



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2004



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL  
MINUTES - REVISED**

Minutes of the meeting of the University of British Columbia Advisory Urban Design Panel held  
at 4:00 p.m. on January 15, 2004  
in the UBC Liu Centre Board Room

**Members Present:**

Voting Members: Chair Jane Durante, Bev Nielsen, Byron Braley, Douglas Patterson, John O'Donnell, Joost Bakker, Joyce Drohan, Rainer Fassler, Sid Siddiqui, Stephen Quigley

**Staff Present:**

Geoff Atkins, AVP, Land & Building Services, Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning, Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services, Fred Pritchard, UBC Consultant, Recording Secretary, Amrita Bastians

**Applications for consideration:**

1. UBC Dentistry Building
2. UBC Marine Residences
3. Wesbrook Mall Townhouses (Lot 41 Theological Neighbourhood)

---

**FOLLOW UP ON JANUARY 8, 2004 DINNER MEETING:**

Geoff Atkins (GA) thanked the Panel for their participation in the dinner and discussion with the members of the University. The feedback received was useful and more such meetings are being planned. As part of lessons learned, the next phase will be a joint meeting with the Development Permit Board. This meeting is being arranged and GA's office will confirm date to the Panel.

Administrative changes to the process are ongoing and the next phase will be incorporated into this meeting – i.e. Joe Stott (JS) as Acting Director of Planning and Freda Pagani (FP) as Acting University Architect, will provide background and context of projects preceding the presentation. Pending finalisation of administrative procedures, Geoff Atkins invited the Acting Chair to continue in this position. Jane Durante accepted.

Joe Stott (JS) discussed project/process schedules, which were handed out to the Panel and spoke to the site and context of the Dentistry Building. Briefly explained University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan approval process and design competition.

Freda Pagani (FP) explained the significance of the Dentistry site and distributed a project design checklist from the Main Campus Plan. FP acknowledged that while recent projects have not exactly conformed to the checklist, it needs to be reintroduced.

The Committee questioned the UBC staff on the transit interchange, how it is addressed as part of the competition and alignment of University Boulevard. The Committee also commented that the bus loop needs a strong connection with the surface and strongly felt that it needs to be part of the competition and the larger plan. There was some concern that the Design Panel has not seen the alignment in detail, or the interchange and its implications. Point of entry into the tunnel and interface of public space with the system is important and should be part of the competition.

UBC staff response: Competition deals with the grade level and above. The underground transit station is separate from the competition and will be a separate activity. Alignment of University Boulevard will be changed. Because of CPTED, safety and sustainable issues, not too much scope for changes. Transit station will be more functional than design oriented. Decision to have the interchange underground was not made by Transit Planners in isolation, but in full consultation with the university and received overwhelming public support. However, concerns raised by the Panel will be considered.

## 1. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

### 1.1 UBC Dentistry Building

Address:	South-west corner University Boulevard and Wesbrook
Dev. Appl:	DA03055
Architect:	Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates Inc.
Developer:	UBC Properties Inc.
Lessee/Occupant:	Faculty of Dentistry et al
Review:	First
Delegation:	Al Poettcker, Graeme Silvera, Joost Bakker, Kim Perry, Eric Stedman
UBC Staff:	Geoff Atkins, Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott
UBC Consultant:	Fred Pritchard

---

Joost Bakker (JB) introduced the team and Al Poettcker (AP) made a PowerPoint presentation of the Dentistry Building in context with the UBNP.

Joost Bakker presented the project overview. Using design boards and drawings he spoke to the size of the building, location, massing, design, fracturing of the building blocks and materials.

Landscape Architect Kim Perry (KP) spoke to the relationship of the building and landscape:

- : road in current configuration will shift southward
- : architects are trying to solve the issue of the two geometries in the corner by breaking the building into 2 parts
- : landscape is related to rhythm of buildings and to the harbour over bus entry
- : large tree will be saved if possible; may need to be replaced; 2 large deciduous trees on corner will be retained
- : permeable pavers in area of parking stalls
- : green roof at the level of the Dental Clinic; small trees will be planted in raised planters at the back

Eric Stedman (ES) spoke to the LEED/environmental aspects of the building:

- : Target is LEED silver
- : Looking at green roofs, storm water control, water use reduction (20%), reduction in energy use (35%)
- : Not looking at a mechanical system; geothermal field considered for McInnis field
- : Uniformity of night time light quality (CEPTD)

ES also spoke to the pedestrian circulation through the development, and handicapped access and materials. JB commented that lighting is an important component of the project. Lighting standards are being put in place for uniformity and quality of light emitted from building.

The Panel questioned the presenters on materials, vehicular entry, stone treatment, operable windows, street fronts, geo thermal system, fracturing of the building.

Panel's comments:

- Existing quadrant is not attractive; more granite would be better. Likes the idea of the rock in a lighter tone. Difficulty understanding glass block with the UBC Crest. Concern about the disjointed canopy - prefers a continuous solid canopy.
- Likes the overall scheme and similarity/continuity of materials at Learning Centre. Some issues with detail: hopes the clean roof will stay, mechanical systems could be an issue, mix of gothic and modern need right detailing. Need careful overlay of horizontal and vertical. Ground plane under covered area needs attention to avoid darkness. Overall, looks good.
- No handicap parking stalls; needs a drop off. Handicap ramp too hard edged, find a way to soften the edges.
- Project role as marking the gateway is most critical. Likes massing, supports separation and orientation of easterly block - gives a stronger presence. Would like to see a stronger acknowledgement within the block, glass cube not sufficient. Suggests connection from the ground to the cube or opening up the corner? Also other collegiate gothic devices could be used. Proximity to curb too close to University Boulevard; tree is too close to curb to survive. Suggests either moving the building or changing the alignment.
- Corner works better as an entrance relative to Wesbrook than University Boulevard. No issue with fracturing of the mass, more powerful Wesbrook façade than to University Boulevard. Questions why it didn't sit in a more simpler and forceful way, and carry the alignment of University Boulevard.

Breezeway is one storey too low. Curtain wall not noble enough, will become dated, lacks timelessness.

- Pleased with LEED silver target. Challenges the project to exceed the 35% energy saving by setting the target high enough.
- Street needs careful consideration, but not so wide, to be like Pacific Boulevard. Strong character might limit options for design competition. Looks like an office building, not a retail building. Dentistry entrance too utilitarian, needs friendlier exterior cues that this is Dentistry. Retail tenants will want signage, which will alter the ground plane look; test renderings suggested. Corner block is a missed opportunity to create a separate element. Idea is to make the street a more interesting and intimate experience for off campus populace.
- Supports previous comments, particularly by two Panel members. Top floor needs more university public presence and way finding to it. A bank would detract from street activity. Need to design back area behind building now, or it will not be done. These kinds of buildings need a precinct study, not confined to the competition area.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel SUPPORTS the design of the UBC Dentistry Building, DP Application DA03055 subject to staff review of the following and commends the Applicant for a thorough presentation.**

- **Square block corner of University Boulevard and Wesbrook makes a good entry statement though may be too close to the curb. Glass cube/lantern could be taken further, be even more celebratory and more iconic**
- **Some concern the square block addresses Wesbrook Mall more than University Boulevard**
- **As a gateway, the whole complex should be very special and timeless**
- **The way the retail base addresses the street needs careful consideration to contribute to the vitality of the village**
- **Concern about handicapped comfort**
- **Complex should have equal design attention to all sides of the building. Solid canopy on both sides of the building for rain protection**
- **Concern about street width appropriateness, particularly at the corner block**
- **Gothic/modern details have to be extremely well handled**

---

## 1.2 UBC Marine Residences

Address:	2300 Block Lower Mall
Dev. Appl:	DA03054
Developer:	UBC Properties Trust
Architect:	Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden/Bregman + Hamann Associates Architects
Landscape Architect:	Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg
Lessee/Occupant:	UBC Housing & Conferences
Review:	First
Delegation:	Jas Sahota, Norm Hotson, Kate Gerson, Doug Birkenshaw, Chris Phillips
UBC Staff:	Geoff Atkins, Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

---

A Panel member communicated conflict with this project and abstained from comments and voting.

Joe Stott (JS) spoke to the type of project, location, the old highway setback of 40m and current set back. Freda Pagani (FP) spoke to the importance of the site and the university's expectation that there will be an effort to recall the fine architecture of other student residences such as the Ron Thom residences.

Jas Sahota, Development Manager, UBCPT introduced the design team and provided some background to the project which is an initiative from the TREK 2000 vision. The site was identified as part of a study conducted by Campus & Community Planning in 2003 to have 5 towers to house up to 2000 student beds.

Fred Fotis (FF), Director of Housing & Conferences presented a brief project overview, some context and the TREK goal. FF commented on pressure from the graduate community to provide houses and the addition of 2000 beds will make a significant impact. This is a stand-alone building, which will be paid for by Housing & Conferences.

The Panel questioned FF on the statistics of handicap students, the justification for putting so many people together on the complex and the decision to change from 5 to 4 towers.

Norm Hotson (NH) spoke to contextual and site related aspects, ground floor plan/programme, accessible suites roof shapes and Commons building.

- : program of 2000 beds was originally designed in five 17-storey towers; buildings will be comprised of four 20 storey towers including 5 storey bases, one 5 storey building and one 1 storey building
- : buildings are positioned such that the greatest impact of the massing and shadows will be along Lower Mall; towers are staggered to optimise views and reduce the perception of a wall of towers
- : architectural expression will be clean and modern.
- : primary entrance to the quadrangle and the entire complex is off Lower Mall; quadrangle will be a purely pedestrian domain
- : wheelchair accessible units will be provided in the base building elements; all common areas will be wheelchair accessible
- : commons building will house support services
- : final configuration of 4 towers was more user friendly particularly in relation to St. John's College.

Chris Phillips (CP) spoke to the landscape:

- : attempts made to site the building, preserving as many trees as possible (160 trees on site)
- : space on western/northern side will have a covered glass canopy;
- : walkways pulled away from the edges of the building to allow private space for ground floor units
- : bike storage for short term visitors at entry of each building; bike storage in the basement for each complex
- : short term parking for convenience store and visitors; no underground parking
- : existing trees have been assessed and valuable trees identified for preservation

Environmental initiatives:

- : Sustainable materials : Green roofs : Low E glazing
- : Geo thermal heating and cooling : Fly ash concrete : Operable windows
- : Storm water retention

The Panel questioned the presenters about the use of the amenity building, sense of entry, development of sustainability targets, security, the justification for 2000 beds and 20 storey towers on this site, if other locations were considered, the lack of a fence or wall along Marine Drive and the possibility of the restaurant, store and recreation being connected.

Panel's comments:

- Connection of this site to the rest of the campus presents a challenge, and a stronger approach to the quadrangle is needed. Needs urban aspects, particularly in terms of connections. Looks closed/isolated – should make an effort to tie it in/make it more open to St. John's College. Number of units is a challenge, but overshadowing of green space questioned. Couldn't one tower be closer to the escarpment? Towers are tightly spaced; a careful study is needed. Needs more breakdown of floor plate. Many tentative comments on sustainability; challenges UBC to bring a LEED building to fruition. Missed opportunity if sustainability is not pushed.
- Excellent presentation, but a very corporate solution to solving student needs and housing; throwback to 70's or 80's. Not worthy of an aspiring world-class university, very disappointing. Could other common uses be in units on commons? Amenity building in one storey loses sunset views; would work better as 2 storeys. Amenity space should also relate to outdoors better. Lower roofs should be green – would have an impact as well in scaling down the sense of the place. Encouraged to look at ways to increase interaction – e.g. laundry lounge.
- This is an opportunity to create a vision for new UBC community; could be a community of different/mixed buildings instead of all mega buildings. Towers are too similar in character - more differentiation needed, missed opportunity. Agrees with comment that amenity could be attached to café and street. Look at having more doors on commons and street, as in Vancouver. Bosque is in sun, commons in shade. Lobbies too small and need more importance. Appreciates tree retention. Parking out front and ground floor access looks suburban - emphasizes importance of car; waste of prime outdoors space. Character of ground floor buildings could be more residential.
- Looks forward to seeing a strategy in terms of sustainability.
- Very thorough presentation, but a model would have helped understand the context. Concerned that the decision to go with four equal tower heights is driving home the point of the "project". Surprised with the decision to have a single storey building on this site. Amenity building could have been pulled into the base of a building to free up the space and have 3 more modestly scaled towers along the Marine Drive

experience. Given the shortage of site area, it seems extravagant to claim this footprint for a single storey building.

- Scale is almost inhumane, too much similarity in scale. Washrooms need a 4 ft wall beside toilet. Toilet must also be near a wall to allow for a grab bar, not against a cabinet. All the doors should be 210, not 208. Use of pocket doors is suggested. Floor plates need a common room on each floor to foster community, or on every three floors. It is unlikely that central lounges will suffice for that.
- Scale is wrong for this part of campus; issue is density in terms of Main Campus Plan – physically out of place; no relation to St. John’s College. Tradition here is low rise/medium rise – e.g. Massey College in Toronto. Towers need to be better, too suburban, looks like Don Mills. Use less concrete, more brick or more glass for continuity. Agrees with previous comment on similarity of towers – needs more playfulness. Re materials, masonry looks right, but not such strong colours; need to address the natural site.
- Agrees with most of the previous comments, particularly on strong colours - looks like Yaletown. Reconsider the yellow brick, revisit fence, make it softer with landscape. Stagger towers, rethink restaurant and store – both would struggle in this location.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel DOES NOT SUPPORT the design of the UBC Marine Residences, DP Application DA03054. Subject to consideration of the Panel’s comments and further discussion with Freda Pagani and Joe Stott, the project is to return for evaluation.**

- **Towers as located are a concern with regards to overshadowing of the green space; at the same time it might be advantageous to move one of the towers closer to St. John’s College.**
- **Further consideration should be given as to how the complex addresses its neighbour, St. John’s College**
- **Consideration should be given to making a closer connection between the amenity building, café and convenience store**
- **Could the tops of the towers be public rooms?**
- **Mid height buildings should have green roofs**
- **Is there a possibility of varying the heights of the towers by manipulating the massing?**
- **More diverse architectural expression for the towers would give the complex more visual interest and individual identities to the towers.**
- **Pedestrian linkages/gateway needs more attention and definition**
- **LEED targets need to be addressed**
- **Density on the site is out of Applicant’s purview, but strongly commented on**
- **Desire for more interactive spaces – lobbies should be made bigger and more accommodating of leisure time; more social space further up in the building**
- **Organisation of the handicapped units needs review**
- **Materials and colour need to be looked at**
- **Suburban vs. urban and how it works - needs more thought**
- **Street front and relation to Marine Drive to be looked at further**
- **Towers need more playfulness**

---

### **1.3 Wesbrook Mall Townhouses (Lot 41) Theological Neighbourhood**

Address:	TBA
Dev. Appl:	DA03046
Developer:	Wesbrook Projects Ltd
Architect:	Creekside Architects
Landscape Architect:	Perry + Associates Inc.
Lessee/Occupant:	Market residential
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Don Andrew (Creekside Architects), Melissa Green (Creekside Architects) Greg Morfitt (Wesbrook Projects), Michael Paterson (P+A), Charlie Lorenzen (Aqua-Thermal Consultants)
UBC Staff:	Geoff Atkins, Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott

---

Joe Stott (JS) advised that this non-institutional project is destined for the Development Permit Board and referred to previous comments of the Panel. Design Guidelines call for townhouses and an earlier Development Permit has been issued for townhouses.

Architect Don Andrews spoke to the changes in the design since the last presentation, materials and green initiatives. The building will have a character in keeping with the University Town concept. Style of building will be more contemporary than previously contemplated. West side of the building is covered by a large gently sloping roof form and will establish an edge to the Campus adjacent the residents of the UEL. The east side of the building will be 2 stories high in response to the single-family homes across the Mall. West side is 3 stories high. The project provides as much level access to the ground floor units as possible and washrooms will be accessible in these units. Ground-oriented townhouses preclude level access; this is a requirement of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Landscape Architect went over changes to the landscape plan:

- : Opportunity from setback from Wesbrook Mall has provided larger patios
- : Landscape at street allows for views in and out
- : Proposing to pull back street trees at the sidewalk at Wesbrook to provide additional separation for the units and a screen for 2nd floor units
- : Roof decks provide additional patio space
- : Landscape will be irrigated. Roof top water will be collected in a cistern and used for a drip irrigation system on planters

The Panel questioned the Applicant on the use of the accessible unit and future of existing Carey Hall building.

*Panel's comments:*

- Concern about upper level patio noise, but project is much improved.
- Much improved. Reservation about livability of basement units. Concerned big street trees don't have much root room.
- Vast improvement. Mansard upstands strange.
- Affordable housing commended, appreciation for attempt to include accessible units. Accessible visitable units, bathrooms should have pocket doors. Project is much improved.
- A much better project, great improvement. Urban street frontage is better. Lower level light wells should be terraced to get outdoor space adjacent. Concern about mansard roofs on west side, issue with hip roof treatment. North and south elevations could have more brick/solidity. Colour choice too murky – use a colour with more punch. East elevation needs detailing. Lower level unit on north side gets little light – should look at orienting the living area to the west.
- Suggested having a screen between roof decks.
- Complimented the whole team for the work done to achieve a superior project, and maintaining affordability.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel SUPPORTS the design of Wesbrook Mall Townhouses (Lot 41) Theological Neighbourhood DP Application DA03046 and commends the Applicant for considering and incorporating the previous issues, concerns and recommendations of the Panel.**

- **A generally well accepted scheme, however still some concern re secondary lower units and their access to daylight**
- **Concern expressed about the mansard roof/deck/handrails; details should be given further design consideration**

**Synopsis:**  
**UBC Development Permit Board & Advisory**  
**Urban Design Panel Discussion Dinner**

Thursday, February 5, 2004  
4:30 p.m. – 8 p.m.  
The Sage Bistro, Music Room

---

*The purpose of the evening was to show appreciation for the Development Permit Board (DPB) members' volunteer commitment and to provide a forum for discussion with the Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP) to enhance understanding of each others' roles. The format of the evening included a social reception followed by dinner service. Geoff Atkins convened the meeting once attendees were seated, and described the purpose of the event and evening overview. Harold Kalke provided opening comments on behalf of the DPB. Joe Stott presented a power point slideshow on the organization of planning and development review processes. Each of the Development Permit Board members had an opportunity to speak about their observations, experiences and to ask questions to the AUDP. An open question and answer session followed, which culminated in discussion about a strong, shared vision of the University that looks much farther into the future. Geoff Atkins formally adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.*

In Attendance were:

UBC Staff - Geoff Atkins, Freda Pagani, Joe Stott, Jim Carruthers, Karly Henney (Recorder)

DPB - Harold Kalke (Chair), Jim Taylor, Al Poettcker, Fred Pritchard, David Barnes

AUDP - Jane Durante (Acting Chair), Rainer Fassler, Sid Siddiqui, John O'Donnell, Joyce Drohan,

Byron Brayley, Bev Nielsen, Stephen Quigley

---

The Development Permit Board Members had the following comments and questions:

Harold Kalke:

- An important distinction between the DPB and AUDP is that the DPB deals only with non-institutional development, whereas the AUDP's mandate covers both and creates the opportunity to make important connections between the two types of development
- The public process for the OCP was long and involved
- There has to be compromise to create a complete community
- Diversity is key to a complete community
- "Fit" for the University and functionality, in terms of how a proposal serves the University are key criteria for review

Al Poettcker:

- The OCP for UBC is the most prescriptive OCP, which creates opportunities and challenges for UBC
- The DPB is partly modelled on the City of Vancouver review panel, however, by having one position for an off-campus representative, it is more inclusive and far-reaching
- The challenges of budget and timing, especially for projects like museums, are often not considered
- The two committees should focus on the projects where they have strong agreement to move ahead
- Differences have primarily been about neighbourhood plans constraints

Jim Taylor:

- Is the AUDP closed to the public? *No.*



- There has been a lot of public turnout at the DPB meetings, usually about concerns with applications bordering the UEL
- Public concerns raised are in reaction to impacts on traffic and privacy, which the University and individual applications have responded well to

David Barnes:

- The comments of the Development Review Committee are important
- He takes an engineering perspective in application review, which can be problematic if there are issues at the DPB stage
- Quality is very important, which encompasses maintenance, marketability and sustainability

Fred Pritchard:

- Planning principles for UBC have been determined
- At the end of the day, the non-institutional focus of the DPB should ensure UBC is a place where people can live, work and raise families
- The AUDP and DPB roles are somewhat “rear view mirror” assessments because of previously established plan, but should always be looking to the future
- Their roles cover more than design; they ensure that each application is a contribution to the community that is unique for the future

The following comments/questions (C/Q) and answers/responses (A/R) were made during the open question session:

C: Jane Durante:

- Different perspectives provide a healthy debate for effective solutions
- The AUDP commentary on the OCP and issues with site selection, massing, FSR, etc., can improve the OCP when the time comes to make changes
- The AUDP needs a better understanding of how decisions are made for neighbourhood plans

R: Geoff Atkins:

- UBC will ensure that the AUDP is plugged into these processes

Q: Jane Durante

- What is the mandate of the APC?

A: Joe Stott

- The APC is a 7-9 person committee appointed by the Joint Committee as a forum for public input into neighbourhood plans
- The composition differs according to spatial context
- The APC is a first level consultative group to advise on the public perspective for plan writing

A: Geoff Atkins

- The University has learned from experience with member selection

C: Jane Durante

- It would benefit the AUDP to hear what the community and/or people on surrounding sites have to say, and what surrounding site conditions are

R: Joe Stott

- So far this has been covered off by internal review
- Campus & Community Planning (C & CP) can provide reports to the AUDP that contain context information and a compliance chart

C: Jane Durante

- Commends Geoff Atkins for convening the design panel & DPB
- Indicates how channels of communication are improving

Q: Harold Kalke

- When the program for a building is established, what is site selection then undertaken?

A: Geoff Atkins

- C & CP's mandate; ultimately the Director of Planning chooses based on an analysis of all existing possibilities

Q: Harold Kalke

- Has thought been given to establishing academic precincts? Is this part of location analysis for projects?

A: Geoff Atkins

- Selection involves the Main Campus Plan and considers academic adjacencies, the functional requirements of the client and balances this with density

C: Joyce Drohan

- There is still a huge missing component of what the overall campus should be
- Overlays/frameworks to understand the connections on campus are needed and it would be important to consult the AUDP when this is done
- The AUDP would benefit from a more overall vision

R: Geoff Atkins

- It is UBC's intention to get to that point, which is aided at every AUDP meeting with discussion about a contextual piece

C: Joyce Drohan

- A primary AUDP frustration is style and we could have an all-day workshop on what the words in the OCP and neighbourhood plans (NP's) mean to the market, to the University, to the DPB, etc.
- There needs to be a forum to debate the issue

R: Harold Kalke

- Personal approach is to first avoid style and go on the inside to evaluate the merits of the project for the long haul

C: Rainer Fassler

- A single master plan is not a solution
- The University Boulevard design competition pulls the reigns too tightly; it needs to allow more creativity and not play it so safe because this risks missing great opportunities
- There should be pre-style consultation with applicants

R: Joe Stott

- Applicants do meet pre-application for an informal session to pull out the salient issues

C: Bev Neilson

- Concern is for balance in terms of providing a variety of housing types
- There needs to be more initiative to develop pieces of affordability and to decide where they will go
- Development of the social environment is key
- For that to happen community and connecting spaces need to be built

R: Harold Kalke

- The University is complying with the requirements for that set out in the OCP
- Students are what drive the University
- He doesn't share the notion that there should be community space in every development

R: Geoff Atkins

- CAC charges will contribute \$30 million to community amenities over 20 years

R: Joe Stott

- The specific targets in the OCP for affordability require 50% of non-institutional building to be for people to work and live on campus, 40 % of buildings are to be ground-oriented to attract families and 20% has to be rental
- Every unit in the last application approved by the DPB contained a secondary suite and there are also two co-development projects

R: Harold Kalke

- UBC isn't a Coquitlam or a Burnaby; it's mission is education and research

- Catering to faculty and students, and what is best for the mission of the University has to be the focus

R: Geoff Atkins

- Creation of a longer term vision will be worked on and will include the AUDP

R: Byron Brayley

- This should also include Housing & Conferences (Fred Fotis)

Q: Stephen Quigley

- How does the AUDP fit into the overall process for making a great University?
- Can the AUDP have the ability to speak about what is slated for each site?
- Is there opportunity to revisit other plans?

A: Harold Kalke

- What you're referring to is dissatisfaction with the result of the last process, rather than a problem with the current process
- The best interests of the University for the long term are being handicapped by the surrounding community, and the GVRD

A: Joe Stott

- UBC does not have the infrastructure to deal with complaints in the same way that a municipality does
- There is a big difference in the political culture at the GVRD versus UBC; the GVRD has one representative assigned to UBC and cannot easily adapt to conditions here

A: Fred Pritchard

- There isn't political sophistication at UBC from elected representatives and the process could be improved by engaging our political representative (GVRD) more
- It's also a matter of planners and developers working together and being responsive, because they respond to different things (market versus rules)

C: Byron Brayley

- Echoes Harold Kalke and Fred Pritchard and that UBC is trying to be the best University
- UBC is not a municipality, an important distinction, but the University hasn't been very politically sophisticated either
- There needs to be a more comprehensive vision to be the best, and the best group of lobbyists for this are those present
- It would help to talk to the GVRD and government in general about this

C: Rainier Fassler

- To clarify previous comments, he agrees a master plan/vision is needed, but that the layers have not been addressed is the problem; the notion of a master plan has to be expanded
- There should be a University Vision and a budget for that infrastructure to happen

Q: Joyce Drohan

- Why don't institutional buildings go to the DPB?

A: Joe Stott

- The DPB covers areas where there is a neighbourhood plan in place

A: Geoff Atkins

- The possibility of the BoG delegating institutional projects to the DPB is being looked at
- The Main Campus Plan is being revisited this year
- There are opportunities with the appointment of the University Architect and Director of Planning for visioning
- One question is whether to have individuals do this, or to outsource

C: David Barnes / Joyce Drohan:

- Reverse the idea: the University needs a champion internal to guide the process, a key point person to represent all the initiatives

C: Joyce Drohan

- The University Architect should be an Architect-Urban Designer, rather than an Architect/Landscape Architect; the vision should be of primary importance though, titles aside

C/Q: Sid Siddiqui

- AUDP ToR should contain sustainability guidelines; the university is missing a huge opportunity to reduce cost and to project a message
- What are the guidelines/targets for this and why is the University not implementing or enforcing them, particularly for residential development?

A: Geoff Atkins

- Sustainability isn't in the ToR because it wasn't highlighted at the time of inception
- The university is passionate about sustainability
- It is one component: ecological, social & economic pieces

C: Freda Pagani

- You can't get sustainability by tinkering, the whole project team has to be involved
- The University has to decide on a standard and apply it
- There is a feeling that all the opportunities for sustainable development with residential development on campus is slipping away because the guidelines are not set; we are missing the chance and it is tragic

C: Geoff Atkins

- Accepts responsibility for sustainability
- Successful sustainability initiatives on other fronts

C: Harold Kalke

- What makes a good committee is to apply the notion of "checking you passports at the door" (credentials) so that everyone represents the University and is equal

Geoff Atkins thanked the members of both groups, made final comments, and formally adjourned the meeting.



**ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL  
MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting of the University of British Columbia Advisory Urban Design Panel held at 4:00 p.m. on February 19, 2004 in the Board & Senate Board Room

**Members Present:**

Voting Members: Acting Chair Jane Durante, Bev Nielsen, Byron Braley, Joyce Drohan and Stephen Quigley

**Members Absent:**

Douglas Patterson, Joost Bakker, Sid Siddiqui, Rainer Fassler and John O'Donnell

**Staff Present:**

Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning, Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect, Jim Carruthers, Manager of Development Services and Recording Secretary, Amrita Bastians

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m.

2.0 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the agenda be confirmed as circulated**

**CARRIED**

3.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on January 15, 2004 be adopted with the following inclusion to the summary comments on UBC Marine Residences: “Connections to the surrounding campus require significant strength, clarity and generosity”**

**CARRIED**

4.0 OTHER BUSINESS:

- Change of venue for future AUDP meetings
- Comments from Joyce Drohan and Stephen Quigley on the joint GVRD/UBC workshop held on February 07, 2004. The purpose of the workshop was to provide an opportunity for the UBC community and neighbours to discuss issues for consideration by the GVRD/UBC Joint Committee to improve the implementation of the Official Community Plan
- Election of a Vice Chair
- Comments on report and evaluation matrix

---

## 1. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

### 1.1 Ladha Science Centre

Address:	South-west corner University Boulevard and Wesbrook
Dev. Appl:	DA03048
Architect:	Johnston, Davidson Architecture + Planning Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning
Lessee/Occupant:	Science Undergraduates
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Michael Kingsmill, Douglas Johnston, Kim Johnston, Randall Sharp
UBC Staff:	Jim Carruthers, Freda Pagani, and Joe Stott

---

Joe Stott (JS) outlined the report used for the first time on this project. The report is brief but comprehensive, and provides more context on the proposal, and an evaluation matrix. JS requested the Panel's comments on the topical format and matrix of this report.

Michael Kingsmill (MK) introduced the team. Since the last meeting the project has been to the Development Review Committee and a public presentation. In compliance with a request at the first DRC meeting, an air dispersion study was undertaken to confirm that the fume hoods on the Chem/Physics building would not have a detrimental effect on the roof garden. The report states there will be no detrimental effects from the fume hoods.

He continued with the project's responses to four AUDP comments from the January 15 meeting.

1. Property lines on the street side: Front set back at the street to be in line with Hebb Theatre. On the floors above, the line is established at the maximum projection of Hebb Theatre.
2. Sharing stairwells: This would not be in the best interest of the project. It could create awkward projections from the building and may place demands on the limited budget to upgrade the adjoining building.
3. Connections to other buildings: Original response is appropriate given that any one building does not have significant population counts and any connection to an adjoining building may serve to secularise the building to one user group rather than the diverse student population.
4. Increasing the number of floors: As a result of budget restrictions the lower level has been down sized to a service floor and student functions have been placed on the roof.

Using revised boards and a model, Douglas Johnston (DJ) spoke to the design, context and materials:

- Front façade lines up with Hebb Theatre
- Ground plane pedestrian around building
- Inside spaces explained
- Moved spaces from basement to penthouse
- Reviewed floor plans, elevations and sections
- Exterior materials simplified
- North façade views

With roof and landscape plans, Randal Sharp (RS) spoke to the landscaping:

- Landscape implements sustainability
- Green features - plant material for shading, roof deck planting for cooling (evapotranspiration)
- Rainwater will be visible
- Water feature will be enlivened
- Importance of CPTED

The Panel questioned the presenters on: east elevation (glass facing east), extent of open space, water storage on roof, wheel chair accessibility to pedestrian plaza and possibility of having an exterior lift to plaza, exiting locations and door swings, open breezeway off elevator exit and code implications of moving building against Hebb Theatre.

The Acting Chair read the previous issues of the Panel and the Applicant's response.

Panel's comments:

- Would like to see walkway on west edge of the building become a ramp; suggests an exterior lift be added at stairs, as the southern walkway is a main pedestrian way.
- The Applicant was congratulated for the effort made to address the concerns of the Panel. Appreciation for the direction of the building - simplicity, crispness and modernist expression that resonates with other buildings on campus. Likes the smaller scale. Concern with public space and the extent of the site. Discussed driveway to the west. (*FP - driveway development will likely be part of Chemistry Building renovation.*) Campus connections don't work well and generally need strengthening. Needs more landscape work on south side. Removal of planter for replacement with water needs further study. Double roadway on East Mall is a concern, creates a disconnect. UBC should consider changing this configuration.
- Need to look at physical security in building. Concern about floor to ceiling glass on east, especially during summer months. Building design should discourage use of elevators. Stairs should be rearranged for easy access.
- Design is much better. Louvres should also be on upper level on south and east. Prominent corner column needs more work - shape etc. Supports ramp through the site. Suggested meeting with John Lane, Physical Access Advisor. Water feature is too constrained - loosen it up and make it more curvilinear and water-like; integrate more landscaping. Concern about tie-in and effect of transit node across the street.
- Agrees that building form and materials are much improved. Skeptical about usefulness of roof area given the campus is used from September - April; needs more enclosure. Building activity is too far from road, due to entry size. Agrees with comment on access; should have more, smaller washrooms on different floors. Four outside doors too many for a small stand-alone building - needs a proctor at all times. Outside staircase to second floor is a security concern - door will get propped open.

*Applicant's response:* Students have been 100% involved and not concerned about issue of being cold accessing the rooms on the roof garden. Also have to acknowledge Ladha's input - he wants a strong entrance. Agrees column needs more design; students will give it a strong sense of presence. Security is being studied closely. Agrees that landscape needs development.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel SUPPORTS the design of the Ladha Science Centre, DP Application DA03048 subject to staff review of the following and commends the Applicant for the effort made to respond to concerns.**

- **Ramp at back is desirable**
- **Possibly an exterior elevator to mews**
- **Security issues and exterior lighting, doors**
- **Glass on east face**
- **Column at front entrance**
- **Water feature - softening with landscape**
- **Outside roof entrance to elevator**
- **Need for consideration of another washroom**
- **Delight with modernist expression and respect for the surrounding buildings**

---

Other business:

- Future AUDP meetings will be held at the Banquet Room of UBC Botanical Gardens, 6804 SW Marine Drive. Free and ample parking is available.
- The Panel discussed at length the GVRD/UBC workshop held on February 07, 2004. Member's attendance at the workshop was appreciated. Hard copy of the workshop proceedings will be distributed to the Panel.
- Process of simplifying minutes is underway.
- Election of a Vice Chair was deferred due to insufficient members.
- Comments on report and evaluation matrix can be emailed to Joe Stott or submitted at the next meeting.

# Notes from the Special Meeting of the Advisory Urban Design Panel April 15, 2004

Present: Jane Durante  
Rainer Fassler  
Joyce Drohan  
Byron Braley  
Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect  
Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services  
Jim Moodie, Moodie Consultants

Jim Moodie gave a brief overview of progress on the development of the Neighbourhood Plan for South Campus. A draft plan will be prepared, hopefully by the end of May, with the South Campus Working Group, which is meeting every Wednesday evening. The Working Group is made up of representatives from faculty, students, Agricultural Sciences, UNA, UEL ratepayers and tenants, the Wreck Beach Society, Pacific Spirit Parks Society and Hampton Place residents.

Consultants are providing background information to the Group; VIA Architecture, Ray Letkeman, Kim Perry, Mark Holland, Richard Drdul and Aplin and Martin.

The AUDP requested an opportunity to provide input to the development of the design guidelines for neighbourhoods. It was felt that this would provide clarity and consistency for future project proponents.

The panel were concerned that the neighbourhood planning seemed to be progressing without overall coordination of aspects such as pedestrian traffic flow and connections.

There was a strong feeling that images to outline the design direction expected for projects would be important, i.e. that words were not sufficient to describe clearly the design intent.

There was a concern that some of the units in the projects that had come before the panel seemed very large. This is because the CCP requires density to be measured both by unit count and FSR and a balance needs to be achieved to meet both objectives.

There was the suggestion of a design competition for a portion of the South Campus.

There was also a feeling that some of the designs that the Panel was seeing did not live up to the 'lofty' goals of the OCP, the Planning Principles and the Trek vision. The panel was looking forward to seeing design innovation come forward in future projects.

The Panel felt strongly that a way must be found to encourage the leadership that is outlined in overarching university planning documents in order to achieve a real 'University Town'.





**ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL  
MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting of the University of British Columbia Advisory Urban Design Panel held at 4:00 p.m. on May 20, 2004 in the Asian Centre

**Members Present:**

Voting Members: Acting Chair Rainer Fassler, Bev Nielsen, Byron Braley, Joyce Drohan, Joost Bakker and Stephen Quigley

**Members Absent:**

Jane Durante, Sid Siddiqui and John O'Donnell

**Staff Present:**

Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning, Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect, Lisa Colby, Manager of Development Services and Recording Secretary, Amrita Bastians

1.0 CALL TO ORDER & CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the agenda be amended to provide for the election of the Vice Chair. Rainer Fassler was unanimously elected Vice Chair until the expiry of his term.**

**CARRIED**

**In the absence of the Chair, Mr. Fassler became the Presiding Officer for the meeting.**

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on February 19, 2004 be adopted.**

**CARRIED**

3.0 APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

**3.1 Reflections – Lot 14 Mid-Campus, UBC**

Dev. Appl:	DP 04005
Developer:	Adera
Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Jonathan Losee Ltd.
Lessee/Occupant:	Market housing
Review:	First
Delegation:	Norm Couttie, Darren Chung, Dale Staples, Jonathan Losee
UBC Staff:	Freda Pagani, Joe Stott and Lisa Colby

Norm Couttie (NC) introduced the team. Using boards and a model, NC went over the neighbourhood context, site location, site topography, design and sustainability. Proposing a 77-unit apartment building – four storey wood frame over concrete parkade. Design vernacular is different to “Journey”. Pitched roof is more appropriate in this case. Character is “west side classic”. Working with UBCPT to draw up a LEED type checklist. Some issues with LEED - not suitable for residential, has a high emphasis on air-conditioning, lack of ranking for cost, complexity and effectiveness for different measures.

Dale Staples (DS) provided background on the design. An attempt was made to make the design complementary to “Journey”. Horizontal lines of building will pick up horizontal aspects of “Journey”. Strong 3<sup>rd</sup> floor cornice line and setback for 4<sup>th</sup> floor. Will meet City of Vancouver requirements for enhanced accessibility within suites.

Jonathan Losee (JL) presented with roof and landscape plans:

- London Plane trees need to be relocated - (trees are within the building floor plan). Arborist assessing transplant potential; existing trees have been topped due to overhead power lines. More desirable to replace trees.
- Landscape ideas taken from Journey – same materials, but used in a more formal design
- Terraced water feature /reflecting pools provides linkage of the two buildings across Main Mall.
- Native materials as per Journey but used in a more formal way in Reflections

Joe Stott brought the Panel’s attention to the Staff Report on this project and specific concerns expressed in page 5 vis a vis relationship to Journey, architectural style, tree location, parkade access and ramp. The Development Permit Board will review this project on June 16 and will consider the comments of the AUDP.

The Panel questioned the presenters on the project including status of overhead power line, why two separate buildings were not considered as the CCP demonstrates, length of the building, scale, FSR, discrepancy in plans and elevations, treatment of bridge, the pool area and why it wasn’t approached as an amenity space, adaptable handicap units, spacing of existing Plane trees, rules for ground oriented units and future of open space.

Panel’s comments:

- Imposing scale. Understands the challenge of the slope, but the length of the building and the way it is broken up is not effective. It is a relentless street wall. Suggests a great deal more transparency for the break and the roof. Judgement in the Neighbourhood Plan to have two buildings was good. Very odd roof form – bungalow like; flat roof would reduce scale and better complement Journey. Contemporary aspect of Journey should be reflected in Reflections. Concern about focus on privacy, entries should be more connected to the street. Applicant was challenged to see how LEED could be applied to this project - not acceptable to say LEED doesn’t work.
- University Town should be finer-grained. Appreciates efforts to break down the mass of the building, but concerned that the proposed length of buildings along Main Mall is still beyond desired scale of the town. Consider other ways of linking the buildings – open glass, innovative design, and public access through. Buildings need not connect/relate to each other, they can be different. Sustainability (FP) – latest draft UBC guidelines were given to UBCPT and the developer to cost out sustainability features and test financial feasibility of guidelines. Director of Sustainability is concerned this approach will result in piecemeal selection of guidelines, based on cost. Sustainability is best dealt with through an integrated design process and this method is not in the spirit of the approach we should be taking; decisions must be made on the basis of a whole system. NC - Adera has committed to adhere to all mandatory guidelines and has provided letter of commitment to UBCPT. Copy of this letter to be sent to the Sustainability Office.
- Missed opportunity with water feature. Consider opening up the buildings to add public access and develop a space for resident children who would prefer to play closer to home. Water feature could relate more to human scale and more integrated to the ground. Complimented Applicant’s approach to accessibility.
- This project was envisioned as 2 buildings and it is surprising to see it as a long narrow mass. Will the 4th floor have a view over Journey, and is that the justification? A long solid stretch of solid urbaneness is an odd fit in this location, too tunnel-like. Consider variation in height.
- Concern about quality and character of Main Mall created by these projects. Main Mall is the public, symbolic campus open space of the university and University Town and this is the first instance of private development encapsulating the Mall. Concern about sense of experience - at what point is it a semi private space and to what extent is the experience of it still one of being in a public space? Encouraged Applicant to look at a second style for the second half. Explore setting the buildings apart as proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. No necessity to marry landscape treatment - play up differences. Preserve integrity of Main Mall; look for more differences along the length of Main Mall. To what extent can the illusion be created that Main Mall is bridging the water feature? Tree retention is encouraged – rate of growth and impact of new trees will never catch up. Not opposed to ramp variance to Eagles Drive. Push the envelope with sustainability measures.

- FP – concerned with cornice line on roofline at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor that is not holding anything up – should look at expressing it in a different way. Comment was made at the Development Review Committee.
- Disappointed to see this project reverting to a traditional style. Panel was very supportive of the contemporary expression of previous project (Journey). Main Mall is the most important link between the university town and academic campus core. Should look at Journey's contemporary theme and materials. Sustainability measures are crucial. Approach to accessibility is appreciated.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel has reviewed the design of Reflections - Lot 14, Mid Campus, DP Application DP04005. The Panel does not support the application and recommends a revised design that addresses the following major concerns and recommendations:**

- **Scale and architectural style**
- **Main Mall character and experience**
- **Explore setting the buildings apart as proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan or otherwise allowing more light through the centre and/or top floor**
- **Celebrate Main Mall as a unique, highly symbolic campus public open space**
- **Sustainability measures are crucial – see how LEED can be applied to this project**
- **Retention of trees to be looked at more seriously; consider maturity**

#### 4.0 OTHER BUSINESS:

Joe Stott updated the Panel on the South Campus Plan. University has undertaken a new approach to design the plan in consultation with the community and to this end a Working Group has been established with a team of consultants (coordinated by Jim Moodie) . A different section of the Plan is addressed each week. Members were invited to attend the Working Group sessions at 6:00 p.m. on Wednesdays, at the Ponderosa. Advisory Planning Committee for the South Campus Neighbourhood has been appointed. Technical Advisory Committee is the second advisory body to address interagency issues and is a coordination of bureaucracies – highways, translink, GVRD. The result of this process will be concluded with a first Draft Plan, by end of June. The first open house was a success and a second is planned for May 27 at the Ponderosa, from 6:00 – 7:30 p.m on issues and options approach to the Plan. FP requested the members to submit architectural images they consider appropriate to South Campus, for consideration.

#### 5.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

#### NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Urban Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, June 17, 2004 at 4:00 p.m.



**ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL  
MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting of the University of British Columbia Advisory Urban Design Panel held at 4:00 p.m. on June 17, 2004 in Room # 604 of the Asian Centre

**Members Present:**

Voting Members: Acting Chair Jane Durante, Rainer Fassler, Bev Nielsen, Byron Braley, Joyce Drohan, Joost Bakker and John O'Donnell

**Members Absent:**

Sid Siddiqui and Stephen Quigley

**Staff Present:**

Joe Stott, Assoc Director, Community & Land Use Planning, Lisa Colby, Manager of Development Services and Recording Secretary, Amrita Bastians

1.0 CALL TO ORDER & CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the agenda be confirmed as circulated.**

**CARRIED**

2.0 ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Duly moved and seconded

**THAT the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on May 20, 2004 be adopted.**

**CARRIED**

Subject to approval by the Panel, Joe Stott proposed that the meetings for the balance of the year be revised. The current schedule follows rather than precedes the Development Permit Board meeting for that month and in some cases, adds a month's delay.

**CARRIED**

3.0 APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:

**3.1 Reflections – Lot 14 Mid-Campus, UBC**

Dev. Appl:	DP 04005
Developer:	Adera
Architect:	Integra Architecture Inc.
Landscape Architect:	Jonathan Losee Ltd.
Lessee/Occupant:	Market housing
Review:	Second
Delegation:	Norm Couttie, Darren Chung, Dale Staples, Jonathan Losee
UBC Staff:	Joe Stott and Lisa Colby

Norm Couttie (NC) introduced the team and proceeded with his presentation. In response to the previous comments by the Panel, the applicant has revised the design and seeks the approval of the Panel.

- a) **Scale:** The “two” buildings will remain joined as one but the connection will be glass, the transparency intended to emphasize their separation.
- b) **Roof form:** The roof will remain flat with a pitched roof around the perimeter. It will appear flat from pedestrian level, but pitched from a distance, which the architect considers more suited to its location on the highest elevation in the Mid-Campus neighbourhood. However the Applicant is prepared to consider a flat roof if the Panel still feels strongly about it.

- c) **Architectural character:** Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Panel's comments and opted to retain the "West Side Classic" architectural character.
- d) **Water feature:** Child's play and public access will not be encouraged for liability reasons, but the water feature will be for visual enjoyment in the form of a raised reflecting pond with nearby seating and will not be the major feature.
- e) **Main Mall character and experience:** Main Mall will remain uninterrupted but paving will be widened slightly at the pond area. A low granite-faced wall with metal fence and granite posts at the property line is proposed to differentiate between the public and semi-private space. Gateway features before and after the project along Main Mall, hence pedestrian connection through Reflections is not considered necessary.
- f) **London Plane trees:** Will be removed. Trees have been topped and will never match the proper shape of the trees on the opposite side. UBCPT and arborist are still reviewing transplant viability. If not viable, new London Plane trees will be planted.
- g) **Sustainability:** Designers, Building Managers and approving authorities believe the current LEED programme is not effective for Strata residential projects. In addition to the base list of proposed sustainability features, the applicant will work with UBC to increase factual information behind UBC's evolving sustainability checklist for new projects.  
The applicant will also be contributing approximately \$20,000 to a new "well-drain" to improve site storm-water drainage in the Mid-Campus area. This "well" could also create a reservoir, which might be pumped-out in drier months to be used for landscape irrigation needs, although this still needs to be tested. Adera indicates it will explore this potential once test results are available. The current landscape plan indicates an automatic irrigation system.  
Applicant also plans to install hot water metering for the entire project.

The Panel questioned the presenters on power lines and main entry elevation.

Panel's comments:

- One member supported the 1.86 FSR and the traditional element for the front door in Option 1. In context of the entire neighbourhood, scale of the building is not a concern. Supports a more traditional approach to building style. Journey is not as pleasing as this project - lacks a level of richness. As a response to market concerns, Adera is spending more on the exterior, to provide richness. Does not support the flat roof - low slope pitched roof works very well. In the long run it would give the Strata a more durable, sustainable roof. Does not think it is the Panel's mandate to comment on sustainability issues. This should be the mandate of the Environmental Review Committee.
- Another member disagreed with comment re: sustainability. AUDP should have input and responsibilities in that regard. Revised presentation has no real change or movement – only some reflection on the comments and few suggestions of possible changes to the bridge link. Original plan was to be less symmetrical and more biaxial. The most powerful design element of this university is Main Mall; it is the integrating device that connects the whole university and the neighbourhoods.
- After a site visit, supports Main Mall width and character. Disappointed with the entry - expected to see a more definitive break by an arch or break in the scale – previous design may be better. This solution does not create a finer grid. Not so upset with the scale of the building anymore because the buildings are quite far apart and does not look like a narrow dark corridor – plenty of sun shining through, making it very pleasant. Issue is at ground level - needs more access to the various sites.
- Building is a mirror image. Previous comments suggested the building could be different in character or rearranging floor plans, different elevations etc. Surprised that more investigation was not done into some of the opportunities. Revised presentation looks the same as the previous design.
- Concurs with previous comments re importance of Main Mall. Absolute symmetry of the buildings claims that part of the Mall as a residential precinct; the Mall should be independent of residential entrances. Making the buildings different would celebrate Main Mall. Respectfully disagrees with the traditional style Wouldn't suggest craftsman style for the Chemistry building. The Mall is the important

issue; small intrusions of water features are a wrong direction. Disappointed with the disagreement of the Applicant regarding architectural character.

- Wants to see projects that are serious about sustainability and would like to see sustainability initiatives noted as “investigative” become real commitments – this project does not go far enough. University should get serious with the quality of sustainability. Reinforced previous comments on Main Mall. It is the most significant spine in the university and to that end neither Journey nor Reflections is generous enough in their contribution. Project looks like a typical development for multi residential zone in a typical city neighbourhood and is not what’s called for here – need to go much further and reap all the benefits of its location. Should have a grand boulevard character. Needs a generous scale, larger architectural gestures including a much more generous break between the buildings and a much more generous entrance. Current entrance in Journey is not strong enough.  
At the May 27 Workshop with stakeholders to the South Campus Plan, there was consistent commentary as to why, on a university campus focussed on innovation and research, the housing projects can’t be more contemporary and innovative. Hopes the South Campus and Development Guidelines will address this. This project needs to as well.

Duly moved

**THAT the Advisory Urban Design Panel has reviewed the revised design of Reflections - Lot 14, Mid Campus, DP Application DP04005. The Panel does not support the application based on the following major concerns:**

- **Architectural form should be more contemporary**
- **Break between the two buildings is insufficient**
- **Sustainability commitments (including LEED standard application) insufficient**
- **Architectural relationship to Main Mall should be improved**

- 
- Joe Stott announced the expiry of Rainer Fassler’s term on the AUDP and extended the university’s appreciation for his service and contribution to the development process on campus. Acting Chair Jane Durante also expressed her thanks and appreciation to Rainer.
  - For the benefit of the members who did not attend the May meeting, Joe Stott briefly recounted the upcoming reorganization at Campus & Community Planning.
  - In response to some members’ questions on the upcoming Design Competition re: draft documentation and the AUDP involvement in the process, Joe Stott undertook to respond to the Panel shortly, by email.
  - Questions arose as to the role of the AUDP within the framework of development on Campus and to what extent the Design Panel’s comments are honoured. Reference was made to Geoff Atkins’ comment about the AUDP reflecting the Vancouver Design Panel. There was consensus in the desire to see some agreed upon instructions to the Developers and Architects as to where the Design Panel should be making adjustments. A publicly accessible Org Chart would contribute to this sense of openness and have great value. This is suggested in the Planning Principles.  
JS - current Org Chart is available on [www.planning.ubc.ca](http://www.planning.ubc.ca). Need to work on a process of continuous improvement. Two appointments to be made to the DPB (term expires in September), and the Chair of the DPB is charged with a report after 24 months. AUDP will be given an opportunity to provide input to that report

#### 4.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

#### NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the Advisory Urban Design Panel is scheduled for Thursday, July 15, 2004 at 4:00 p.m.



## UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel

### Minutes

**Date:** Thursday, July 15, 2004  
**Time:** 4:00 – 7:30 p.m.  
**Venue:** Asian Centre, 1871 West Mall, Room 604

**Members present:** Jane Durante (Chair)  
Byron Braley  
Joyce Drohan  
Bev Nielsen  
John O'Donnell  
Stephen Quigley  
Sid Siddiqui

**Regrets:** Joost Bakker

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Acting Director Campus & Community Planning; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Tom Miller, Intracorp Developments Ltd.; Roger Koodoo, Intracorp Developments Ltd; Douglas Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects; Lena Chorobik, Wendy Grandin/Viewpoint Landscape Architects; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc; Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates.

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the June 17, 2004 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 DP 04007: Theological Lot 38 Residential Development and Lots 21 thru 28 Duplexes

Joe Stott presented the staff report to the panel and introduced Tom Miller, Intracorp, to present the application for the residential development in the Theological Neighbourhood that will be forwarded to the Development Permit Board. This application is for a 55-unit apartment building and 3 townhouses on Lot 38, and 8 duplexes in four buildings on Lots 21 thru 28. An apartment building and townhouses are also proposed for Lot 37, which will be applied for in a separate application in the fall. Tom M. introduced Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects to provide the details for this application.

Doug R. discussed the context of this application within the Theological Neighbourhood, the topography of the site, architectural style, materials, and the green features proposed for this development. This project will be built to the Vancouver accessibility standards. The two cityhomes (the two northern most apartment units) are not accessible from the apartment building corridor, but do have access through the basement from the parkade.

Lena Chorobik, Wendy Grandin/Viewpoint Landscape Architects, outlined the trees to be retained and provided details on the patios for the duplexes, ground units of the apartment buildings, along the pedestrian pathway, and woonerf.

*The Panel discussed the following issues with the Applicant:*

### **Pond**

- Depth of the pond will fluctuate, but will be maintained at 19" inches deep, designed for safety reasons.
- Approx. 100 feet wide, ensures privacy between the 2 apartment buildings, when the project is complete.
  - There is a dotted line on the plan across the pond, delineating the edge of the parkade and a partition of the pond between Lots 37 and 38. The Lot 37 portion will be built later in association with that development. The partition wall will be 3-inches lower than the outer edge of the pond, allowing overflow of water to fill both halves when the other side is built.
- Applicant to consider using the pond for cooling.
- Lighting will be subtle around the pond.
- Applicant will consider the storage of water for irrigation.
- Noise travelling over water is a concern, which can be partially dealt with by agitating the surface of the water.
- Maintenance of the pond, regarding leaf litter, will need to be addressed. Planters have a depth of 3 feet, which will be sufficient for the trees.

### **Sustainability**

- Photovoltaics are just used in the outdoor lighting. The use of geothermal is too expensive because of the scale.

### **Materials**

- Hardipanel is used on the side facing St. Marks College. Hardiboard is used on the pond side, more as a background material. Brick will be used on the face of the building and wood throughout.

### **Circulation and Parking**

- Garbage bins will be in the parkade. Garbage collection will be private, where a small truck takes out the garbage bins to the street, for the garbage trucks to empty.
- There is a built-in hammerhead at the entrance to the parkade, for vehicles to turn around.
- Access to Wesbrook will be restricted to emergency vehicles only. The details about this access will be worked out with the development of the area around St. Marks College.
- There is no public access between the townhouses from Chancellor Mews to the pond.
- Visitor parking is on Iona Drive and there is public parking available along Theology Mall.

### **Relationship with neighbours**

- Iona Building will not be visible from the pedestrian level along Chancellor Blvd.
- The peaked roofs of the bookend duplexes partially obstruct views from the townhouses and cityhomes.

### **Other**

- Aiming for a slightly lower market buyer than other developments in the Theological Neighbourhood.
- Street addresses for the townhouses and cityhomes are on Chancellor Mews.

*The Panel had the following comments:*

- Recommend more sustainable measures, incorporating a more efficient heating system or green roofs.



- The bookended-duplex units should be reconsidered regarding architectural design and roof style. Panel members strongly suggested the expression of these buildings should be a modernist one consistent with the main building of this development.
- The size of the pond and potential leakage are concerns.
- Practicability of the woonerf is a concern. Woonerf needs more landscaping.
- Overall scale of project and relationship to Lot 37.
- Material quality on upper levels of the apartment building should be refined.
- Flexibility of units to adapt for different needs, i.e. being accessible to all.

*The Applicant responded to the Panel's comments:*

The Applicant will address the comments regarding the pond. The duplexes were designed to mirror the different architectural styles in the University Endowment Lands. They will be reviewed with different forms. The materials at the front of the building are quite different as they are facing the Iona Building. The applicant agrees that materials in the upper levels do need more refinement.

Regarding the heating system, more market research is needed. It was decided to use hardipanel, as the apartment building is a wood-frame. The pond is the central theme to this development, providing a strong statement and having visual and physical access to the pond. Leaks can be easier to find, as the water just needs to be drained, compared with digging up landscaping above a parkade. The woonerf is 20 feet wide and comments are valid on the townhouse side regarding landscaping. It does need to be made more pedestrian friendly.

When the Chair called the question, the AUDP supported this project.

#### **4.0 Preliminary Introduction of the Community Centre on the Old Horse Barn Site**

Joe S. introduced Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, to make a pre-application presentation for the community centre proposed for the Mid-Campus Lot 13. This project is on the "Old Horse Barn" site, which was built in 1920 and demolished in 2003. The proposed facility would reflect this historic barn in its design. Matthew C. introduced Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates to provide the details for this application. This project will be formally scheduled on the AUDP agenda after a staff review but early Panel commentary is requested at this stage.

This site is an important transition point along Main Mall from the institutional precinct to the residential neighbourhood. Main Mall starts at the Flag Pole as a two-lane street with boulevard to Thunderbird Boulevard. Most of the buildings are set back except for the Forest Sciences Building, which is much closer to the lane. This will be mirrored on the west side of Main Mall, when the current parking lot site is developed. After the Forest Sciences Building, only the east lane continues and then turns into a pedestrian street, south of Thunderbird Boulevard. Main Mall, from Thunderbird Blvd, would serve as a pedestrian/bike greenway connecting the main campus all the way to South Campus and the Pacific Spirit Regional Park.

The site for the community centre will include a common area outdoors, which can be used as a stage for seasonal celebrations. There will also be a formal green area with benches. Play areas would be integrated throughout. The results of a questionnaire by local residents were used to determine the list of activities to be programmed at the community centre, including a daycare, exercise room, and coffee shop.

Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., discussed the details of the proposed community centre building. The proposed building design will retain the basic barn form, with the basic roof form, structure, and profile. Materials for the building will include glass and heavy timber inside, and cut stones, with natural colour post and beam for the outside.

*The Panel had the following questions and comments and the Applicant responded:*

### **Community Centre**

- Ensure safety for people of all ages.
- Provide activities for children of all ages in outdoor areas.
- The building should be transparent from the outside, for example glass in exercise room should be reviewed.
- Reinstating the barn motif has limitations.
- Modern versus traditional design for building. Maintaining the original structure of barn would have more character and heritage, need to be conscientious with introducing modern elements.
- Daycare is aimed at other than UBC staff or students, with a capacity for 30 children. Should review the role of the daycare when not in use, for example, rooms having a dual purpose. More details on the drop-off and pick-up area.

### **Sustainability**

- This project presents a great opportunity for UBC to confirm its commitment to sustainability, by designing and certifying it as a LEED Silver project.

### **Relationship with neighbours**

- The landscaping should be more formal and dignified to reflect the grand boulevard of Main Mall.
- No obstruction of view along Main Mall, from the Flag Pole to Thunderbird Stadium.
- The transition area needs more review and perhaps could terminate at the Forest Sciences Building, instead of Thunderbird Boulevard. Also review the difference between the entry into Main Mall and the termination. Several panel members felt the barn was not consistent with the 'Grand Boulevard' character of Main Mall – the primary spine of the Campus. It was suggested that given the building is a new one that the character and built form of the barn replacement structure be reviewed to reinforce the dignity and strength of this important location.

### **5.0 Other Business**

A number of items were discussed regarding the role of the AUDP. One representative from the AUDP is present at every Development Permit Board. The AUDP needs to elect a vice chair. Further resolution of procedural matters will be held over for the August 12, 2004 AUDP meeting.

### **6.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel

### Minutes

**Date:** Thursday, August 12, 2004  
**Time:** 4:00 – 6:45 p.m.  
**Venue:** Asian Centre, 1871 West Mall, Room 604

**Members present:** Joyce Drohan (Vice Chair)  
Byron Braley  
Bev Nielsen  
John O'Donnell  
Stephen Quigley

**Regrets:** Joost Bakker  
Sid Siddiqui  
Jane Durante (Chair)

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Acting Director Campus & Community Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Brent Argo, Maples Argo Architects Inc.; Alan Maples, Maples Argo Architects Inc.; Mia Hearsh, Perry & Associates; Michael McDonald, Kasian Kennedy; André Kroeger, Kasian Kennedy; Ralph Laser, Kasian Kennedy; Shawn McLean, Kasian Kennedy; and Carolyn Kennedy, Perry & Associates.

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

In the absence of the chair, Joyce Drohan was unanimously elected as Vice Chair until 2006. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the July 15, 2004 Meeting

The minutes from the July 15, 2004 meeting were not adopted at this meeting. They will be reconsidered at the September 9, 2004 meeting after revisions are made.

#### 3.0 DP 04014: Food and Nutritional Health Building

Joe Stott presented the staff report to the panel and introduced Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the Food and Nutritional Health Building. This application includes renovation to the existing Family and Nutritional Sciences Building for more office and laboratory space and a 600 m<sup>2</sup> annex addition to the building. This addition will be used for laboratory space for Food Sciences, as they will be relocating from their current building, which is on the site of the Marine Student Residences project currently under construction. Rob B. introduced the architects, Brent Argo and Alan Maples from Maples Argo Architects and the landscape architect, Mia Hearsh from Perry & Associates.

Alan M. explained the design of the building. The mechanical unit will be enclosed on the roof and there will be a screen to hide it. The building and sidewalk will align with that of the Michael Smith Building. A breezeway will connect the existing building to the new addition. This will be a concrete building with sunshades on the south side and steel columns.

The landscaping will include pedestrian connections through the area, connecting East Mall to Main Mall and the surrounding buildings. There is a grade change of one metre across the site. Trees will be planted to assist in sun shading. Expected completion date for this project is August 2005.

***The Panel discussed the following issues with the Applicant:***

**Siting**

- Many options, varying the orientation, length of the building, and location in front or behind the existing building for the siting of this building were reviewed prior to the decision for the present configuration. The expansion of the Biodiversity building, pedestrian connection east west through the site, retention of the rear courtyard, and preserving trees along East Mall restricted the location of the addition.
- The new street line has evolved over time with the Michael Smith Building to the north and the High Head Room Building to the south. The sidewalk along East Mall would be realigned to the new street line.
- This addition evolved as a result of the elimination of the Food Sciences Building to make way for the Marine Student Residences project, by UBC Housing and Conferences. There is limited funding available for this project, which precludes the possibility of a third level. The program is being reduced, the new addition will hold part of the Food Sciences Building, while others will be redistributed to other areas, where space is available.
- A future extension to this building is not planned. A master plan does not exist for the Biosciences area, but there is a Space Planning Master Plan.
- The link to the proposed Food and Nutritional Health addition meets the corridor in the existing building.

**Design**

- Existing building is concrete and looks heavy, compared with the addition, which is much smaller and lighter with the use of more glass.
- 2 options for the exterior design were presented for consideration with sunshades on both levels or just one level and increasing the size of the brow.
- The south side of the building is recessed from the grade change. The area from the sidewalk to the building needs to be addressed.
- Need to contact EcoTrek, an energy and water retrofit program, for this project.

***The Panel had the following comments:***

- Revisit the building setback from East Mall; this should be increased.
- Scale of project is too small. Increasing size and/or adding 3<sup>rd</sup> floor to the building would be supported and fit in with the neighbourhood.
- Concern with the trees being removed.
- Create more interactive spaces in the landscaping.
- Maintain site line to the High Head Room Building.
- Revisit the possibility of adding more landscaping to assist with sun shading and the balance.
- Larger brow option is not generally supported. The first rendering option is preferred.
- Application lacks contextual information, no section drawings, and insufficient information.
- Also a lack of information regarding the green initiatives.
- Consider alternatives to sun shading to allow for landscaping right to the building and provide a lighter expression to the building, for example, retractable sun shading.

No vote was taken on this application; the applicant was requested to resubmit with a more complete information package.

**4.0 DP 04016: West Mall Flex Building**

Joe Stott presented the staff report, including the Evaluation Matrix and LEED Scorecard, to the panel and introduced Michael McDonald, Kasian Kennedy, to present the application for the West Mall Flex Building. The proposed West Mall Flex Building will accommodate temporary swing space, with lecture theatres, classrooms, and office space. The project needs to be completed by September 2005 and has a strict budget. Michael M. introduced Joe Redmond from UBC Properties Trust, the architects, André Kroeger, Ralph Laser, and Shawn McLean from Kasian Kennedy, and the landscape architect, Carolyn Kennedy from Perry & Associates.

Michael M. explained the design of the building. The building will be tilt-up concrete with curtain wall glazing. The concrete will be painted a warm red-brown colour to make the building distinctive. It has a varied setback, as the site is long and narrow. The building will be built to high LEED silver, including natural ventilation in the classrooms and office space and slowing runoff from the building. Air conditioning will be required in the lecture theatres for acceptable cooling levels during the summer.

***The Panel discussed the following issues with the Applicant:***

**Design**

- Building will meet high silver LEED standard (38 points).
- There are no plans for future expansion on this building.
- Budget has driven the programming and floor space for this building.
- There are few windows in the lecture theatres because the heat from the sun would increase and require more air conditioning and the potential for blackout is desirable inside.
- Tilt-up concrete was chosen for efficiency and cost.
- Ensure quality and simple detailing on windows.
- Elevator mainly used for office space. Classroom access is mainly using the stairs.
- Weather protection along West Mall was reviewed but budget is a concern and the sidewalk is too far away from the building to be effective.

**Adjacent Parkade**

- Air circulation has been reviewed and modelled to ensure sufficiency with regards to the lecture theatres abutting the parkade wall. Air circulation would become a concern if the whole Flex Building would abut the parkade. This is not possible with the mechanical equipment for the parkade, which cannot easily be moved, so the classrooms are pulled away from the parkade and are closer to the street.
- Influence of lighting in the parkade with building next to it.
- Ensure open space between parkade and building meets CPTED standards.
- Acoustics in the building need to be addressed with regards to low frequency from engines in the parkade.

**Landscaping**

- Mechanical service area should have landscaping, as the area will be viewed from the classrooms. Vine maples are proposed for this area.
- Trellis and plantings will be done along the south side of the building.

***The Panel had the following comments:***

- Concerned with tilt-up and lack of details, depth and dimension for the scale of this building. Possibly consider a green screen.
- Revisit siting of building and consider pulling back the classrooms further from West Mall.
- South elevation needs more consideration, with its height and blankness adjacent to pedestrian route.
- Revisit north side landscaping.
- Concerned with lack of office space in this building and on campus.
- Need more animation and social space, outdoor and/or indoor, along West Mall and parkade pedestrian walkways.

- Improve street level details and consider more entries and weather protection.
- Strong wall colour needs revisiting; consider options such as textured or staining concrete compared with painting.
- Opening windows on classrooms and crush space in front of lecture theatres.
- Natural ventilation and stack effect.
- No net increase in site run-off. Roof can slow run-off.

***The Applicant responded to the Panel's comments:***

The amount of office space has been previously discussed with staff and it was determined that the ratio for this building is balanced at this time. The Applicant will address the comments regarding the south façade. Benches will be added along the West Mall. The detailing of the tilt-up, colour, and possibility of canopies will be revisited.

The AUDP did not support this project as proposed.

## **5.0 Other Business**

The role of the AUDP was raised. Joe S. recommended a ½ day workshop to discuss the role and Terms of Reference of the AUDP. This idea was supported and staff will make further arrangements.

## **6.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



# THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus and Community Planning  
www.planning.ubc.ca

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, September 23, 2004

**Time:** 4:00 – 6:45 p.m.

**Venue:** Student Union Building, 6138 Student Union Blvd, Room 206 (Council Chambers)

**Members present:** Jane Durante (Chair)  
Joost Bakker  
Byron Braley  
John O'Donnell  
Stephen Quigley  
Sid Siddiqui

**Regrets:** Joyce Drohan  
Bev Nielsen

**Staff:** Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure & Services Planning; Patrick McIsaac, Urban Design / Landscape Architect; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Joe Redmond and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc; Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates; Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust; Gordon Horsman, Westone Capital Corporation; Hugh Tangye, Bastion Development Corp.; James Hancock, Martin Brückner, Collen Dixon, and Gwyn Vose, Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright.

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes

##### 2.1 July 15, 2004 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as amended under Item 4.0, Sustainability to read:

- This project presents a great opportunity for UBC to confirm its commitment to sustainability, by designing and certifying it as a LEED Silver project.

##### 2.2 August 12, 2004 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 DP 04012: Hawthorn Place Community Centre

Lisa Colby presented the staff report to the panel and introduced the additional support staff David Grigg, Associate Director, Infrastructure and Services Planning and Patrick McIsaac, Urban Design / Landscape Architect and Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the Hawthorn Place Community Centre. The AUDP reviewed this project as a preliminary application at the July 15, 2004 meeting. Joe R. introduced the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., and the landscape architect, Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates to provide the details for this application.

Richard S. introduced the landscape context and design for this project. The main axis of Main Mall will remain uninterrupted, which included the community centre setback further from Main Mall. There will be a transition in the landscaping from the formal academic precinct to the more informal residential scale. Details of landscaping to include accessibility to the community centre, public art, activities for children of all ages, basketball area, natural amphitheatre, and garden area extending from the café. Garbage pick-up will be from Larkin Drive and additional parking will be provided along Thunderbird Blvd.

Sustainability will include catching on-site drainage, similar to Hawthorn Park, planting drought-tolerant and native species and selecting locally manufactured materials. There will be at least establishment irrigation.

Ray L. discussed the architectural details of the community centre building. These details include expressing internal activities through glazing, roof form expresses former barn site, and granite is added to the base with shingle roofs and siding. The building will be built to an equivalent of Silver LEED.

Patrick M. discussed the vision for the UBC landscape plan, including the Main Mall revitalization. This proposal is consistent with this plan.

David G. discussed the infrastructure for this area. Ensure lighting in this area will not be intrusive on neighbours. There has been discussion to raise Thunderbird Blvd at Main Mall for a pedestrian crossing. Drainage should be connected to Hawthorn Park.

*The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:*

#### Main Mall

- East lane of Main Mall is continuing through and there will be no obstructions to the view down Main Mall. Only the path adjacent to the community centre will curve to slow bike traffic through this area.
- One member noted that ‘laser grading’ of Main Mall to remove the high point and allow for a continuous view from one end of Main Mall was under consideration at one point. Staff advised that such a proposal could involve excavation of a scale likely to result in the loss of a number of mature trees, require a large amount of excavation, impact many of the buildings along Main Mall, very costly, and unsustainable.

#### Community Centre

- There will be two roof materials, the barn will have shingles and the ‘addition’ will have a dull grey standing sheen metal roof.
- Daycare space is not going to be converted for evening use. UBC Housing and Conferences will determine space allocation.
- The intended use for this building will be a local community centre primarily for the Hawthorn Area, which will be administered by the UNA. Meeting and office space will be available to everyone for a rental fee.

#### Landscaping

- Concern with noise from basketball court.
- Ensure fire access is from Larkin Drive and not Main Mall.
- Bike racks need to be well maintained.
- The pool on the axis of Main Mall is intended as a focal point and sound source for the terrace.
- Public art will be placed around the pool, gates, fence around the daycare and other areas.

#### Sustainability

- The onsite drainage will have minimal standing water to prevent mosquitoes.
- The building will not be registered with LEED, just an equivalency.
- There is no air conditioning for the building, there are additional windows for cross-ventilation.

***The Panel had the following comments:***



- One member recommended the design is strong enough that removal of some of the higher end finishes such as the stone or shingles would be supported if cost overruns were encountered.
- Main Mall design should be the primary informer of the landscape to the north of the community centre building. The variety of space in all the community functions should be auxiliary to the strength of the Mall's presence.
- Ensure views down Main Mall are maintained.
- Main Mall landscaping needs to be revisited, especially the transition from the academic to residential. Recommend creating a common effect along Main Mall as a transition, for example with the use of pavers. The flagpole needs to be rethought.
- Details relating to building materials still need to be simplified, including the use of two different roofing materials.
- One member did not feel retention of the London Planes was crucial.
- One member was concerned that project may be 'over-programmed' for such a simple project and UBC Properties Trust must be careful to ensure building operates as intended or it will 'fall flat' (ie. if Café operator shuts down).
- The applicant was complimented on a high quality presentation.
- One member felt that Main Mall should be more public at this transition space, yet it's form seems to disintegrate within the site.
- One member recommended the building be registered with LEED to show commitment to sustainability. Also pursue other sustainable measures such as collecting rainwater, geothermal possibilities, and ensure building is shaded.
- Showers are recommended for the community centre, even if there is no room for locker rooms.
- Review options to memorialise the barn, perhaps a plaque.

Joe R. commented that Main Mall is a key component of the University character but is already broken in some places, e.g. Rose Garden, and it changes character to reflect areas through which it runs.

The panel supported the community centre building with minimal landscape for the immediate surrounding site bounded by Main Mall on the east and Thunderbird Blvd on the north. The overall landscape design will be revisited in a separate meeting after panel members have been brought up to speed with the current thinking for the new mall design.

Special Meeting: Thursday, October 7, 2004 on Main Mall Landscape  
Freda Pagani offered to organize a presentation of the Main Mall landscape plan.

#### **4.0 Pre-Application Discussion on Two Theological Sites**

Lisa Colby introduced James Hancock, from Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright to present the Site H and Lot 51 Market Residential projects in the Theological Neighbourhood. These applications were introduced as a 'pre-application' consultation and AUDP commentary was invited at this early stage.

##### **4.1 Site H Market Residential – High Rise Tower**

*The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:*

- Massing of the building looks heavy behind Iona Building and competes too much with it. Iona creates and addresses a forecourt with Chancellor. This proposal competes with that drama.
- Strong horizontal is too heavy; building should appear taller and slimmer.
- Materials should be glassier and lighter, with heavier materials on the lower end, articulate first 2 storeys in a stronger manner, including the front door and entry.
- Building should be distinctive and unique, don't try to mimic Iona Building. Might be part of Gage Towers 'family' or stand on its own.
- List of sustainability features and compliance with University guidelines and policies should be provided with the project.
- Improve streetscape of Walter Gage Road.

#### **4.2 Lot 51 Market Residential**

The architecture was designed to reflect the Iona Building. There will be a 7-storey apartment building with 11, 2-storey townhouses at grade on Lot 51. The suites will be oriented towards the views with access to the main building from Iona Drive.

*The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:*

- Attention to detail will be important with regards to the juxtaposition of this building with the existing family housing to the south. Existing townhouses are family oriented, wood-frame, plastic toys. New housing would be high-end. Will new buyers tolerate the housing behind?
- Be careful of compatibility of materials proposed with existing housing on St Andrews and behind.
- List of sustainability features and compliance with University guidelines and policies will be required.
- Proposal tries to put a large mass in a small scale setting. Perhaps it should articulate the proposed building more at the second storey level before going up to higher levels. Would also be open to a glassier style.

#### **5.0 Other Business**

None.

#### **6.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



# THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus and Community Planning  
www.planning.ubc.ca

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 14, 2004

**Time:** 4:30 – 6:45 p.m.

**Venue:** Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

**Members present:** Joyce Drohan (Co-Chair)  
Joost Bakker  
Byron Braley  
John O'Donnell  
Stephen Quigley  
Sid Siddiqui

**Regrets:** Jane Durante  
Bev Nielsen

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Acting Director, C&CP; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Joe Redmond, Dan Bock, and Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; J. Terry Barkley, CannonJohnston Architecture Inc.; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates.

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30pm. The Panel approved the agenda as amended, with the removal of Item 5.0.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes September 23, 2004 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as amended:

- Item 3.0, the first comment, change wording to: One member recommended the design is strong enough that removal of some of the higher end finishes, such as the stone or shingles, would be supported if cost overruns were encountered.
- Item 4.1, at the end of the third comment, to add: including the front door and entry.
- Item 4.1, add the comment to the end: Improve streetscape of Walter Gage Road.

#### 3.0 DP 04018: New Empire Pool

Joe Stott presented the staff report to the panel and introduced Dan Bock, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the New Empire Pool. Dan B. introduced the architect Terry Barkley, CannonJohnston Architecture Inc. to provide the details for this application. The landscaping for this project still needs to be addressed.

Terry B. presented the details of the new Empire Pool. These details include the context and layout of the pool, the location of the slide and the dive tower, and the berms on the east and possibly north sides of the pool. The pedestrian bridge will be a separate application.

*The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:*

Pool

- Sunshade studies have been done, only in the fall in the late afternoon does the pool get shaded.
- Pool will not be painted; just a white colour and the water will reflect the colour of the sky.

- The pool has no shallow end; the shallowest end of the pool is 3 metres.
- Slide details are awaiting funding.
- Pool is primarily a university pool and for use in competitions. The depth is not very family-oriented.
- Deck should have public appeal and amenities. Moveable landscaping is important. The bleachers are not permanent so the area against War Memorial Gym is clear most of the year. There is clearance under the bleachers.
- The proposed seating is required for events and will be used.

#### Circulation

- Access is not changing, it is still from the current location. Most visitors will be pedestrians from the bus loop. The drop-off area from the turnaround is secondary, mainly for emergency and fire access. There is an entrance to the outdoor pool from the turnaround, but this will only be used during events.
- Vehicular access from Wesbrook will change; details will be determined at the University Blvd. Design Competition.
- All access is at grade.
- Disabled parking will be available near the pool. Other parking will be in the North Parkade or possibly in one of the additional building's underground parkade along University Blvd.
- MacInnes Field will be reoriented towards the east and slightly larger than its current size. Future housing will be along Wesbrook at the east end of the field.

#### Sustainability

- Energy has not been reviewed yet. Also solar and geothermal power will be reviewed but is partly dependent on the design of University Boulevard. Measures will be taken to accept alternative sources. Blanket options and recycling deck drainage water are also being reviewed.

#### ***The Panel had the following comments:***

- Landscape is important for this project. East walkway by War Memorial Gym needs to be comfortable through landscaping and lighting. A wall of green along one end would also be beneficial.
- Important that the fence is impenetrable for security and also transparent for views.
- Reconsider bringing the pedestrian bridge back, as it would contribute to circulation, provide views of the pool and be integrated into the public realm. Possibly reconfigure dive tower and slide with bridge to provide a stronger visual end.
- Circulation for pedestrians needs to be clear.
- Consider a retractable roof.
- Two members had concerns with parking.
- Alternate energy sources should be incorporated.
- Ensure noise does not impact residential.

The panel supported the new empire pool, subject to revisiting the landscape design at a future meeting. A shadow plan was also requested.

Joe Redmond requested the panel's comments on the landscaping for the athletic commons area, linking the pool with the field, SRC, Gym and surrounding areas.

#### ***The Panel had the following comments:***

- Add a hard perimeter around the commons area to tie it together.
- The berm could be doubled as accessible. If the bridge were to proceed, an elevator would be required on the south side as there is not enough room for a ramp.
- The berm could be continuous on both sides but doesn't have to reach the full length. Incorporate with the field.
- Type of fence around the pool needs careful review.
- Circuitability and open space is important.

#### **4.0 DP 04022: East Campus Rental Housing**

Joe S. presented the staff report to the panel and introduced Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the East Campus Rental Housing. Matthew C. introduced the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., and the landscape architect, Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates to provide the details for this application.

Ray L. provided the context for the East Campus Rental Housing and discussed the architectural details of the building, which included the materials, roof and window details.

Matthew C. will be participating in a sustainability workshop with the design team in the following week to determine the details on compliance with UBC's Draft EAP.

Michael P. introduced the landscape context and design for this project, including the below grade bicycle parking and vehicular parking at grade.

*The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:*

##### **Building**

- This is a UBC PT project, so it is market rental housing, not part of UBC Housing & Conferences. Housing is aimed at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year students.
- There is no parking available underground, only surface visitor parking, which includes a handicap space, hook-up for alternative fuelled vehicles and one space for a car from the Co-operative Auto Network (CAN). It hasn't been determined if metered parking will be available along Wesbrook Mall. There will also be a parkade proposed for across Wesbrook, where spaces can be rented by students.
- Size of rooms are 8' 6" x 14'.

##### **Landscaping**

- Outdoor recreational space should be available as part of this site. Possibly through [the courtyard?

##### ***The Panel had the following comments:***

- Building should be more residential, less of a residence. Should incorporate sliding doors with windows.
- Program use of outdoor space and access. Incorporate a common area for the residents.
- Style should have more west coast detailing and sensibility, move away from the traditional.
- Building should be moved further west, away from the high rise proposed on the adjacent site to the east. Also address sensitivity to high-rise through landscaping.
- Ensure building is durable.
- Consider adding balconies to suites. This can be done visually, as there have been concerns with keeping balconies neat, generally from a lack of storage in the suite. Pursue the possibility of creative storage for the building.
- Review the option of changing the program from 6 to 4 bed units. Rooms are very narrow.
- Pull out courtyard to the street to have a more animated street front.
- Review the removal of the pitch in the roof in the middle. Possibility to use flat roof as a common outdoor area.

The panel supported the East Campus Rental housing (1 member abstained from the vote).

**Action:** Panel request a copy of the sustainability report.

#### **5.0 Other Business**

- 5.1** 2005 Meeting schedule will be confirmed through email.

## **6.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*