasing visual buffer which blends in with the neighbourhood. These walls were set back within the property to allow for planting along their base on the outside, thus adding a pleasing aesthetic quality to both the development and its neighbourhood.

Spacious patios allow residents to enjoy their outdoor areas and afford the opportunity to add comfortable seating and tables. Planting beds allow for screening and provide enclosed, private small gardens for each unit. Pots filled with seasonal plants provide an extra dimension of colour on the patios and entries.

Deciduous trees were chosen for both ornamental and shade qualities and are used both on and off-site, lining existing and new walkways and streets adjacent to the new Lot D residence. Street trees were also chosen to blend in with the neighbourhood, provide continuity and define character. Other plant material was similarly chosen for design continuity. Flowering shrubs and ground cover help to add to the regional aesthetic quality of the site, while responding to the need for low maintenance and low water requirements.

Sidewalks around the perimeter of the site allow for access to ground floor units while at the same time ensuring future public linkages are maintained within the neighbourhood. Selection of site material such as hard landscape paving and lighting will also reflect the established design guidelines for the Theological Neighbourhood.

Panel’s Questions/Concerns

Applicant’s Response

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the approach to accessibility to homes, within the homes and adaptability and are any of the units accessible? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Units above the townhouses are accessible. 5 out of the 12 ground orientated units are accessible from grade, 7 are not. The 30 units that are not ground orientated are accessible by elevator. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there wheel chair livable units? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue came up at the Technical Review Committee and has been worked on since then. Decks would need a small ramp. There is a corporate policy when selling to a person who needs more adaptable features. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there accessibility through the front entrance with the ability to use the washrooms? Has any thought been given to making the washrooms bigger? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not at this stage |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are their exclusions for windows in the planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exclusions for dens or libraries. |

policy on interior spaces such as libraries and dens?

- What provisions have been made to gain some natural light in the dens?
- What is the treatment on the balcony guardrail?
- Drawings don't show Woonerf. How will it come about?
- Parking behind Iona building was questioned
- Will the large cluster of trees in front of Iona be retained?
- How does this fit into the neighbourhood and fit with the Iona building?
- What guiding principles are being used with respect to sustainability and what features if any are being incorporated that will push the envelope in terms of sustainability?
- What kinds of energy conservation measures are being used?
- Nothing in the guidelines dictate windows in dens.
- 2 ft concrete and ½ ½1-1/ 2 ft glass
- Designs for Woonerf were put on hold; construction to start in April/ 04. Woonerf will not be elaborate. Entrance off Iona will be direct - proposing pavers down the centre, asphalt for the stalls
- Doug Ramsay explained service entry, entrance to parkade, drop off point for books, new student residence building off Military Road etc. No visitor parking underground.
- Trees will be retained. Forest at the back will also be retained and during course of construction will be barricaded.
- TM provided some background on the Theological Neighbourhood Plan. Theological Neighbourhood came together about using under utilized land, principally to generate cash to finance their main goal of the structural upgrade of the Iona building, student housing and Carey Hall. About 10 years ago through the GVRD and UBC, a master plan was drawn up showing this building. TM also explained the mixes and uses and the intent to make it a lively place to live and work, respecting the Iona and future build out of the TNP
- Rather than new systems for heating, passive design is being used. Fly ash concrete, light fits, timers on thermostats, recyclable batt insulation, separate bins for construction material waste etc.
- South elevation has less window area than other elevations, fins, and window placement. Heat system is electric, gas fireplaces to supplement

Panel's comments:

KM: CEPTD - main entrance needs more visibility. Plans appear different from elevations. Appreciation for separation to patios - good relationship to pedestrians and traffic. Plans and elevations are contrary with regards to openings and fenestrations and are difficult to understand. Concern at lack of windows in the large interior spaces that include closets; could be a bedroom unit.

RF: Footprints are very large and buildings are complex. Buildings should be simpler to avoid detracting from Iona. Drawings are misleading - new buildings will read larger. Has a problem with bookends concept - Iona doesn't need it. Whilst it is important to tie the two buildings together, attempts must be made to differentiate them. North elevations are too important in relation to Iona; east and west elevations work better. Plans would work better if elevations were not so constrained. Buildings should be less bookends and more concerned with defining open spaces. The solid vertical flanking elements could provide some very nice views to living rooms in the 3rd and 4th floor areas were it not for the restraint of the design typology.

BN: Would like the issue of accessibility into the townhouses reviewed with an aim to gain a few more accessible units. There is an opportunity in the larger units to increase the size of the bathrooms. Applicant was encouraged to embrace adaptability as the market is responding tremendously to adaptable design and UBC should have developers who respond likewise.

Joyce D: Quibble is with the Neighbourhood Plan. The oval has been diminished and could be improved. Agreed with previous comment on symmetry. Buildings have a dual role on the site and one of them is to reinforce the open space to work with the Iona. New building elevations are not sufficiently reflecting the strength of the Iona. Vertical element with stone was appreciated, but not strong enough. To ensure facades contribute as much as possible, the use of granite in the chimney element was suggested. Feels the buildings

are not street friendly partly because of the underground parking, and large balconies; seems detached from the street and public realm. Sustainability approach is disappointing.

JOD: Concurs with previous comments on bookends. Feels buildings are quite close. Retaining the large conifers will help. Present back entries to the townhouses should be reviewed. Architectural style does not reflect residential. Granite relationship to the Iona is at the back and is a missed opportunity. Concurs with previous comments that the building should be very subdued, to either bring out the Iona or complement the architecture. Bookends are identical - architecturally and materially, and will dominate the space.

Amendment: *"The design of the two new buildings is very similar to the design of Chancellor Place. Having 3 buildings with very similar architecture will tend to increase the domination of the new buildings at the entry to this new neighbourhood. The similarity will also make it very difficult to design the fourth building that will surround Theology Mall. If this is a different design it will look awkward."*

Concern at the close proximity of the new student housing from the new townhouse building and the very small courtyard setting that is resulting. No strong indoor or outdoor development in home planning. Despite beautiful yards, access is only through the front door to the yards; a missed opportunity to generate some residential character. Townhouses don't read clearly in the elevations and are not seen as individual townhouses. No stylistic detail in the concrete - needs more work. Long balcony does not complement the Iona building. Entry needs more visibility. Townhouses should have individual entry.

SQ: Need the Neighbourhood Plan model to show project context. Has difficulty visualizing how project fits in. Project is not there yet.

JB: Project shows the struggle the university is having in creating an architectural character and moving towards a university town. A schizophrenic struggle reflected in its verticality and horizontality. Many people uncomfortable with modernism. Design guidelines speak of solidity of character, timelessness and authenticity. However extending the vertical element would be a more successful strategy. Horizontal expression just floats and has no connection with anything.

DP: Concerned about the use of "the commons". Commons implies a wide range of uses and is not just parking and roads; needs to be better conceived. The lots are difficult shapes and inclined to push the lobby back into the middle. Lobbies and buildings will be good for CEPTD purposes and also create activity in the forecourt. Is there an opportunity to put furniture into the terraces at ground level? Could base be reduced a bit to enhance the public realm? Selection of small-scale trees lacks the energy to deal with the massing in the long term.

BB: Would like to see a site model of the three buildings - easy to visualize problems. Concern at the horizontal emphasis - can the balconies be reconsidered? Bookends stick out ahead of the Iona building.

SS: Although effort has been made to provide some green features, it is still disappointing in the context of UBC. Revised document reveals several features that were considered have been dropped - low flow showers, dual flush toilets, R2000 type facility, etc; building is now a standard design, with no specific sustainability features. Suggested review on the basis of life cycle cost.

Summary:

- CPTED principles should be followed when locating the front door to allow better visual access from the street.
- These two buildings should be calmer and less complex to show more respect for the Iona building. Do they need to be symmetrical bookends? Elevations are not yet echoing the strength and simplicity of Iona; perhaps a more vertical expression would help the relationship with Iona.
- There is a need to look at the accessibility issues - the project should be embracing adaptability,
- Loss of the oval open space in front of Iona: diminishment of the public realm an issue. Is there a way to animate the forecourt?
- Sustainability issues need addressing - be more proactive.

- Concern that the only access to some of the townhouses is only through the Woonerf; make the townhouses read as individual units.
- A context model would be a great help in understanding the site issues.

Applicant's response: Tom Miller expressed his appreciation for the Panel's comments, which will be taken back and considered. He further requested the Panel for a consensus of design direction - modern or gothic?

Panel's response:

- Both approaches are possible, however given the size of the buildings cladding them in granite would make them overpower the Iona. Needs to be a calmer, less complex, more restrained, less articulated building that focuses more on defining the space. Gaps between the buildings are too tight; try to create more space.
- Each building has a biaxial symmetry, which is not a bad strategy. However, one side could be different - more stone on the side toward Iona? Chancellor House is equally important in the "stage set".
- Look at proportions that would complement the Iona building to make the Iona more important and make the space important. The buildings should perpetuate symmetry around the Iona instead of around themselves.
- Shouldn't confuse the symbolic nature of the Iona building by trying to replicate it too much with buildings of a different function.

Applicant's response: The site, bulk etc is dictated by the guidelines. Traditional elements on the base, more modern above Theological guidelines are quite prescriptive. Drawings need more work; need to develop the lobby further. Panel's comments will be considered to further refine the design.

2. Lot 10 - Mid Campus

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	TBA
Application Status:	No application yet
Developer:	Ledingham McAllister Homes
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill + Associates
Landscape Architect:	Ron Rule Consultants Ltd
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market
Review:	Preliminary Review
Delegation:	John O'Donnell (Ledingham McAllister Homes), Keith Hemphill (Rositch Hemphill + Associates), Ron Rule (Rule Consultants Ltd)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins

EVALUATION: Not required

Applicant's Opening Comments: JOD introduced his team, thanked the Panel for the opportunity to make a preliminary submission and proceeded to provide some background on the project: Lot 10 was offered to a number of developers. UBC Properties Trust evaluated the proposals on the criteria of compliance with guidelines as outlined in the Mid Campus Plan, number of units and proposed total floor space, number of proposed secondary suites, proposed lease purchase price based on a return per unit and per sq. ft. of floor area. This is the only site identified in the Mid Campus Plan to have "single level units" with garages, living areas and master bedrooms of each unit all on one level. The footprint of these units is generous with significant opportunity to provide usable outdoor space for each unit. Although the Proponent was aware of the proposed plan for the tower on Polygon's site, not until the tower crane went up did they realise its full impact. The desire to diminish the impact of the tower on the Lot 10 units is a significant factor in the site planning.

The main purpose of preliminary review is to establish general site plan principles. Keith Hemphill explained the site context and discussed the potential move of a portion of the park on the north/ west to the south edge of the site, pedestrian connections and link from West Mall to the Rhododendron Wood. Alternative ways of considering the significant relationship between 18-storey tower and single level units were looked at and the Panel was being presented the best design synthesis of dealing with this issue. Design intent is to improve the

relationship along the edge by shifting the plan to the north; ensuing trade off with the park was briefly discussed.

Ron Rule spoke to the landscape: shift of park space to south edge would provide a wildlife corridor from West Mall to Rhododendron Wood and improve viability of units on south. May add a stream for runoff along the north edge of site. Main project entry is on the north end.

Panel's questions and comments:

KM: How are site-planning principles driving the actual site plan?

- Orientation of the buildings - daylight access and orientation of front doors are important. Should we be exploring a housing model to do higher density transition?
- Do not have the option.

Basic precinct planning needs to be challenged. There seems to be fundamental flaws in the basic plan and process by which the developer submits plans and drawings before the bid. Pockets of development are not creating a viable, sustainable urban context on campus. Suites are too large and density is too low.

- Drawings and plans were submitted and approved on the basis they met the intent of the zoning and guidelines.

JOD: CCP sets the number of units in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan. Existing neighbours would have to agree to any more density. The tower has to be accepted, with minimal effect. Hampton Place, with high-rise and low rise has been successful. The proposed built form yields the highest return.

Joyce D: Difficult to comment without seeing relationship to context. Units are low density and inward looking. Concern at series of developments; fundamental aspects of this site need to be questioned. The park remaining on the northwest corner would be more beneficial to the surrounding community. Does not think this type of almost gated development is the right direction for the campus. Focus seems to be on private open space instead of public open space.

DP: The Neighbourhood Plan is essentially a diagram. The park on the corner is not sacrosanct. Concurred with previous comment that this development is inward in focus. Suggested exploration of an innovative way to do more grading and solve the street edges. Needs a stronger interior as well as a stronger exterior, even if the corner of the park has to go.

BB: The Park is not sacred and can move; consider a trail along south side - trails are important for public use.

JB: Number of units and land value is set. In proposing this open space, ensure it leads somewhere, with a larger public benefit. Make something that is significant, as a contribution to the university at large.

SQ: Reads like a gated community, has the appearance of tinkering with the organization of space. Quality of the space is most important. 18-storey tower is absurd. Would like to see shadow patterns of the tower and how this fits the big picture. How will this project improve the University Town?

RF: Cannot read the intent in the plan and unable to comment until designs of units are developed. Does not understand how this project will contribute to the whole.

GA - Will discuss these matters with Development Permit Board, and VP's in charge of planning to identify some of these issues and remedy some of the Panel's concerns.

Before the meeting convened, Geoff Atkins, in a brief address, informed the Panel that the UBC Board of Governors, subject to concurrence with the AIBC, has ratified the new members. As their appointment is technically not official yet, their role at this meeting would be as observers and not voting members.

He went on to explain some of the changes made to the Panel:

- more members added for flexibility
- more architects added
- UALA will provide service as staff support and not as a member
- in the absence of Tom Llewellyn, Jim Carruthers will be the contact person for AUDP matters
- Freda Pagani is Acting UALA
- Amrita Bastians will continue to provide administrative services

GA's Executive Assistant will be calling upon the Panel members shortly to set up closed session meetings to discuss feed back of the first year. Existing members will be requested to extend their terms in order to phase the rotation of the Panel. GA would also be seeking the Panel's feed back on times, location and conditions of meeting suitable to them. Given the expanded Panel, the venue will likely be the Board and Senate room.

An orientation meeting will be set up with Harold Kalke (Chair, Development Permit Board), Dennis Pavlich (VP External & Legal Affairs) and Terry Sumner (VP Admin & Finance).

The first order of business at the next AUDP meeting will be voting in a Chair, who will be an architect, as well a Vice Chair.

GA also advised the Panel of the protocol in the event of a conflict of interest with a member on a particular project. The conflict must be declared before the commencement of the meeting.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - November 27, 2003

Time: 4:00 -8:00 p.m

Place: Board & Senate Room

Present: Panel Members:

Bev Nielsen (BN)
Douglas Patterson (DP)
Jane Durante, Acting Chair (JD)
John O'Donnell (JOD)
Joost Bakker (JB)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Sid Siddiqui (SS)
Stephen Quigley (SQ)

UBC Staff: Geoff Atkins, AVP Land & Building Services (GA)
Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning (JS)
Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect (FP)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services (JC)

Regrets: Joyce Drohan
Karen Marler
Byron Braley

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. UBC (Theological) Lots E & D
2. Lot 41, Theological Neighbourhood, UBC
3. Townhouse Development University of British Columbia Lots 20 + 17
4. NRC Institute for Fuel Cell Innovation

Freda Pagani (FP) commenced the meeting and explained her role as Acting University Architect. Letters of appointment were handed over to the new members of the Panel, as well the new Terms of Reference. FP also informed the Panel of the difficulty some of the proponents had with regards to meeting the Board deadline for institutional projects, and suggested the AUDP meeting dates be changed to the third Thursday of every month, instead of the fourth. The Panel members agreed to the change. The Panel's view was also sought on accessing AUDP information digitally, as done in the Development Permit Board process. Majority were not in favour, preferring to receive the 11x17 hard copies, with reduced information.

FP informed the Panel of the first order of business which was the election of the Chair, and handed over the meeting to the Acting Chair.

JD, Acting Chair, explained that the nominee for Chair would have to be a registered architect and upon election would be required to serve for one year. Election of the Chair was postponed due to absence of Architect members and JD (Acting Chair) was requested to stay on until the election, which would take place at the next meeting on December 11, 2003. On behalf of the Panel, Douglas Patterson and Rainer Fassler thanked JD for the wonderful job she has done as Chair and Vice Chair.

Joe Stott introduced himself to the Panel and explained he was filling the role for the Director of Planning on this committee until the appointment of the new Director of Planning.

Geoff Atkins agreed to make parking passes available to Panel members for future meetings.

Sid Siddiqui questioned if the absence of an APEG member in the composition of Panel meant elimination of a representative. GA explained that the first issue in restructuring the Panel was to address the lack of architectural representation. The Panel would still have the benefit of SS for one more year, and thereby provide an opportunity to see if the Panel had the right makeup. Two members whose terms were due to expire at the end of 2003 have been requested to stay on for a few more months. One important aspect previously overlooked (and will be changed), is to have the Architect and Planner meet applicants in advance, to provide guidelines and information on submissions.

1. UBC (Theological) Lots E & D

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03042
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Ramsay Worden Architects (RWA)
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates Inc. (P+A)
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Kim Perry, Tom Miller (Intracorp), Doug Ramsay (RWA), Roger Kodoo (Intracorp), Al Poettcker (UBCPT)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION: Unanimous support

The Acting Chair welcomed the applicant and invited them to introduce the team and present.

Al Poettcker explained the evolution of Chancellor Place - (Theological Neighbourhood). Reference was made to the OCP requirement to retain the Iona Building as a key landmark, if feasible. The building will be in fact retained at a considerable cost to the VST. Attempts to get the full density permitted in the OCP were driven by the desire to retain the Iona Building. The proceeds obtained from market housing will support the academic mission of the Theological schools on campus. This Issue was discussed at the UBC Board and the ability to do market housing was granted by UBC.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Kim Perry (KP) presented a brief overview of the key components of the NP to provide a better understanding of the relationship of the buildings. He spoke to the response to the issues raised at the previous meeting: Theology Mall will become the primary focus with the Iona Building a feature element at the end of the corridor. Woonerf - 10 parking spaces will be removed, driving aisle will be done with pavers, speed bumps etc. and this will become a pedestrian route. Plan is to build this in the summer.

Doug Ramsay (DR) addressed the three major issues raised by the panel at the previous meeting - urban design and context, accessibility and sustainability.

Urban design and context:

- brought stone into facades facing the common space, at same height, to relate more to the Iona Building
- more regular window pattern to match Iona
- stained glass in chimney
- building not symmetrical within itself - explained evolution of Iona Building which is not symmetrical
- removed horizontal bands on the facades away from Iona
- changed main entrances to relate to sidewalk in front of Iona
- units accessible at grade
- added water feature to main entries
- reduced irregularity of balconies

Accessibility

- used the Vancouver standard for accessibility introduced in September
- access through front door
- larger washrooms, larger doors
- reinforcing walls to support grab bars

Sustainability

- green power source commitment
- high efficiency fireplaces
- campus composting plan will be followed
- dual flush toilets (installed on a trial basis)

Doug Ramsay remarked that the Panel's comments at the last presentation were very helpful and resulted in significant improvements to the plan.

KP spoke to the landscape plan, which has not changed since the last presentation. Front entrance has been reworked. Water feature is on axis with route from Iona Drive; more interesting paving at arrival point. To respond to the Panel's comment regarding relationship of the grade change to adjacent landscape, a retaining wall will be built, saving as many trees as possible. Orientation of the townhouse doors have been changed substantially - brought entrances to some south units inside.

Panel's Questions

- Was there consideration for low flow showerheads?
- Dual flush toilets are widely used with success and plenty of documented information is available. Why is this feature on a trial basis?
- How does this residential building design mix with the Theological academic community?

Applicant's Response

- Intracorp has introduced this feature previously and found that it had to be changed, as users are unhappy with the flow of water.
- Concerned that toilets match design; limited selection in toilets.
- Daytime more for academic and in the evening people return to residences. Mixture of functions like SFU downtown.
- KP - Open space (UNOS) has been distributed around neighbourhood; no designated park space. Have developed design guidelines that apply through neighbourhood. Good proximity to many functions.
- AP - Iona teaches religious courses and provides a religious environment for students. Intent was to embrace the religious notion and market it as a product adjacent to classes and chapels. Resident students are compatible to residential setting; confident that the interaction of students and faculty and staff would make a rich livable environment.

Panel's comments: Majority of the members commended the proponents for the responsiveness to the issues raised by the Panel at the last meeting. There was agreement that overall the building is greatly improved, the stone addition is a change for the better and improved the precinct quality.

One Panel member agreed that the building is improved, but comments from the previous meeting still hold. Suggested looking at the symmetry more closely - could be more playful with the forms of the two bookends. Another suggestion is to reduce the area for drive in and parking to improve green space.

One Panel member appreciated the vertical expression framing the Iona. However this member is still concerned by the use of stone to plant a punched window expression. North end looks too symmetrical; all punched window walls could be in stone. Plan for north expression vastly improved, however symmetry of building could be reduced further.

One Panel member complimented the proponent for making the townhouse units accessible and commented that the interior planning of the units is excellent. With a little further push, some of the units could be fully accessible with accessible bedrooms, pocket doors, and making adaptable space by removing one sink in the bathroom.

One Panel member is pleased with the sustainability response. More opportunities exist, but improvements are good.

Summary:

- General feeling that there was excellent response to previous comments by the proponent.
 - Consensus that the much calmer architectural expression was far more neighbourly to the Iona Building.
 - Consideration might be given to the two buildings being slightly less symmetrical, at the same time the building with concrete back rather than stone reads like a cost saving.
 - Sustainability issues have been addressed as have accessibility concerns.
 - Placement of the front doors and the associated open space is much improved.
-

2. Lot 41, Theological Neighbourhood, UBC

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03046
Application Status:	In process
Developer:	Wesbrook Projects Ltd
Architect:	Creekside Architects
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates Inc.
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market residential
Review:	First
Delegation:	Don Andrew (Creekside), G. Morfitt (Wesbrook Projects), Kim Perry (Perry + Associates)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION: Non support - project to return

JD welcomed the Applicant and invited them to present. One Panel member informed the Acting Chair that he would be abstaining from questions and comments due to his involvement with this project.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Greg Morfitt (GM) introduced his team and spoke briefly on the project. It is a 2-1/ 2-storey ground oriented stacked townhouse building located in the Theological neighbourhood. Carey Hall will use funds from the proceeds of this market project for their new Academic building including staff and student housing.

Don Andrew (DM) spoke to the context, program and design intent. The project lies within the Theological Neighbourhood and is designed for ground-oriented market housing. Requirements of the Theological Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) are:

- a minimum of 24 ground oriented units (front doors on the street)
- floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.2
- 2 ½-1/ 2 storey height limit
- respond in character and scale to the houses across Wesbrook Mall

The project consists of 24 principal dwelling units and 10 secondary dwelling units. 04 secondary units are on the ground floor, 06 are below grade. All parking is underground with space for 52 cars - 48 for residents, 3 for visitors and 1 is accessible. A platform lift will provide convenient and secure wheelchair access from the parking level to grade via the south stairway. Locker storage space is available for 51 bicycles.

Since the building has all separate entrances, this creates issues. NP requires entrances on street to be raised 2 feet. Five units are fully accessible from the sidewalks. Materials are highly residential, reflecting houses across the way. Gable forms reflect other neighbourhood buildings. All lower elements will be detailed in Iona granite; Hardi-board on rest of walls. Roof to be asphalt shingles, windows residential in character, entry porches on all sides of buildings.

5 units on ground floor are accessible. This building will be able to use the Carey Academic building as a meeting area. Agreement is in place (letter to come from Carey).

A full review of Green initiatives, including a report from Keen Engineering was handed out the Panel. The initiatives include, but are not limited to, Low-E glass, an increased insulation factor, a bi-level heat recovery ventilation system throughout the building and an innovative on-site rainwater retention system for use in landscape irrigation.

Materials: Fibre cement siding products, stone cladding, energy efficient windows and fibreglass reinforced long life roof shingles for exterior components. Energy efficient windows, heating and heat recovery systems will be included.

Kim Perry spoke to the landscape: The landscape is designed with sensitivity to security. The building entries are elevated above street level, complement the architecture and are low enough so that there is adequate visibility from patio to sidewalk. Overlook issue - patios being slightly elevated. CPTED issue has been addressed. Plants along the sidewalk are low flowering shrubs and perennials, enhancing the pedestrian realm and giving character to the residential units. The hedge planted on the patios is kept trimmed to ensure visibility, while still providing the necessary privacy to individual units. Lighting will also enhance security. Bollard lighting and stair/ wall lights proposed along the west sidewalk; stair/ wall lights and up-lights are proposed along the east (Wesbrook) sidewalk. Streetlights along Wesbrook Mall will further provide security. Woonerf planned for Military Road. Potential to use rainwater to irrigate - Arborist report done.

Plants along the ends of the corner near the drive ramp have been kept to a minimum height of 2 ft to ensure traffic safety. Tree canopies can be trimmed and trunks are narrow enough to allow adequate visibility. An existing streetlight in the area will also enhance traffic safety.

DA: Goal is for this to be sustainability model for the campus. Keen Engineering has been hired for green building initiatives:

- irrigation
- 6 litre low flush toilets
- low flow shower heads
- added insulation in walls and roof
- Low E glass in south and west

Staff response on issues by Jim Carruthers: variances (setback from Wesbrook), accessibility (off grade entrances in NP), green building evaluation, social spaces.

Panel's Questions

- Visitor parking - intercom, security gate?
- Where is the property line?
- Can you park on Wesbrook and if not, where will visitors park?
- **Re item 18, photovoltaic cells - is it all or one of them?**
- What is the future of Carey Hall?
- How is the parking space dictated?
- Does the layout meet Code re windows in bedrooms

Applicant's Response

- Intercom at gate
- Property line is not in the middle of Wesbrook Mall - part of the issue of the setback on the west side.
- No parking on Wesbrook. Visitor parking is contained underground.
- Will get back with the response
- Intent is to retain the existing building. No long term replacement plan
- 52 parking spaces - maximum is 2 per unit, but includes 3 spaces for visitor parking and one accessible, although there is zero requirement for visitor parking. Minimising footprint by using tandem parking.
- Has been reviewed. Will meet Code.

Panel's Comments:

- Re: fit and context, this is one precinct where the bar has been raised. Finds the buildings incredibly busy and complicated in language. Lack of discipline and restraint in use of materials and form. Disappointed to find a building in this location that does not fit.
- Building works well, has a very strong residential character and works quite well relative to UEL concerns. Pleased with the overall vision of the building. Likes porches, bays, and entrances, but prefers elements shown on rendering. Concern about livability/ marketability of some of the homes - would definitely support a variance to turn the top two floors into apartments. Would like to see an elevator, lobby and corridors. Some homes are a bit tight to Wesbrook Mall. Concerned about suites totally below grade and impact on limited frontage; needs better connection to upper units.

- Understands difficulty to make townhouse front doors accessible. To accomplish the goal to make the front door accessible for visitors, design has to go a bit further and allow visitor access to the bathroom. At least one out of the 5 accessible units should have bathroom accessibility. Hedge along Wesbrook could have very good residential character. Agreed with previous comment re lobby and elevator. Better unit planning and better light rather than townhouse concept needed. First and lower level could be connected allowing lower level to be an office as well as a suite - flexibility in design required. Townhouses do not work from an accessibility point of view.
- Understands it is a challenging environment and site. One challenge is around expression, with UBC ambition to create a university town, and this building does not specially contribute to this ambition. Could use more rigor in design and less casual design of townhouses. Could dormers come forward, made more vertical? Concerned about detail design of porches, columns, handrails etc - these details contribute to the impact of the project.
- Concurred with previous comments. Cannot conceive of this building on this site. Disagrees with need to reflect housing across the street; Wesbrook is an edge and this building expression is inappropriate. Below grade units are dreadful. Serious concerns about planning of upper floor units. Were other forms studied and were they part of discussions with client? Feels building form could be achieved in more appropriate ways. This is not a good fit.
- Agrees with comment on below grade units. Relation to Wesbrook Mall is really bad. Military Road is not a Woonerf. These condominium units have no relationship to each other - the arrangement does not allow it.

Applicant's response: Land has requirements and townhouses are a part of it. Concerns should be distinguished between the building and Neighbourhood Plan. Affordability is a huge issue - suites were previously in basements and Director of Planning encouraged they become secondary suites. Neighbours behind hedge are a big influence. Agrees there are issues, but if this is converted into an apartment, this will not be what was sold to the Applicant.

Acting Chair: Advised the Applicant to take away the notion of the basis of the Panel's comments. All have to deal with the Neighbourhood Plan.

Summary:

- Architectural language is too complex - more rigour, make it read as one building or as townhouses.
- A variance might be appropriate for livability of lower units or suites.
- An apartment form might be better/ more livable on this site.
- Hedge separates the Wesbrook private houses enough that their view need not be used as a criteria for design.
- University Town would have a more particular architectural expression.
- Social sustainability and civility - gathering/ meeting places need to be addressed.

3. Mid Campus Lots 20 + 17

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03050
Application Status:	In process
Developer:	UBC Properties Trust
Architect:	Raymond Letkerman Architects Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates Inc
Lessee/ Occupant:	
Review:	First
Delegation:	Matthew Carter (UBCPT), D. Roche (UBCPT), Jason Letkeman (Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION:Support

Applicant's opening comments: Matthew Carter (MC) introduced the team and presented. The project (Lot 17 + 20) comprises a phase II co-development 61-unit townhouse project (on a stacked basis), and is located in Hawthorn Place on mid campus. Stage 1 on Lot 5 has been a huge success, and oversubscribed. The development is targeted towards UBC employees. The project's target audience is UBC faculty and staff and focus group sessions have provided insight into the demands of the user group. Some important issues to buyers are individual entrances, direct access into public realm, affordability and individual outdoor private space. To respond to the requirements of the user group, the objective has been to provide attractive and liveable townhouses.

The project was presented to the Development Review Committee on November 26, 2003, at which time concerns were raised over accessibility and visitability. Whilst acknowledging the issues, it is difficult to accommodate accessibility and visitability within this development form. The policy of the Mid Campus Neighbourhood is to follow City of Vancouver's guidelines for accessibility and visitability, but this applies to apartments and not townhouses.

Jason Letkeman (JL) spoke to the location in context. Each unit has its principal entry accessed directly from the park or from the street, to encourage a sociable and interactive neighbourhood. He also stated the requirements for site per the Neighbourhood Plan and UBC Development Handbook, which are:

- target density - 1.2 FSR (93,500 sq. ft)
- 3 storey building height
- 2 parking spaces per townhouse unit

Four of the five buildings comprise stacked townhouses. This development form involves a single level unit at grade and a 2 level unit on the 2nd and 3rd floors. Both the upper and lower units have private outdoor garden space. 35 units have direct access to grade. Parkade accommodates 75 cars (1.2 cars per unit).

The buildings respond to the established residential character of the Mid Campus neighbourhood. The architectural massing is established by grouping front entries, with strong articulation of building forms via gable roofs and window bay elements, consistent among all five buildings. Exterior cladding materials are comprised of brick with cedar shingles. Central to the design concept has been the inclusion of a semi private outdoor area for each unit. Each home has private space designed to function either as a children's play area or as a social space for residents.

Kim Perry (KP) spoke to the landscape design in context. Main Mall greenway is through the Mid Campus Neighbourhood site, creating a symmetrical plan with green links. Notion with diagonal routes is to connect pedestrians to future development areas. A plan is under way to revisit circulating patterns of the roads on campus and eliminate double carriageways. It is likely that East Mall will be reconfigured with traffic moved to the west. Landscape has been designed to complement the architectural character of the project through the use of materials and design of the edges between the public and private realms. The units along both the south and east property lines will access onto a path, which forms part of the overall neighbourhood greenway system. KP also spoke to the streetscape pattern, planting at the sidewalk and brick wall along park edge. An underground parking garage is accessed from East Mall. The location is designed to be clearly visible to avoid security concerns. Bike storage is provided within individually owned storage areas, accessed from the underground parking garage. Each townhouse unit provides parking for at least 4 bikes.

The design incorporates sustainable features. KM spoke to the community level and construction level sustainable features. The use of drain water heat recovery systems is also being investigated. A composting unit is planned.

Staff comment: Jim Carruthers spoke to some concerns of the Development Review Committee:

- Access to grade level suites - project is not constrained by having to be up 2 feet from grade. Out of 24 possible suites, able to make 15-17 units accessible at street level
- No access from underground parking - suggestion from DRC that this be looked at
- Storm water retention - (issue raised by Assoc Director Infrastructure and Services Planning)

Panel's Questions/Concerns

- Can a tot lot be developed in fire lane in the park?
- Is there any other location within the site for a tot lot?
- Basement areas are window-less. Concern about

Applicant's Response

- Yes, as the park gets designed.
- Not possible to have a tot lot on site
- No window walls. Explained paved area.

water seeping through paved patios.

- Could this be done in a more contemporary expression.

Is there a plan for:

- Rain water collection and reuse?
- Recycled material use?

- Energy conservation and water reduction?

Construction of suspended slabs done before with success; a challenge, but achievable.

- Based on focus group feedback, market would not respond to a more contemporary design.

- Can use park to reuse rainwater
- Design is not far enough advanced yet. Will do research into what can be achieved. Buyers interested in sustainability.
- People live close to work. Provision has been made to purchase a car for the Co-operative Auto Network (CAN Auto). Car will be a Volkswagen Beetle

Panel's comments:

- Highly readable form of development, would support it.
- Concern that Building is too uniform - has a project scale rather than houses/ neighbourhood. Majority of landscape is on the roof. Backyard patios on building 2 is a livability concern.
- Agrees this looks a saleable project, but could be more whimsical. Disappointed with traditional direction - looks like Toronto, Victorian; encouraged developers to be more forward thinking and go with a more contemporary expression. Concern this will create a Disneyland direction in a university town. Basement spaces need windows - water seepage is a concern.
- Well thought out project. Suggested reducing size of parking areas; fire lane edges could be softened to look like a courtyard. Liked distinct styles of buildings.
- This is a missed opportunity. It is sad that a university that wants to be on the forefront is producing this type of architecture. Every project is becoming more predictable, more uniform and more uninspiring. There are no surprises, no delight; it looks like a neighbourhood on tranquilisers. Yet this is one of the better projects. Concerns with previous projects have been handled skillfully, but this is not the issue. Issue is with uninspiring design.
- Townhouses are inaccessible but could achieve better visitability at street level. If the Applicant is going to the extent of making the entrance accessible, make the bathroom accessible with 3 ft door, pocket or swing door. Would like to see a tot lot built on the park. More variance in each building is needed - could each block be a different colour?
- Seems to have more sustainability features than hand out indicates. Suggests a LEED checklist indicating planned features.

FP - Neighbourhood Plan has a green building checklist. GA suggested this be part of the guidelines.

Summary:

- Frustration with architectural style - traditional versus contemporary
- Appreciation for readability and clarity
- Backyard patios and lower rooms have a livability problem
- More differentiation between the 5 blocks, bit too much the same. Needs some "whimsy", add some surprise, some delight
- Make fire lane more interesting - possibility for seating or children's play associated with fire lane paving
- Frustration with architectural style - traditional versus contemporary; what happened to the West Coast style? Be forward thinking, University Town image will suffer

4. NRC South Campus

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03045
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Bunting Coady Architects
Landscape Architect:	Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg
Lessee/ Occupant:	NRC Institute for Fuel Cell Innovation
Review:	First
Delegation:	Tom Bunting (BCA), Paul Reyes (BCA), Eric Cheung (Public Works Government Services Canada) Jim Breadon (Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg), David Semczyszyn (NRC)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Geoff Atkins, Freda Pagani

EVALUATION : **Support - project to return at a later stage of development**

The Acting Chair welcomed the Applicant, called for introductions and invited presentation. One Panel member communicated his involvement with this project and abstained from questions and comments due to conflict.

Applicant's opening comments: Tom Bunting gave a brief introduction to the project. Building is about 70,000 sq. ft. It is a facility for the new NRC Institute for Fuel Cell Innovation, located at the intersection of South West Marine Drive and the future extension of Westbrook Mall in the South Campus. It is consistent with the OCP but not part of the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan. Access to Marine Drive is being resolved between UBC Properties Trust and Ministry of Highways. The program is on 5 acres of land - site can accommodate phase 2. Program is 3-fold - main research component (2 storey gas lab building), tank area, demonstration project. Program challenge is to fit it on the site - there is a requirement to divide this into two buildings. Building material is a combination of industrial palette/ corrugated metal. Details of the building try to deal with an energy efficient envelope. Registered as LEED; additional funding will be required to pursue certification.

Jim Breadon (JB) spoke to the landscape plan. The current site plan features retention of large trees in the buffer to Marine Drive. Smaller trees could be retained in the buffer between the parking and other paved areas and the property line, if grades, security issues, and growing conditions allow. Replanting can also increase the tree stock on site. Careful management will be needed to ensure the vegetation remains healthy and that large trees not become hazardous in the near future. Landscape works will include grading, landscape drainage, planting and pedestrian circulation. Storm water management, water efficiency, and management of existing forest guide the design principles. Landscape character will emphasise native planting, particularly drought tolerant plant material. Forest management strategy, storm water management, water efficiency, parking/ paved areas was also addressed.

Staff question (JC): How was the width of the green edge along Marine Drive determined? This is an OCP requirement.

- 20 meters is a Ministry of Highways requirement (advised by UBCPT)

Panel's Questions/Concerns

- Why is the building being moved?
- Have there been any tests on whether the 20m buffer is adequate as a visual screen?
- Are there other examples of a 20M buffer in this kind of landscape and development conditions?
- Will a bus stop be on Marine Drive?
- What is likely to happen around the new building?

Applicant's Response

- Building will be reused, but use not determined as yet.
- Not at this point.
- Current site has a less than 20M buffer and seems to be sufficient.
- Yes - should be a full turning intersection for efficient bus access. Also need a signalised intersection so people can cross to Marine Drive to catch the bus.
- It is zoned as UBC research, not residential

- Does NRC have plans to show this research off?
- Will put some projects in public part of the building. A communications officer is on board, who is totally open to group visits. Will soon have the demonstration fuel cell car program.
- JD: Large visual access enlivens campus
- FP - Push to develop south campus neighbourhood as a hydrogen village. NRC facility is absolute key, needs to be shown and not hidden. Should be street friendly
- Is Wesbrook not being extended to Marine Drive at this time?
- Not yet, depends on Ministry of Highways. UBCPT is initiating.

Panel's comments:

- Interesting building, but without a model it is difficult to understand all the pieces, spatial arrangements and skylights; these are very important issues.
- It's a suburban office park type of building and a gateway to the new community. Concerned this is the first thing people see and needs to be addressed. Building should have a town character, blending more with the south campus -people may be disturbed looking at it. Housing is being squeezed - may be parking should be underground and site reduced. Concern about expression of corrugated metal. Porous paving is good. Could the whole front be green, extend buffer around front? Outdoor seating area could be developed to look more like a park.
- Concurs with comment that more information is needed for a project of this size, particularly accessibility to the public. No problem with general concept. Concerned about access onto Marine Drive; intersection will punch a huge hole in green edge - can do without it. Would like to see the project again.
- Reiterated concern about access onto Marine Drive - would deteriorate into a shortcut. Should find a different way to express the typology, make it less industrial park-like. Looks forward to Hydrogen Village.
- FP Congratulated the team for work on LEED - it's a stunning change. Feels strongly that the existing building should not be moved, but it is too late to stop it.
- The Acting Chair commented that it was great to see a building that expresses itself.

Summary:

- Important gateway to the campus from the southeast. Building and landscape should express that function.
- Interesting spaces.
- A model would help the Panel understand the context, building and landscape.
- Material quality and space in right direction.
- There is a hope that the public can get a glimpse of what goes on inside through glass panels in the façade.

**UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL**

MEETING MINUTES - December 11, 2003 - Revised January 05, 2004

Time: 4:00 -8:00 p.m

Place: Board & Senate Room

Present: Panel Members:

Byron Braley (BB)
Jane Durante, Acting Chair (JLD)
John O'Donnell (JOD)
Joyce Drohan (JD)
Karen Marler (KM)
Rainer Fassler (RF)
Stephen Quigley (SQ)

UBC Staff: Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning (JS)
Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect (FP)
Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services (JC)

Regrets: Bev Nielsen (BN)
Douglas Patterson (DP)
Sid Siddiqui (SS)
Joost Bakker (JB)
Geoff Atkins

Recording Secretary: Amrita Bastians

Project reviewed at this meeting:

1. Place Vanier - Gordon Shrum Common Block
2. Lot 10 UBC Mid Campus
3. Museum of Anthropology Development
4. Science Undergraduate Society

Election of the Chair, which was the first order of business, was not followed through due to the lack of a quorum.

1. Place Vanier - Gordon Shrum Common Block

Address:	1935 Lower Mall
Dev. Appl:	DA03013
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Toby Russell Buckwell & partners architects
Landscape Architect:	Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.
Lessee/ Occupant:	UBC Housing & Conferences
Review:	Third
Delegation:	Patrick McTaggart, Richard Findlay, Matthew Carter
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION: Unanimous support

The Acting Chair welcomed the Applicant and invited them to introduce the team and present. The Applicant was requested to limit the combined discussion to 15 minutes.

Staff Comment by JC: The project has been to the Design Panel twice before. Originally it was a submission for a total renovation of the Shrum Block, addition of a foyer, meeting space and landscaping. The project did not get

the approval of the Panel in May 2003. The project since then has been broken into two phases, with the renovation of the Shrum Block proceeding. A major concern was with the addition and landscaping. The first phase was allowed to proceed but the second phase had to come back with a second Development Application.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Patrick McTaggart (PMT) presented. The program is to provide the students with a revitalized interactive environment and sense of "place" unique to the Place Vanier student community. The addition includes a two-storey and basement entry foyer wing constructed to the north of the existing building. It provides a more significant entry experience and models a façade unique to the surrounding Place Vanier resident community. The glazing of the façade provides a transparent interface to encourage student interaction and acts as a visible lit beacon at night. The entrance canopy and eyebrow at the upper level corresponds with the materials of the covered pedestrian walkways of the Tec de Monterrey and Korea House. The brick, anodized aluminum window framing and stucco details are consistent with the existing building. Redevelopment of the site addresses improvements to landscaping, paving, pedestrian walkways, lighting and reconfiguration of the existing entry driveway/ parking are to create a gathering plaza and entry gates. KMT spoke to the improvements to facilities in the lower, ground and second floor - (details provided in AUDP submission).

Landscape: Richard Findlay (RF) presented. The new landscape design seeks to open views to the building architecture as a prime focal point and create a new outdoor plaza area around the new architectural entrance foyer and covered canopy area. The entrance arrival space reflects the detailing and flavour of Place Vanier, as well all the new site details will utilize the existing design/ character of the existing Place Vanier. The new driveway loop/ redesign will now be balanced with angled parking on both sides of the central boulevard. He also addressed the perimeter seat wall detail and covered walkways.

PMT - Previous comments of the Panel re operable windows, Low E glazing and reduced east glazing were incorporated into the new design.

Panel's Questions

Applicant's Response

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there natural lighting available to the lower level of the addition? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the existing covered walkways connect the existing buildings? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connect only to Tec de Monterrey and Korea House |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piers and roofed elements on the north side do not appear substantial in terms of protection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is wider than the existing covered walkways by about 4 ft. Can walk through in a north/ south direction. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entry pavilion being a steel structure, what is the expression of the roof? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where acoustics is not a major concern, it is an exposed structure. In meeting rooms and lounges, it will be a combination of steel structure and acoustic tiles. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the second floor opening provide enough connection and light to be worth losing floor space? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening could be reduced. |

Panel's comments: Majority of the members appreciated the Applicant's response to the previous issues raised by the Panel, particularly the entry pavilion - it is a nice improvement and delightful change.

- Gateways and steel structure still seem to be of a slightly different language from the simplicity of the building; seems over detailed in relationship to all the elements of the building.
- Appreciation for the operable windows, entrance in the renderings seem more appealing. Concur with previous comments re upper floor and multi purpose room - need to simplify.
- Concur with previous comments. Need a section to understand new entrance. Quibble seems to be around configuration of interior space. Applicant was encouraged to treat lobby areas with more generosity. Finishes could be more friendly. Dichotomy of traditional versus contemporary still exists - landscape should be in a modernist idiom; UBC cannot continue in this grey area. Precincts need stronger definition. Entrance at Lower Mall and terminus elements need to be looked at.

- Applicant has been sympathetic to the existing building and followed through well in the design.
- Canopy piers tend to block pedestrians. Termination elements are light and flimsy - space needs more definition. General approach is good. Suggests simplifying/ rearranging masonry elements.

Applicant's response: Comments from the previous Design Panel meetings have led to a better project. The team has worked hard on the canopy and feels comfortable with the design.

Staff Comment by FP: Development Review Committee unanimously could not support the pulling back of the covered walkway from the entrance as it reduces functionality.

Applicant's response: Renovations require compromise.

Panel's response:

- continuous covered walkway is not necessary; terminus structures provides a function
- landscape is a vast improvement, covered walkway does not need to be continuous; it improves space. Likes linear quality. Minor reservations on canopy
- support for the solution presented; covered walkway terminates to create a sense of plaza and is an improvement

Summary:

- Appreciation for the considerable response to previous comments
- Make items in the landscape simpler
- Concern at piers and canopy
- Landscape language not modernist enough

2. Lot 10 UBC Mid Campus

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03051
Application Status:	In process
Developer:	Ledingham McAllister Homes
Architect:	Rositch Hemphill + Associates
Landscape Architect:	Ron Rule Consultants Ltd
Lessee/ Occupant:	Market Residential
Review:	Second
Delegation:	John O'Donnell (Ledingham McAllister Homes), Keith Hemphill (Rositch Hemphill + Associates), Ron Rule (Rule Consultants Ltd)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION: Non support - project to return

The Acting Chair welcomed the Applicant, called for introductions and invited them to present. The Applicant was requested to limit the combined discussion to 15 minutes.

Staff comment by JC: Project was seen by the Panel in October 2003 for design direction, with a proposal to move park space from the northwest corner to the south side. There was an issue with the Promontory (18-storey building), and comments about gated community.

Applicant's Opening Comments: Keith Hemphill (KH) presented. The design has proceeded on input from the Panel at the previous presentation, focusing on the outdoor spaces and relationship to the project, mostly landscape issues.

Landscape: Ron Rule presented and spoke to:

- streetscape - pedestrian character, sidewalk, elevation, New Road, narrowed paving, materials, reduced driveways, reduced commons space and park connections
- water feature in common central area
- individual outdoor space, courtyard, transparent entrance
- many oblique views around entire perimeter into the park - (outward orientation)

- use of hedging and step walls to mask retaining walls; focus on plants and not on walls - about 100 trees planned
- elevational changes in some patios
- connection of front doors with pedestrian orientation on West Mall

Each unit has an entry court, patio and side garden, south and north exposure and the opportunity for morning and afternoon light. Re privacy and screening from the towers, Applicant is working with Architects.

KH responded to the Panel's comments/ concerns from the previous meeting.

1. Project's overall contribution to the university

The purchase of the land and project contributes significantly to the UBC endowment. It also expands opportunities for interconnection with pathways and improves the pedestrian orientation of the site. It supports the Mid Campus Plan and addresses specialized housing needs, particularly the market housing aspect. Homes are designed to allow for aging in place.

2. Inward Focus

Through adjustments and changes in the landscaping, the project has an outward focus. This was achieved through front entrances onto the street, animation of the edge, interconnections through the site, good provision of open space and opportunities to see into and out of the site.

3. Focus on private space vs. public space

Interconnectivity has been improved through the introduction of Hawthorn trail. This is a townhouse site and a fundamental requirement is to get the road to the units. Design Guidelines require that the buildings are oriented such that the garages are least visible on façades. Effort has been made to make the internal road an amenity.

4. How the Site Planning Principles drove the design

Project's internal roadway system and arrangement of the units has responded to the Mid Campus Plan.

5. Need for a stronger interior and exterior

Have animated the perimeter, improved roadway, space etc.

Panel's Questions

Applicant's Response

- | | |
|--|---|
| • Does the Mid Campus Plan encourage gated communities? | • Not intended to read as a gated community. An effort has been made to connect spaces. |
| • What happens at the Rhododendron Wood, will the Wood be lit and what is the rise from West Mall? | • There is a system of trails. Rhododendron Wood is not lit. Intent is to make it an accessible trail - slope is about 5% up to the Wood |
| • Does the model accurately represent the tower? | • Tower has a concrete wall on the property line - (discussions ongoing with Polygon to have the wall reduced). |
| • Why is the FSR below the permitted? | • At the bidding process, UBPCCT called for FSR preference for developing the site. Suggested single level living form and proposal was made based on 18 units. Bid was accepted and unutilized FSR has been allocated to future sites. |

Panel's Comments:

- This should not be called West Coast architecture - it's a confusion of history and misleading; this is an issue with every project. It is strange to see a village of this character sitting at the base of a tower. Interior road is a concern - dominated by garage doors and feature pavement and does not contribute to community, feels exclusive. Community Plan would not prevent contemporary West Coast architecture.

- Gated aspect is a big concern; trails could be better handled - one wouldn't feel welcome walking through the area. Units 1 +12 could have faced New Road, like units 13-18. Fencing along Hawthorn Place is a concern - unable to get a sense of what it looks like.
- These units are big estate homes on a tight site and don't make sense. Such houses belong in West Vancouver and do not fit the University Town concept. Agrees with previous comment re interior elevation dominated by garage doors and pavement. Fundamental issue is, it looks a gated, exclusive community. Cannot understand why University is encouraging this direction.
- Concurs with previous comments. Surprised and disappointed to see the project return in the same form, with none of the real issues addressed. In some instances it has moved even more in the direction the Panel had a problem with. Mid Campus Plan suggests much more public space, allowing passages through and more integration with the campus. To treat this as a gated, exclusive community is wrong. If such character is coming out of the Neighbourhood Plan, the University needs to look carefully at the Plan. Setting a precedent for putting West side estate houses in a tight, suburban context will be difficult to revoke.
- Agrees with all the comments. Problem with West Coast character, relation to street, building type and form in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Summary:

- Architectural character vs. University Town concept
- Concern at the gated sense of this community
- Internal roads and garage doors create an uncomfortable environment
- No ability to walk through the space - very private and exclusive
- Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan misses the mark

Applicant's response: The University Town was envisioned through the planning process and the Mid Campus Plan is part of the University Town. The Panel is at odds with this notion, but developers have to proceed within that context, and the context of marketability - (Hampton Place example). Police would want clearly separate public and private spaces (CPTED principles).

3. Museum of Anthropology Development

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03050
Application Status:	In process
Developer:	UBC Properties Trust
Prime Consultant:	Stantec Architecture
Design Consultant	Arthur Erickson Architects Inc.
Landscape Consultant:	Cornelia Oberlander
Lessee/ Occupant:	MOA
Review:	First
Delegation:	Rob Brown (UBCPT), Noel Best (Stantec), Arthur Erickson (Arthur Erickson Architects Inc), Cornelia Oberlander
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION: Unanimous support

The Acting Chair invited the Applicant to introduce the team and present. Two Panel members communicated their conflict with this project and abstained from questions and comments. The Applicant was requested to limit the combined discussion to 15 minutes.

Applicant's opening comments: Rob Brown (RB) provided a brief project overview. The MOA renew project has an overall budget of \$58M. 65,000 sq.ft of new space is being added, 80,000 sq.ft of existing space is being renovated. The schedule is Board 3 in January 2004, Board 4 in November 2004 and construction start in early 2005. Currently working on issues regarding site access, construction, staging, and code. Museum intends to remain open during construction. Plan is contingent on the approval of the North Campus Plan currently underway.

Staff comment by JC: OCP requires a hydro geological study and Plan to be done prior to any development. Joe Stott (JS) confirmed the Plan has been done. BOG has approved the Cliff Erosion Mitigation Plan prior to consideration of the North Campus Neighbourhood Plan (NCNP). The NCNP is scheduled for public meeting in January and BOG approval by end January. The Plan then goes to the GVRD Board of Directors for confirmation and returned to the BOG for full adoption at a later date. The main consideration of the Study identifies this site as a no till area, and certain recommendations will be considered in site preparation for managing trenches and excavations, which will be handled by the Code Consultants. Note: all new development is to the street side of the site.

Noel Best (NB) spoke to the site plan and architectural design. Arthur Erickson and Stantec Architecture have been selected as prime Architectural consultants. Focus of the work to date has been to develop a formal response that is sensitive to the 'heritage' nature of the existing building and landscape. The structure will be largely brought up to current museum, code and seismic standards. The planning response to the functional program is to provide new visitor services and education facilities in a two-level extension to the building to the left of the main entrance. Private research facilities, new temporary exhibition galleries, accessible storage, open laboratories and storage, workshops and shipping/ receiving are accommodated in a linear extension of the existing upper office wing. Consistent with Erickson's original intent that this multi-level structure be perceived as a single-storey building, the bulk of the new addition is set below grade into the existing landscape berm that separates the parking areas from the Museum.

Landscape and site planning work is also underway to improve the quality and accessibility of both the main public and secondary group entries to the Museum. Improved bus access, staging and parking is also being incorporated. Construction start is planned, subsequent to approval of the NCNP, for January 2005. Construction is anticipated to last 22 months and will be staged to allow near continuous operation of the Museum.

Cornelia Oberlander spoke to the Landscape Plan:

- will keep and restore landscape palettes
- greenery and views will be restored
- Museum is a landmark and destination for display
- mounds will be retained
- will work with Musqueam Band
- green roof will be maintained
- whole site will be a learning experience
- intent is to have water in the pond
- landscape will be renewed with original intent of an ethno botanical garden and will be enhanced with native trees and plants of cultural significance to the Musqueam. CO referred to Nancy Turner's studies on ethno botanical gardens
- dealing with environmental responsibility; plan to build a system to take runoff into a holding tank, and unpaved paths will be paved with a surface that allows seepage into the soil

CO also spoke to the views and GVRD's new property line.

It should be noted that while the project team is looking at the longer-term restoration and development of the full site, this project deals with the building renovation and expansion. The remedial site and landscape works are therefore limited to those affected and or damaged by the construction of the building.

Panel's Questions/Concerns

- Concern that the look of the building changes dramatically at the bus receiving area.
- Why do the roofs look like green roofs - can't the landscaping be run over them?

Applicant's Response

- Important to have an element of surprise in the landscape. NB explained the front elevation and experience into the building. Current architectural expression will be maintained. Doubling the size of the building will have an impact. NB also explained character of entry with renderings.
- This is a major issue. User is concerned about collections in the basement and green roofs on top. User was assured of minimal planting which can be easily removed. Roofing system will be shallow with light soil. Perimeter will be exposed for easy inspection. No conflict with extension of

- Unable to read activity at bus access site. Concern that entry portals will be dwarfed.
- Why are the berms being preserved?
- Was any thought given to future extensions?
- Were any other alternatives considered to reorganize or relocate the entrance, traffic, congestion and buses?
- rectilinear form.
- Applicant shares this concern - continuing to work on the nature of the landscaping and entry.
- To maintain natural forms which screen the building
- No immediate future plan - could be another 25 years.
- Present arrangement of buses stopping in front of the Museum is an issue. New parking location seems to address the issue. 6-7 staff parking spots have been eliminated and landscape extended. Have considered possibility of exit to Marine Drive for buses, but the chances of getting this through the Ministry of Highways, were slim.

Panel's comments:

- Agrees with question re future expansion, concern at density of trees in this area. Likes the treatment of public spaces. Buses will be the first visual impression to visitors and is a huge issue. Very supportive of filling the pond - recommended the Panel pass a unanimous motion on this.
- Has no doubt the architecture will be well resolved. Would like to see the project return with further refinements. Biggest issue is traffic and public entrance zone - should explore ways to simplify. Some thought should be given to future expansion.
- Concerned with change to the front entry character; entry is low key. Given the bus groups and increased public visitation, whole front in front of berms needs to be reviewed. Would support closing off the road in front of the front door and having an entry by the President's house - bring the public through the parking lot and eliminate asphalt by the front door. Concern about green roofs - owner's concern over security would destroy what Cornelia is trying to create. Green roofs look peculiar in front of the building - removal recommended. Concern at location of the new gallery - seems like a missed opportunity, no celebration.
- Likes the project, addition and landscaping. Issue with green roofs; would have been more gentle to have it bermed over, and not so rigid. Concern at too many options to the group entry - could downplay by reintroducing greenery. Concern about shipping to cafeteria area and adding more asphalt to the precinct - could spoil the journey around the building; should be made more inviting.
- The Acting Chair commended the university for choosing Arthur Erickson for this project. Re green roofs - should find a way to soften edge. Re parking, group access should be clearly defined - separate functions. Fully supports water in the pond. Project needs to come back.

Summary:

- Parking buses, group entry, traffic
- green roofs
- servicing of the cafe

Science Undergraduate Society

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03048
Application Status:	In process
Architect:	Johnston, Davidson Architects
Lessee/ Occupant:	Science Undergraduates
Review:	First
Delegation:	Michael Kingsmill (AMS), Doug Johnston (Johnston, Davidson Architects), Kim Johnston (Johnston, Davidson Architects)
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

EVALUATION : **Non Support - project to return**

The Acting Chair invited the Applicant to introduce the team and present. The Applicant was requested to limit the combined discussion to 15 minutes.

Applicant's opening comments: Michael Kingsmill (MK) introduced the project. The project is the new Ladha Science Centre for science undergraduates. It has been to the Board of Governors where the site was endorsed, and received approval for Board 2.

Doug Johnston (DJ) spoke to the site plan, architectural expression and landscape plan. The proposed site is located on East Mall between Hebb Theatre and Chem/ Physics, where the raised podium currently exists. The new building of approx 3000 sq. ft will be freestanding with street access from East Mall. It will have a basement, main floor, second floor, and a rooftop garden. In the basement there will be service and storage spaces and the entrance foyer with elevator access to the upper floors. The main floor will have study and meeting rooms and the SUS office. There will be space in the lobby for a photocopier and Internet terminals as well as display cases. The second floor will be the assembly area with a capacity of ± 135 persons. It will have a kitchenette and vending machine area in addition to the washrooms. The lounge is laid out to support social and academic events with movable furniture. The top floor will be a rooftop garden accessible by the elevator and stairs, complete with garden furniture and planting.

Landscape: The project will respect its neighbourhood context by retaining the character of the landscaping features in the area. Existing podium landscaping will be uprooted and stored off site to be reestablished at the end of the project. The existing walkway behind the Chem/ Physics building will be maintained and improved with better lighting and shelter from weather. At the street entrance it is proposed to introduce native shrubs and trees, benches and other street furniture.

The main plaza will be enhanced with a water feature and additional outdoor seating. Planting material will be native to the region and feature both shrubs and dwarf trees to provide appropriate scale. A major theme is to select regional plant material, featuring seasonal variation and colour. The roof garden plant material will be displayed in large planters to allow for flexibility and change and will be a combination of flowers and drought resistant shrubs.

Materials on stair tower - multicoloured glass tiles, reddish wood on louvres on the south side, greenish glass for glazing. Although the building will not be eligible for a LEED certified rating, intent is to introduce a number of sustainable features such as green materials for the building, water management system, low flow fixtures, low emitting materials, recyclable materials, reuse of trees, solar shading on building exterior, reduction of heat gain, more efficient and indirect lighting, natural ventilation and lighting on the upper level.

Water feature - in the summer the bottom of the feature will have river rocks and provide visual interest.

Panel's Questions/Concerns

Applicant's Response

- | | |
|---|--|
| • Concern that the project stands apart from the larger population and buildings. Is it possible to have underground connections to the Hebb Theatre? | • Difficult to connect to the Hebb Theatre - possible to connect to Chem/ Physics, but the project has a modest budget. |
| • Is there a possibility to connect to the bus depot? | • Would be very difficult. |
| • Can there be a link to the Hebb Building staircase? | • Would have to upgrade current Hebb Building for code - exits, handrails etc. Cost of this would have to be borne by the project. |
| • Was there a setback given at front? | • Established by the Applicant. Projecting forward of Hebb Theatre |

Panel's comments:

- Project is too complex in materials. Buildings in context are of very different expressions, geometries and massing - too complicated. Since the plan is so small, could one stair be open?
- Agrees with previous comment re materials - too much colour and too complicated for a small building. Basement meeting rooms too isolated. Café should be closer to front entrance. Suggests opening up the main floor. Likes green roof. Try to connect behind the building; Hebb and back alley being a dead end is a security concern - landscape at back needs more development. Try to find a way to integrate the roof

element from the Hebb building.

- Pleased to see a building in this location. Likes the existing connector between the Hebb Building and the curvilinear form and the idea of trying to be more restrained. Feels the building hangs together vertically. Concurs with previous comments on stairs - needs to be more open. Shares concern re alleyway - should not be a dead end. Concern about light wells in the meeting rooms - look at other devices to light these rooms.
- Building is too exuberant for the area; seems to be catering to the donor and competing for attention. Curvilinear form looks like a ship and makes the surrounding buildings look dowdy. Concurs with previous comments re interior - it is the size of a house, will not work programmatically. Missed opportunity to relate physically to the other buildings. If budget is a concern, suggests toning the building exterior down and using the money elsewhere.
- Supports previous comments. East Mall is an academic street - this building will fight present urban frontage and have a strange expression. Suggests looking at other options that might achieve student's requirements and a better urban fit. Issue with putting a pavilion in a left over urban space. Could be striking in a more simplified way.
- Concurs with previous comments re curvilinear form and colour. Connection to the other building is a concern; linkage to Hebb does not have to be extravagant. Need better use of land. Look at increasing the building by one or two more floors - two storeys are not enough in this area. The team was complemented for its effort at trying something ingenious.

Summary:

- Concern at complexity of main floor space - open it up
- Materials to be simplified, reduced in number
- Sustainability - share stairwells etc while still giving students identity
- Dead end lanes are insecure
- Connections to other buildings might save money
- Consider increasing the number of floors

Advisory Design Panel
Year End Review Notes - September 25, 2003
Geoff Atkins, AVP, Land & Building Services

Geoff Atkins (GA) opened the discussion by extending the university's appreciation to the Panel, and thanked them for their time and valuable input.

GA advised upcoming changes with respect to:

- Change in the process
- UALA role - he/she will become a staff support to the Panel.
- New Chair will be an Architect

Modifications suggested in the Board reports and names of new members will be released after the Board of Governors meeting next week. New Panel will change over after the next meeting on October 30, 2003 after approval from the Professional bodies.

GA referred to his meeting with Jane Durante at which time she referred to some of the issues re models, timely submission of material, disconnect between UBC Properties and UALA, and suggested changes that could be made.

When the new Panel is assembled, one of the tasks at hand would be to look into what went right and what went wrong during the first year. GA would also like to ensure that the meeting is at a place and time that is convenient to the Panel members, and what protocols they would like to have in place.

Matters under consideration:

The Panel was originally set up to review non-institutional buildings. The university is considering if the process should be applied to institutional projects as well. GA is of the opinion that the university is better served by using this process. Larry Bell will assist with governance-based issues.

Panel comments and concerns

- Majority of the Panel members raised the issue of context. Contextual information is critical, but has been slow in coming - e.g. of University Boulevard, Main Mall, Ike Barber Learning Centre, redo of the road by Botanical Gardens. Context in the larger zone is rarely seen, and is one of the major problems for the Panel. Examples of massing - Vanier and east side of Main Mall; west side landscape is loose. (GA - *working to complete Main Mall funding*)
- Proponents should be encouraged to come in early with context, master plan and precinct planning. With more options on the table, it makes for good dialogue. Example of University of Washington - does precinct study phase before building design.
- Instead of elaborate drawings, need drawings that look at different ways in which contextual issues of any particular area/development might be addressed. Currently plans are done as land use decisions - not detailed programmatic aspects, spatial relationships and other issues. Plans are treated in a fixed manner, instead of a direction process and this is problematic. There have been instances where the Panel has been told the plan cannot be changed. (GA - *this is a major issue and will be given consideration*).
- Need more descriptive drawings

- A good example of contextual information being provided for is the Aquatic Ecosystems Research Centre project. Because of the precinct study, the Panel found it much easier to comment on this building and it's fit.
- No firm UBC policies on sustainability and green buildings.
(GA - UBC is in the process of drawing up a policy with respect to institutional projects. No quantitative figures for non-institutional projects. Suggestion that Freda speaks to the Panel.

Residential development:

- UBC needs a model housing project. Design must be innovative and contemporary in every aspect.
- Panel shouldn't be seen as only addressing style (traditional versus contemporary).

(GA - Dennis P and Terry S, Al P will be invited to address the Panel).

- Byron Braley asked the Panel for examples of innovative projects in the lower mainland
 - Capers building on 4th Avenue is good example
- Sid Siddiqui will provide European examples of sustainable buildings to GA
- Example of innovative incentives offered to Developers in Portland
- Example of Vancouver Design Panel on neighbourhood issues

GA response

- Some of the issues raised have been addressed in the Board of Governors Report
- In order to pay more attention to the landscape architecture, more architects will be appointed to the Panel. Composition may change from time to time.
- Main Campus Plan is scheduled to be updated next year and will be only for institutional development, but will be integrated with the rest of the plan areas.
- Suggestion to refresh ourselves with OCP, CCP and Neighbourhood plans; arrange for presentation by the Planning Principles committee - Harold Kalke, Dennis Pavlich, Terry Sumner
- Day to walk the campus
- Chair of the AUDP will sit in, even though he/she will not vote.
- Discussed DPB make up - UALA will sit in on the DPB meeting
- Panel input will be sought for public realm study - University Boulevard, Library gardens

The Panel was of the opinion that the proposed changes were promising.

GA once again thanked the Panel and brought the meeting to a close.