



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2005



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus and Community Planning
www.planning.ubc.ca

Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, January 13, 2005
Time: 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members present: Jane Durante (Chair)
Joyce Drohan
Joost Bakker
Byron Braley
John O'Donnell
Stephen Quigley

Staff: Joe Stott, Acting Director, C&CP; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect;
Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust; Gordon Horsman, Westone Capital Corporation; Kim Maust, Bastion Development Corp.; James Hancock, Martin Brückner, and Gwyn Vose, Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright; 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 circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes October 14, 2004 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 04024: Theological Lot 44 Market Residential (Site H)

Joe Stott introduced the staff report to the panel and introduced Gord Horsman, Westone Capital Corporation, to present the application for the proposed market residential building (Ocean Point) on Lot 44 of the Theological Neighbourhood. Freda Pagani summarised the comments from the pre-application presentation at the September 23, 2004 AUDP meeting. Gord H. introduced the architects Martin Brückner and James Hancock, Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright, and the landscape architect Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, who each presented the details of this project.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant.

Building

- The main entrance to the building is from Walter Gage Road, but the building is oriented to north for the views. There is a granite element with seating and a water feature at the entrance.
- There is a height restriction on the site of 135 m.
- The applicant has had previous experience with the installation of hot tub on the roof and has had no problems.

Parking

- Visitor parking is separated with a gate from the resident stalls.

Landscape

- There is no fence around the path and adjacent park.

The Panel had the following comments and recommendations:

- Many Panel members commented that the changes the applicant made were appreciated and an improvement over the earlier pre-application scheme.
- The entrance from Walter Gage Road is understated and recessed. The panel feels that the entrance needs to be enhanced and improved.
- While one panel member felt the massing is too flat and wide. Another member commented that the building appears from certain angles to be two towers.
- The panel recommends that the appearance of the base element needs to be stronger.
- The panel recommends more effective use of stone on the building, especially in the podium areas and providing continuity through to the ground.
- The building is heavy shouldered and the panel would recommend that the treatment of the top should be lightened. Possibly pull back the upper floors.
- Ensure security at the exit stairs and create a feature from it.
- Roof gardens are whimsical in nature and provide a positive element to the building.
- One member does not support the narrow vertical bands of granite rising the full length of the building.
- The texture of the building against the Iona building needs consideration.

The panel formally supported the Theological Lot 44 market residential building.

4.0 Lot 51 Market Residential (St. Andrews site) submitted for Pre-DP Application comment

Joe Stott introduced the project and Gord H. to present preliminary sketches of the upcoming application for a market residential building on Lot 51 of the Theological Neighbourhood. This application was also previously introduced as a 'pre-application' consultation at the September 23, 2004 meeting. Gord H. introduced the architects Martin Brückner and James Hancock, Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright, and the landscape architect Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, who each presented the details of this project. AUDP commentary was invited at again at this early stage.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Low hedges should be added around the property.
- Gardens are terraced down for suites that are below grade.
- Front of building onto Iona Drive is very busy.
- The outdoor decks look very large look out of scale with building on the renderings.
- The south façade does not have enough articulation, looks too institutional and disconnected compared with the north façade. Possibly add more glass.
- The entrance to the building needs more work.
- 'Eyebrows' should be larger and used as sunshades.
- One member commented use of granite is more satisfactory.
- The nature of this site is not a good fit with surround buildings.

The Panel requests a rendering of the St. Andrews Hall area for context.

5.0 DP 04022: East Campus Apartment Residences: Follow-up Information

The Panel had requested a copy of the sustainability report from the October 14, 2004 meeting for the East Campus Apartment Residences. This report was now submitted for information. Freda P. provided a brief background to the Environmental Assessment Program.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Different standards should be implemented for the different housing types.
- Liveability should also be included.
- Have the project audited by a third party.
- Incentive and reinforcements are needed.
- Mandatory items should be more aggressive.

The Panel received the report for information.

6.0 Other Business

Sid Siddiqui's and Bev Nielson terms with UBC's Advisory Urban Design Panel expired on December 31, 2004. The Panel noted their contribution to the AUDP over the past 2 and 3 years respectively and asked staff to extend their appreciation for their volunteer service.

7.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 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, February 3, 2005
Time: 4:30 – 8:00 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Jane Durante (Chair)
Byron Braley
Linda Moore
John O'Donnell
Stephen Quigley

Member Absent: Joyce Drohan
Joost Bakker

Staff: Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services, C&CP; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Tom Miller, Intracorp Developments, Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects; Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects; Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; Sylvie Mercier, Read Jones Christoffersen, Dick Stout and Jennifer Uegama, Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects, Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk, and Danny Ho, UBC Parking & Access Control Services.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:45pm. DP05007: Library Gardens was removed from the agenda. The Panel approved the agenda as amended.

2.0 Approval of Minutes January 13, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 04027: Mid Campus Lot 19 Residential Development

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report to the panel and introduced Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the residential building on Lot 19 of the Mid Campus Neighbourhood. Matthew C. introduced Jennifer Craig, UBC Properties Trust, the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, and the landscape architect Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, who each presented the details of this project.

The project is a 55-unit Co-Development apartment building for faculty and staff. A series of focal groups were held with 100 faculty and staff to determine the design program. The architecture for this building is to have a 'West Coast' character. The applicant introduced revised plans not yet presented to staff and different than those circulated in the agenda package. The revised plans introduced a flat roof concept for the projecting gables. See plans SK 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, dated February 3, 2005. The applicant advised they are also considering solar pre-heat tanks and a geo-exchange system for this project.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The Panel is divided on the two elevation schemes (original versus revised rooflines). Further resolution is needed for both schemes but either could work and be supportable.
- If using the flat roof scheme, need to work on proportions to render more elegant and make thinner.
- The entrance element needs further clarity, depending on the roofline. Entry should be closer to the street.
- Sustainability for this project needs to be pushed further.
- One member commented the brick could be replaced with a more sustainable material.
- The sloped main roof (as opposed to the projecting peaks) will not be visible except from a distance.
- One member commends applicant for another Co-Development project on campus.
- Opportunities for additional front doors on the south and west elevations should be reviewed.
- The Panel commends the applicant on the floor plans.
- Revisit windows for the project, too many different types.
- The landscape plan is supported. Relationship to the park is pleasing.

The Panel supported the Mid Campus Lot 19 residential building in general, subject to the resubmission of resolved drawings of the roofline and massing.

4.0 DP05002: Theological Lot 37 Market Residential (Site C)

Lisa C. introduced the staff report to the panel and introduced Tom Miller, Intracorp Developments, to present the application for the market residential building on Lot 37 of the Theological Neighbourhood. Tom M. introduced the architects Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects, and the landscape architect Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects Inc., who each presented the details of this project.

This project is composed of a 46-unit concrete apartment building with 2 townhouses facing Chancellor Mews. The apartment faces Iona Drive and completes the lagoon and layout configuration from Lot 38 to the east. Proposed parking is less than the maximum permitted and a Mercedes smart car will be donated to the complex for car co-operative purposes in an allocated parking stall.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Rich palette of materials commendable. Extend more of this richness to the north (Chancellor Mews) and east sides of the building.
- One member commented that the lack of public access along the path through the site is a disappointment.
- The inset balconies lose light and the trees obstruct the view of the units on the west side of building.
- The mechanical penthouse needs to be made more elegant. Needs a stronger form. Perhaps larger?
- One member had concerns with the extent of glass along the decks because the clean look of the building will be lost when the building is occupied and decks become cluttered with belongings and furniture. Possibly introduce wood planter boxes or some shielding for portions.
- Further use of granite should be added on the poolside (east side).

The Panel unanimously supported the Theological Lot 37 residential building.

5.0 DP05004: Thunderbird Parkade

As Jane Durante was part of the project team, the Chair was passed to Stephen Quigley.

Lisa C. introduced the staff report to the panel and introduced Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the proposed Thunderbird Parkade on the B1- Parking Lot at the Thunderbird Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall intersection. Joe R. introduced Sylvie Mercier, Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd., to discuss the functional planning and structure of the parkade, Dick Stout, Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects, to discuss the site context and architecture of the building, and Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Ltd., to discuss the landscape treatment for this project.

Panel members discussed the project at length and offered commentary on two levels:

- a) General locational commentary within the precinct
 - b) More specific architectural commentary
- a) The panel questioned the proposed location and provided the following commentary for consideration regarding location:
- Necessity of a parkade is understood but location of a new parkade of this size and scale (6 levels, with the footprint larger than the Life Sciences Centre) on a gateway intersection as prominent as Thunderbird Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall is a concern;
 - Consideration should be given to orienting the building north-south, the entry off Thunderbird Boulevard, but with buildings between it and Wesbrook Mall.
 - An expanded precinct study would be of value to address the range of concerns including how to better address:
 - The unusual and extraordinary building massing;
 - Further urban design to better understand the inter-relationship of the proposed parkade with neighbouring buildings and open spaces (ie. in relationship to the existing Life Sciences Centre and the proposed Olympic facility);
 - Clearer resolution on the definition of the pedestrian linkages and view corridors; and
 - Streetscape character to better understand the pedestrian experience given the unusually large size and scale of the proposed parkade.
 - Perhaps the parkade could be partially concealed by being set further back with buildings between it and the surrounding streets.
 - Vehicular entry to the parkade might be considered off Wesbrook, allowing reduction of Thunderbird Boulevard to a two-lane local street with pedestrian character, linking to residential neighbourhoods.
 - The university will be here for a long time and the existence of the power sub-station should not compromise long-term site planning and design for the precinct. The cost of relocating the station or combining it with another structure, or building a parkade or other use overtop should be explored. The value of freeing up another development site in this manner, while simultaneously eliminating the negative visual impact and allowing more design flexibility within this emerging precinct may outweigh the costs.
 - A parkade may present the wrong image on such a prominent corner across from an Olympic facility.
 - This would be the largest freestanding parkade at UBC and others are grouped with or hidden behind buildings.
 - Putting some of the parkade below grade might reduce the footprint, allowing more site area for an additional building between the parkade and the street.
- b) The panel further provided the following specific design critique regarding the parkade architecture itself, recognising that a revised location within the precinct might mitigate or vary some of these concerns:
- The Panel was in general very complimentary to the design of the project, congratulating the proponents on the effort taken to make the most of an opportunity which envisaged a rather conventional usage by University standards;
 - The parkade structure could include an innovative use in addition to parking to give the building additional identity/purpose and credibility;

- Some innovative or different use might be considered on the rooftop;
- Street level uses might be considered to further animate the pedestrian level;
- Increased design attention is suggested to improve the 'friendliness' of the structure at the pedestrian level; it should feel interesting and safe at the pedestrian level given its scale on the block;
- Connections to the Olympic facility across the way should be emphasized;
- Partial sinking of the parkade one or two storeys into the ground or adding landscape berms may be a less costly compromise (rather than fully underground) to reduce the scale of the structure;
- If the parkade remains as a single use structure it could be simplified into a more modern, distinctive structure. Perhaps more open and glassy.
- Consideration of a different brick colour other than that used on the Life Sciences Centre might be more appropriate.

The applicant responded to the Panel's comments that the locational challenges and issues raised have been duly recognised and explored at the Board of Governors level. However, the Board 1 approval for the location of this project has now been granted. Revisiting the location and general siting is therefore beyond the parameters of the current project and AUDP's review mandate, in the applicant's view.

The Panel responded that while it may be beyond the applicant's mandate to reconsider the locational issues at this stage, the Panel took the position that respectfully offering such contextual insights to the Board of Governors as part of the AUDP project review, with the best long-term interests of the University in mind, was within the mandate of the AUDP. The Board may use this information, as it considers appropriate.

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 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, March 3, 2005
Time: 4:45 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (co-Chair)
Joost Bakker
Byron Braley
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Jane Durante
Linda Moore
John O'Donnell

Staff: Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services, C&CP; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder), Patrick McIsaac, Urban Design / Landscape Architect.

Presenters/Guests: Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; J. Terry Barkley and Adam Fawkes, Cannon Design; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust; and Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:45pm. DP05007: Library Gardens was removed from the agenda and replaced with DP04018: Empire Pool Relocation. The Panel approved the agenda as amended.

2.0 Approval of Minutes February 3, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Main Mall Update

Lisa C. introduced Patrick McIsaac, Urban Design / Landscape Architect to present an update to the Main Mall landscape study. A workshop on Main Mall and the Hawthorn Place Community Centre was held on Tuesday, February 22, 2005 with various representatives from UBC and surrounding communities. As a result of the Main Mall study analysis, including this meeting, 13 design principles for the South End of Main Mall were decided upon:

1. Clarity of Terminus
2. Transition (or Threshold)
3. Integration
4. Image of Place
5. People Space
6. Programming
7. Respond to South Sloping Aspect
8. Spatial Containment
9. Animated Edges
10. Internal Focus
11. Clarity of Circulation
12. Meaningful Commemoration
13. Sustainability

The Panel had the following comments:

- The design needs to be inspired and reflective of the University’s aspirations as one of the country’s premier post-secondary places of learning; it should be legible, dignified and generous, especially in accommodating a wide variety of campus events; it should also be comfortable and inviting for everyday campus use.
- The panel requested that the design for the space be presented at the next AUDP meeting. There is a value in seeing the design. Also include an artist’s rendering seen from various directions, including a plan perspective.
- The 13 principles should be rated/ranked to narrow the scope
- The plan should be for the long term and some members felt that it should not be limited by the existing trees.
- The site grade should be used to strengthen this space. Space needs to be 3-D, not just a plan of plantings and grade. It was also strongly suggested that in spite of budgetary limitations, architectural elements should be introduced to strengthen and enhance the design concept.

4.0 DP04018: Empire Pool Relocation – Resubmission

Lisa C. introduced Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust, to present the changes to the Empire Pool application previously reviewed by the Panel on October 14, 2004. Joe R. introduced J. Terry Barkley and Adam Fawkes, Cannon Design, to present the changes and the revised shadow study, and Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates, to discuss the landscape treatment for this project.

The Panel discussed the following:

- The metal slate fence cannot be totally unobtrusive, but is visually transparent enough for people to see through to the pool.
- The southwest corner is the entrance for the spectators. The width of concrete is needed to accommodate the bleachers.
- The surface of the deck is brushed concrete with drainage patterns.
- Trees are not currently proposed on site because they are a maintenance concern with the pool.
- The walkway is 5 metres wide and will be removed when the new bus loop opens and the temporary bus loop closes.
- Drop-off area is not yet developed as it is part of the University Boulevard Architectural Competition.
- Strips of grass under the temporary bleacher location are durable and plantings along the fence could also be added.

The Panel had the following comments:

- There is a strong dialogue between the structure of the diving tower and War Memorial Gym. This should be extended to the change room and mechanical room by giving them a more sculptural character and more colour.
- Treat the landscape to play off of War Memorial Gym.
- Significant trees should be added to the south edge of MacInnes Field to clearly define the pool as a place on campus. Possibly place trees where the temporary sidewalk is located when it’s removed. These trees should be selected as part of the larger context and should be a species that can be reasonably limbed-up to maintain the view of the pool.
- Several members expressed concern that the historical presence of the pool on University Boulevard has been lost and urged the University to ensure that the pool’s prominence is addressed in the University Boulevard competition.

The Panel unanimously supported the resubmission for the Empire Pool Relocation.

5.0 DP05003: Mid Campus Lots 15/16 Residential Development

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report to the panel and introduced Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the residential building on Lots 15 and 16 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood. Jas S. introduced the architect Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, and the landscape architect Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, who each presented the details of this project.

The applicant advised they are not ready with the elevations for Lot 15 and therefore only request consideration for Lot 16 with the 72-unit Faculty/Staff Rental building, including 6 cityhomes. The 9-townhouse units on Lot 15 may become market housing, but this is still undecided. The lot line between Lots 15 and 16 will shift further west to accommodate the apartment building.

The Panel discussed the following:

- There is a 0.5 m grade change across the site from Thunderbird Blvd to Logan Lane. The courtyard would be 1.5 m higher than the sidewalk.
- The grade and landscaping would have to respect Lot 16 even if Lot 15 were to possibly change to market housing.
- It is undecided whether the public access would be proposed between Lots 15 and 16.
- Panel members felt the parkade entrance should be on Logan Lane.
- Staff and the applicant noted that tenants of Logan Lane Co-Development did not want this parkade entry on Logan Lane.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The flat roof on top of the bays needs work.
- Ensure no leakage with the use of hardipanel.
- More patterns are needed on the masonry to add details.
- Colour scheme needs to be more distinctive, especially to avoid the general 'brown-out' that is occurring with most new residential in this neighbourhood.
- From a public perspective along Main Mall, the larger building would be more fitting along Eagles Drive, across from the park.
- Sense of entry seems to read more from Logan Lane and parkade access may be better from Logan Lane.
- The panel noted that the design of the townhouses needs to respond to their position opposite the proposed Main Mall terminus. When the application for the townhouses return, the following items should be taken into consideration: more robust materials; a more dignified expression and scale appropriate to this location; the public space across Eagles Drive; and landscaping between the two projects (ie: ensuring that there is more of a sense of the landscaped deck above townhouse parking and, if possible, extending a semi-public path through this area).

The Panel supported the Mid Campus Lot 16 residential building, subject to revisiting the roofline, colour scheme, and materials.

Lot 15 was not considered and full review will be discussed at a further meeting when elevations are submitted.

6.0 DP 04027: Mid Campus Lot 19 Residential Development

Lisa Colby introduced the staff memorandum to the panel for the residential building on Lot 19 of the Mid Campus Neighbourhood application, regarding the submission of more fully resolved drawings of the roofline and massing.

The Panel had the following comments:

- One member commented they preferred the previous south elevation. The other three members preferred the revised scheme.

- The roof entry canopy would be better if left simple and flat.

The Panel supported the Mid Campus Lot 19 residential building in general.

7.0 Other Business

None.

8.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Monday, April 11, 2005
Time: 4:40 – 8:15 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Jane Durante (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Byron Braley
Linda Moore
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan

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

Presenters/Guests: Jas Sahota and Crystal Haryett, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Chris Phillips and Grace Fan, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg; Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates; Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; John Patkau and Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:40pm. The Panel approved the agenda as amended with the addition of a preliminary review of the Biodiversity Centre.

2.0 Approval of Minutes March 3, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

Joe Stott informed the Panel that John O'Donnell has resigned from the Panel. The Panel asked staff to convey their thanks and appreciation for his service to the University.

3.0 DP05003: Mid Campus Lot 16 Residential Development – Phase 1

Lisa Colby introduced the staff reports for Agenda items 3.0 and 4.0 to the panel. The panel had given support to Mid Campus Lot 16 (Phase 1) Faculty/Staff Rental Housing project, subject to some minor adjustments, but the Development Permit Board requested the applicant present the adjustments to the AUDP. Mid Campus Lot 15 (Phase 2) will be under review for the first time at this meeting. With the approval of Lot 16, all OCP targets have been met in Mid Campus. The Lot 15 project will be for 9 market townhomes.

Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust introduced the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, and the landscape architect Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, to address AUDP Commentary from the last meeting for the residential building on Lot 16 and to present the application for the townhomes on Lot 15 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Glazing and colour changes are significantly improved.

- One member still feels tilted roofs could be better resolved.
- On balance, AUDP support revised scheme

4.0 DP05003: Mid Campus Lot 15 Residential Development - Phase 2

The architect had presented this project simultaneously with agenda item 3.0.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Very prominent site on the edge of park. Opportunity for select housing. Design should be stronger.
- Function of this project as the edge to the park means the housing should almost read as one building unit, in addition to the applicant's need for units to have individuality. Perhaps treatment of corners on end units may help achieve this balance.
- Massing model would have been useful to help understand the massing in context with the Hawthorn Place Community Centre Park and surrounding projects.
- Materials proportion might be better reversed, higher quality, e.g. predominantly brick building with wood on bay windows.
- Need an elevation indicating colour scheme. Proposed colours could be elegant but need to see the coloured elevation with proper proportions of colours.
- Very little useful outdoor space. Should explore opportunities for lookouts and balconies to supplement and push the design further in this premium location.
- Accessibility a serious issue. Units should be visitable from the exterior if not fully accessible inside. Explore ramping to achieve visitable access at least to the rear on some or all units.

The Panel did not support the project as presented.

The Panel requests a resubmission of this project addressing above items. The next presentation to include a massing model in the neighbourhood context, and a rendering of the project as seen from the Hawthorn Place Community Centre Park.

5.0 Main Mall Study and DP04012: Hawthorn Place Community Centre - Resubmission

Lisa C. introduced the context and background of the project. Patrick McIsaac, Urban Design / Landscape Architect presented an update to the Main Mall landscape study commissioned by staff. Philips Farevaag Smallemberg was retained to conduct a historical, policy, and design review of the larger Main Mall context, with eventual focus on principles for the south terminus area. Other stakeholders were also included in the process. A workshop on Main Mall and the Hawthorn Place Community Centre was held on Tuesday, February 22, 2005 with various representatives from UBC and surrounding communities. As a result of the Main Mall study analysis, including this meeting, 13 design principles for the South End of Main Mall were defined. These principles were provided to the Hawthorn Place Community Centre applicant who in turn updated their landscape plan.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The panel congratulated the consultants on the high quality presentation.
- The visual line along Main Mall is still maintained on the east side of the 3 London Plane trees.
- Visual continuity of Main Mall should be maintained.
- The Gulf Island landscape requires sun exposure and includes trees such as Arbutus and Garry Oaks.
- The scale and movement through the different areas.
- What is the inspiration for Main Mall?
- One member commented the landscape should be kept simpler. Three members liked the richness and variety of the landscape.

- Design guidelines should be developed for the site across from the Forestry Building to ensure the pinching at the terminus.
- The plan should be for the long term and one member felt that it should not be limited by the existing trees.
- Edible landscape requires higher maintenance; need to be aware of jurisdiction.
- Sustainability approach includes reduced asphalt, permeability of pavers, edible landscape, storm water management through swales, native plantings and local materials.

The Panel recommended support in principle for Lot 13 / Hawthorn Place Community Centre Park landscape plan. The AUDP requested the applicant return to the AUDP at the detailed development stages for additional information on proposed materials.

6.0 Preliminary Introduction of the Biodiversity Research Centre

Lisa C. introduced Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust, to make a pre-application presentation for the Biodiversity Research Centre. Rob B. introduced John Patkau and Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects, 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.

John P. provided the context for the Biodiversity Research Centre. It will be linked through the Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratory (AERL) Building to the Biological Sciences Building. This building will house wet labs, offices and a natural history museum, which will showcase collections of mammal specimens, insects, fish, and plant collections.

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

- Context of the proposed Biodiversity Research Centre to the Main Campus Plan is required.
- Site has very low density.
- Pedestrian access will be through the walkway as part of AERL.
- Storage of the collection will be publicly accessible. It will be all on one level, with offices adjacent to the collections. Larger footprint is required with the type of storage proposed compared to something more compact and less publicly accessible.
- Lighting will need to be controlled, but skylights may be possible.
- Museum should be visually accessible from the street.
- Courtyard area details have not been finalised but this will be a multifunctional space incorporating a learning garden and view for offices.
- Review access for school bus drop off for students visiting museum from East Mall.
- The south façade should address Fairview Square.
- The programming should justify the width of the inner courtyard that results in lower site density and reduced area for Fairview Square to the south.

7.0 Other Business

None.

8.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, May 5, 2005
Time: 4:30 – 7:45 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Jane Durante (Chair)
Byron Braley
Joyce Drohan
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Linda Moore
Joost Bakker

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

Presenters/Guests: Crystal Haryett, UBC Properties Trust; Doug Johnston, Johnston Davidson Architects; Amy Tsang, Perry & Associates; Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects.

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 addition of an information item for distribution:

- DP03055: Dentistry Building – Retail and Signage Design Criteria

2.0 Approval of Minutes April 11, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP03048: Abdul Ladha Science Centre

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the Abdul Ladha Science Centre. The original submission, which received support of the AUDP at the February 19, 2004 meeting, has since undergone further funding and design revisions. Crystal Haryett, UBC Properties Trust introduced the architect Doug Johnston, Johnston Davidson Architects, and the landscape architect Amy Tsang, Perry & Associates, to present the revised application for this project.

The project is for a science student social centre to be built on the space between Hebb Theatre and the Chemistry/Physics building. It will be a 2 ½ storey structure facing East Mall.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Elevator is being extended to provide access to the mezzanine. A bridge will be extended from the mezzanine to the elevator.
- Colour of wood is a more natural tone, not like the red that is depicted in the rendering.
- The wood should be stained to protect the wood and unify the colour.
- Extend weather protection over the entry door.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Simplicity of the project is an improvement over previous design.
- Role of building has expanded ; it will now interface with the University Boulevard project.
- Landscaping needs to be richer throughout the site, especially along the stairs on the south side of the building. Possibly have large planters to allow for semi-permanency.
- Ensure pedestrian traffic patterns are maintained.
- One member expressed concern with the maintenance of the outdoor furniture during the school year.
- Ensure concrete is saw-cut rather than stamped.
- Main entry needs further refinement with doors, signage and extended weather protection.
- North wall treatment should be more consistent with the character of the rest of the building.
- Context needs to be clarified. Is the building in alignment with neighbouring building frontages?

The Panel unanimously supported the Abdul Ladha Science Centre in general, subject to the confirmation of the position of this building being aligned with the setbacks of Hebb Theatre and the Chemistry/Physics Building.

4.0 DP05012: Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre

Lisa C. introduced Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust, to present the background and context of the Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre. Rob B. introduced Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects, to provide the details of this project, including the building layout, proposed materials and storage of the collections. A staff report, describing the project, had been provided to members.

The project is comprised of a 3-storey, 125,000 sq.ft. research laboratories and museum facility on Main Mall, south of the Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratories (AERL) building.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Height of entrance along Main Mall is ~ 20 feet, 2 storeys. View into the feature entry display will be generally at eye level.
- Details of the ‘roof top’ garden in the central courtyard (above the museum collections) still need to be determined. Maintenance of the garden was cited as a primary consideration for what is planned as a significant public space and overlook for interior public spaces.
- Entry pavilion should include weather protection on top of sun screening, especially for groups moving from the bus drop-off to the main entry.
- Landscaping along the south side of office block includes a retaining wall to allow light into the bottom floor office spaces.
- Project proposes to make whole collection accessible.
- There is not a functional connection with Family, Nutrition and Health (FNH).
- Materials will be similar to AERL.

Lisa C. updated the Panel from the last pre-application meeting for this project regarding the density. Staff support this density, noting the 125,000 sq.ft. building is consistent with what could reasonably be expected given the open space expectations for this area in the Main Campus Plan (An open space referred to as ‘Fairview Square’ was foreseen in this area).

The Panel had the following comments:

- The design should allow for Fairview Square to become a significant open space as identified in the Main Campus Plan; it was suggested that this might be achieved through a different approach to the form of the open space.
- One member expressed concern with the connection to the FNH building, suggesting a more comfortable relationship be explored.

- In keeping with the Main Campus Plan, the café use on Main Mall was strongly encouraged, especially to provide much needed animation along this important public route.
- All members of the panel expressed that the general Museum portion along Main Mall needs to be stronger.
- Support general quality of proposal.
- Courtyard landscaping is critical to this important public space; possibly review expressing the implied pattern through more plant material versus a mix of soft and hard surfaces. Courtyard landscaping is critical; possibly review a whole host of planting versus a mix of soft and hard surfaces. Need to design to address maintenance issues.
- The light well design needs to relate sensitively to Fairview Square and Main Mall.
- Need developed elevations and context drawings to understand the full intent of the proposed building.

The Panel unanimously supported the general massing and disposition of programming and space in the Beaty Biodiversity Research Building, subject to further details on the materials, rendering of view from Main Mall, further landscape details and resolution of the project's acknowledgement and positive approach to Fairview Square.

5.0 Information Item - DP03055: Dentistry Building – Retails and Signage Design Criteria

This item has been deferred to the next meeting.

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, June 2, 2005
Time: 4:45 – 7:45 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Jane Durante (Chair)
Byron Braley
Stephen Quigley
Linda Moore

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan
Joost Bakker

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

Presenters/Guests: Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; Michael McDonald and Steve Rayner, Kasian Architecture Interior Design and Planning Ltd.; Ken Larsson, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning;

Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; John Patkau and Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects, Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg.

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 circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes May 5, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP05016: Winter Sports Centre

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the Winter Sports Centre. Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust introduced the architect Michael McDonald, Kasian Architecture Interior Design and Planning Ltd., and the landscape architect Ken Larsson, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning, to present the revised application for this project.

M. McDonald presented the project boards and model. The project is for a multi-functional 3-rink facility with a focus on ice sports:

- Arena A – 5500 permanent seat ice arena (with configurable space to accommodate up to 7000 seats and NHL or Olympic Ice);
- Arena B – refurbished 980 seat NHL sized rink; and
- Arena C – 200-seat Olympic Ice rink.

The \$37.4 million project will be design-build. It is proposed that Arena B and C be done as Phase 1 with Arena A following later. Existing Arena would only be shut down for 8 months in the process.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Materials for this project include:
 - Thermoplastic polyolefin (TPO) for the roof membrane, which is a seamless rigid plastic material;
 - Light gauge steel metal panels between the roof and concrete, which will have vertical lines, 2 ft apart; and
 - Concrete for the lower walls will be painted a beige colour.
- A 6m width of asphalt around the site is required for Emergency Vehicular access.
- Parkade entrance aligns with the emergency access exit on the west side of the site.
- If the football stadium is moved to the adjacent site for Osborne Centre, the main entry would be from the same location as the emergency access on the west side.
- Pedestrians crossing Thunderbird Boulevard from the parkade will be controlled on event days. The crossing will also be safer once the road narrows.
- Programming beyond ice-sports has not been looked at yet, but space is available to accommodate others in the future.
- The community entrance will have sliding doors.
- Public transit will be accessible from Wesbrook Mall.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The applicant was commended on the presentation and materials.
- Details of the larger forms of the building will be key to the success of the building.
- Materials also a concern for the scale of the building. Possibly add more glass on the south side.
- Building needs more texture, especially in areas with long expanses of wall.
- There's more potential for the canopy and it needs to be further integrated.
- Landscaping is not strong enough for the building, larger elements, eg. large trees, are needed. Also, review possibility of adding Virginia Creeper on the walls to add colour and texture.
- Large roof element needs more interest, eg. visual texture or graphics.
- Sustainability needs to be more innovative.
- Building does not reflect a special UBC character. Too generic. Any way to link more to UBC? Might celebrate UBC athletics more.
- Review possibility to have louvers in smaller banks.

Freda Pagani clarified that the urban heat island effect does not exist in Vancouver. Therefore, having reflective material has no impact on this, but it is useful for energy conservation. Freda P. also requested a life-cycle cost study on paint versus tinted concrete.

The Panel unanimously supported the Winter Sports Centre in general, subject to the resubmission to follow-up on texture and materials details.

CARRIED

4.0 Resubmission

4.1 DP05012: Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre

John Patkau, Patkau Architects, introduced the design refinements for the Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre that have been made since the last presentation to the Panel. New drawings were distributed. Work had been done to better illustrate the west wing as seen from Main Mall.

Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg, spoke of the urban design context of Fairview Square. C. Phillips was just retained that day and had no concept plans available for presentation. The applicant wished to pursue a partnership with UBC Botanical Garden in the inner courtyard and asked to defer completion of the landscape plan until the consultant and the Botanical Garden's staff had had more opportunity to develop a design together. Applicant did not want to delay whole project based upon landscape design noting that CFI funding for the project may be lost if the project does not proceed to Board for consideration in July. Funding was contingent upon certain schedule limitations.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Is there a fallback landscape plan for the courtyard, if UBC Botanical Gardens no longer involved in this space.
- Panel members wanted some commitment that there will be a lot of soft/green landscape.
- Is the 'garden wall' separated from the building? Yes – on trellis/structure.
- Important that the content in the courtyard reflects biodiversity and include a social dimension, and a visual and aesthetic space.
- Café is proposed for the southwest corner of building, and the glass may be extended to cover this area.
- Materials will be a continuation of AERL in addition to some new ones.
- The second floor will have a connection/walkway through to AERL and Biological Sciences Building.
- The opening of the walkway is 6 meters high, and 6.4 metres between the posts, therefore, the opening onto Main Mall is 14 metres wide.
- Roof over breezeway is covered with glass over the metal screening.
- Could use an accurate plaster model of a skeleton if there is a concern that a real skeleton might deteriorate or not be found for display at the entrance. Applicant felt confident an appropriate skeletal display would be acquired.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The perspective rendering of the west elevation is appreciated.
- Building is exquisite except for south and east elevations, which are too institutional, dismissive. Buildings need to relate better to neighbours and public realm.
- The southwest corner of the building, with the location of the café needs further softening and detailing. Still too much of an intrusion into Fairview Square.
- Some of the Panel members did not agree with the landscape architect's suggestion that Fairview Square might be interpreted as an organic ensemble of spaces – wanted it to have some formal structure given the formal lines of Main Mall.
- The building needs to connect better and reflect the surrounding areas, such as Fairview Grove and the landscaped area east of the FNH Building.
- Connections to AERL and Biological Sciences are appreciated.
- The building looks inward toward the courtyard.

- More detail needed at the landscape level, on junctures, and materials. Design not yet developed enough.
- Courtyard and museum should be endowed for maintenance purposes.
- Important to have a landscape plan to review before Development Permit approval.
- Endowment of courtyard and museum important for maintenance purposes.

The Panel supported the Beaty Biodiversity Research Building conditional upon resubmission to the Advisory Urban Design Panel for final design review, after Board 3 approval by the Board of Governors but prior to Development Permit issuance. The following items should be addressed prior to final design review:

- ***Fully developed Landscape Plans***
- ***South and east elevations are to be better resolved***
- ***The southwest corner should be softened***
- ***The relationship between the courtyard and Fairview Square to be addressed***
- ***Further detail to be provided throughout on junctures and materials***

CARRIED

4.2 Information Item - DP03055: Mixed Use Building – Retail and Signage Design Criteria

Lisa C. introduced the *Mixed-Use Building's Design Criteria for Retail and Signage* for information. One Panel member had requested the opportunity to discuss the *Mixed Use Building's Retail and Signage Design Criteria* that had been distributed for information at the May 5, 2005 AUDP meeting. Members commented that the guidelines were difficult to understand and the Panel requested that the applicant provide a rendering of the façade with sample signage as might occur under these guidelines.

5.0 Other Business

Jane Durante's term with UBC's Advisory Urban Design Panel will expire on June 30, 2005. The Panel noted her contribution to the AUDP over the past 8 years respectively and asked staff to extend their appreciation for her volunteer service.

Members agreed upon June 16, 2005 as the date for the walking tour of campus and dinner. Staff will arrange and contact members with further details.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, August 4, 2005
Time: 4:40 – 7:15 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joost Bakker
Byron Braley
Stephen Quigley
Linda Moore

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan
Bob McKay

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure & Services Planning; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Noel Best and Peter Wreglesworth, Stantec Architecture; Cornelia Hahn Oberlander, Landscape Architect; Crystal Roche, UBC Properties Trust; Michael McDonald and Steve Rayner, Kasian Architecture Interior Design and Planning Ltd.; Ken Larsson, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning; Tom Miller and David Roppel, Intracorp; Martin Brückner and Colleen Dixon, Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright; Rob Barnes, Perry and Associates Landscape Architects.

1.0 Call to Order and welcome new member Robert McKay

Joost Bakker was elected chair for this meeting only and called the meeting to order at 4:40pm. Robert McKay could not attend this meeting; his welcome will be deferred to the next meeting.

Joe Stott, Director of Campus & Community Planning introduced Nancy Knight, AVP of Campus & Community Planning. Panel members welcomed Ms. Knight to the meeting.

2.0 Election of the Chair

This item has been deferred to the next meeting when more members are present.

3.0 Approval of Agenda

The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

4.0 Approval of Minutes June 2, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

5.0 Resubmissions

5.1 DP04012: Hawthorn Place Community Centre & Main Mall Materials

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the Main Mall Materials. David Grigg, C&CP, presented the four material panels proposed for Main Mall, outlining palette Options A, B, C, and D, and summarised comments received to date. Overall the preference has been for Option C. Other comments received prior to this meeting include:

- Concern with slipperiness of marble

- Most disliked the natural edge of the concrete, looked unfinished
- Random pattern pavers were generally preferred
- Majority preferred pavers over concrete

Other considerations include concrete is half the cost of the pavers but if any utility work is done, matching the colour of the concrete after repairs would be difficult. Pavers would be set in mortar, for maintenance purposes, to prevent weed growth between pavers.

The Applicant answered panel questions as follows:

- Both east and west sidewalks will be 4 ½ metres wide and paved.
- Mortar can be as strong as concrete if mixed properly and there is a low water content. The mortar will be ¼ to ½ inch thick and grey.
- Materials are expected to have a long life.
- Consultants chose concrete as a material because it reflects materials already present on campus.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Panel members appreciated the mock-up installation. It was very useful and effective.
- Materials do not provide a strong enough visual statement. Consider colour concrete for a darker, stronger impact.
- One member preferred random paver pattern with basalt linear strip and marble highlight randomized, possibly on both sides. Marble slippage is not as critical.
- One member commented warmer and/or coloured materials with concrete or brick pavers should be considered. Current four options do not have enough character, do not express 'UBC'.
- Connections and intersections should be explored further.
- One member commented the granite selection is benign, a more interesting one could be found. The Story elements are the landscaping/trees, a highly coloured treatment would take away from this.
- One member did not support the mortar, preferred the sand and weeds if necessary.
- Panel members preferred the granite as it connects to the University character.
- More testing and exploration is worthwhile.

The Panel supported the notion to prepare and install additional samples of materials.

CARRIED

5.2 DP03052: Museum of Anthropology

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the Museum of Anthropology. Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust introduced the architect Noel Best, Stantec Architecture, and the landscape architect Cornelia Oberlander, to present the revised application for this project as a result of the reduced budget. This project is expected to go for Board 3 approval in September.

Noel B. presented the master plan for the Museum, design of the 2-storey extension to the south side of the Museum, and layout of the building. Cornelia O. presented the landscape changes around the Museum, including regrading the berm, north of the visitor parking lot, and additional trees for the entrance.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- With the loss of budget, there are no changes for bus facilities.
- Staff/student entrance is separated from the public entrance.
- Very little of the building will be seen once the berm is reshaped.
- Handicap Accessibility to the front entrance is circuitous. The grade of the stairs is changing.

- Future programming is funding dependent.

The Panel had the following comments:

- One member commented the extension is appropriately understated and elegant. There will likely be future demands on site.
- One member appreciated the functionality and that architecture and landscape design form a seamless addition.
- Building maintenance is important.
- Visitor services are very important and the buses need to be dealt with.
- Strategic plan needs to be addressed. Recommend a priority list for this project as budget pressures increase.

The Panel unanimously supported the revised design for the Museum of Anthropology extension and renovations.

CARRIED

5.3 DP05016: Winter Sports Centre - Materials

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the Winter Sports Centre, which received Board 3 approval in July. Crystal Roche, UBC Properties Trust, introduced the architect Steve Rayner and Michael McDonald, Kasian Architecture Interior Design and Planning Ltd., and the landscape architect Ken Larsson, Sharp & Diamond Landscape Architecture & Planning.

Steve R. presented the materials board and explained changes to the grade and the design of entrances for the Winter Sports Centre. Ken L. presented the landscape changes around the Sports Centre, including the additional coniferous trees and the additional short term parking on the west side of the building.

The Applicant responded to the questions as follows:

- Surface parking is critical for the short term and is required as part of the phasing of the project as well as being useful long term.
- Comparison of the previous entrance to the revised entrance design.
- Pre-cast panels are a mix of a smooth plus another texture, which hasn't been determined yet.
- Panels will be pre-cast off-site. They are not tilt up.
- Roof material will darken to a consistent greyer colour. Because there will be no roof top access to appliances or facilities, streaking and staining will be minimized.
- Painted concrete will last about 20 years before needing to be repainted.

The Panel had the following comments:

- One member had concerns with the life span of the painted concrete and roof material.
- Insulated metal panels should be more silver than grey.
- Entrance needs revisiting. Functionally it has improved but the scale has been lost.
- Explore opportunities on the east facing wall for signage, colour etc.
- Texturing is very important, possibly play up vertical streaking.
- Explore the addition of granite somewhere in the design to incorporate an element of the University character.

The Panel thanked the applicant for returning with additional information on materials and design changes. Overall the project is still supported and members encourage follow-up on the points noted.

6.0 Preliminary Applications

6.1 Theological Lot 51

Lisa Colby introduced Tom Miller from Intracorp who wished to present preliminary sketches of an upcoming application for a market residential apartment building on Lot 51 of the Theological Neighbourhood. The Panel had previously seen pre-application sketches for this lot by the architect Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright on behalf of Bastion Development. The Bastion proposal was withdrawn by the applicant. Intracorp has now retained the same architects Martin Brückner and Colleen Dixon of Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright, and the landscape architect Rob Barnes, Perry & Associates. Informal feedback is invited from the AUDP on some new early concept sketches.

Intracorp wishes to increase the height of the proposed building by 2 floors, from 6½ to 9 storeys. In exchange for the increase in height, Intracorp would contribute towards additional landscaping in the Theological Neighbourhood and would narrow the building by approximately 10 feet. This increase in height would not require an amendment to the OCP as the height of the building falls within the height envelope from the Iona Building but would still require a minor urban design amendment to the Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design and Development Requirements, including public consultation opportunity.

Martin B. presented the preliminary design for the building, which is now proposed to be taller and slimmer than the previous design. Rob B. presented the proposed landscape as part of the contribution to the neighbourhood.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- The extra landscaping beyond the site would include a pedestrian path, formal garden area and children’s play area. This off-site landscaping would not be proposed if the additional height does not receive approval.
- The existing Chapel and Pavilion will be demolished on site.
- There would be no increase in density on the site, as a result of the taller buildings.
- The current permitted height is similar to the height of Argyll east and west.
- The building is 10 feet narrower than previous design (total of 91 feet wide).
- One member expressed concern with additional height when the building is already oriented east-west. Massing model would have been useful to visualize and compare the two heights and to show the context in relation to adjacent neighbours.
- The area proposed for off-site supplementary landscape contribution appeared to benefit more private interests to those in the vicinity of St. Andrews, rather than the broader public realm.
- The formal rose garden area is not compatible with the adjacent children’s play area. Additional landscape form and location needs to be reconsidered
- Changing the height represents a change to a complex balance within the Theological Neighbourhood Plan. Many interrelated factors need to be explored and confirmed as still okay within the community if height changes. Complex series of issues with shadow and view implication need to be reviewed.

Staff noted the issued right of way on west side for service access to the Curtis Building should be addresses and the applicant should include the Faculty of Law in discussions.

Staff advised that in 2004, there was a process for an urban design amendment to the Theological Neighbourhood Plan to increase the density and height to 6½ storeys. The additional change in height now requested would again have to go through a similar process.

The AUDP was not necessarily opposed to the massing of the proposal but would require information on issues noted above at the time of application in order to properly consider the request.

7.0 Other Business

None.

8.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, September 1, 2005
Time: 4:35 – 6:45 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Byron Braley
Joost Bakker
Bob McKay
Linda Moore

Members Absent: Stephen Quigley

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure & Services Planning; Patrick McIsaac, Urban Designer/Landscape Architect; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Howard Airey and Robert Cadez, Formwerks Architectural Inc; Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects; Hans von Tiesenhausen, Pantheon Development; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; Grace Fan, Philips Farevaag Smallemberg.

1.0 Call to Order

Joyce Drohan called the meeting to order at 4:35pm.

2.0 Election of the Chair and welcome new member Robert McKay

Joyce Drohan was elected chair and Joost Bakker was elected vice-chair for the Advisory Urban Design Panel.

The Chair introduced Robert MacKay, Concert Properties and Panel members welcomed him to the meeting.

3.0 Approval of Agenda

The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

4.0 Approval of Minutes August 4, 2005 Meeting

Byron Braley requested the August 4, 2005 minutes be amended under Item 6.1: Theological Lot 51 to include his stated comments that:

A formal rose garden area as proposed may not be compatible with the adjacent children's play area and family housing. Additional discussion regarding the appropriate landscape form and location will need to occur.

The Panel then adjusted the minutes as amended.

5.0 Resubmissions

5.1 DP04012: Hawthorn Place Community Centre & Main Mall Materials

Lisa Colby provided the background and context for the Main Mall Materials project and explained that the project coordinators were available to provide an information update of the work in progress. David Grigg, C&CP, summarised comments received on the Main Mall Materials options to date. There was

a general consensus on the language of the materials. David G. introduced Grace Fan, Philips Farevaag Smallemberg, to present the Main Mall Paving Principles and the second generation of materials exploration. David G. requested Panel members to comment on the following:

- Sustainability
- Durability
- Colour
- Bold enough
- UBC Character

The Applicant answered panel questions as follows:

- The edge will be flush throughout. 4.5 m width of hard surface with 1 m width of grass edge on both sides along the entire length of Main Mall except in front of the MacMillan Building because there is not enough width.
- The reduction of the road width will increase the width of the central lawn.
- The marble in the installation sample has already shattered. These samples are 2" thick, but the actual pavers will be 4". So far not much support for marble because it's also slippery.
- Larger pavers were considered but are problematic for maintenance reasons. The pavers should be 8" x 16" x 4" = 50 pounds. The weight determines the manageability and size of the paver.
- \$4-5 million is the estimated cost of the pavers for the whole length of Main Mall. Currently Agronomy Road to the south lawn is funded. The rest of the length is proposed to be installed in increments over the next 5 years.
- No details are yet prepared on designs for the node points.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Panel members appreciated the mock-up installation. It was very useful and effective.
- One member agreed with the objectives and to add timelessness as an additional one.
- Materials are acceptable. Basalt and granite will be effective and strong.
- Patterns still need to be revisited, as they are lacking in UBC character and not iconic enough.
- Two members preferred dark pavers with granite rather than basalt to reference UBC buildings.
- Suggested that installation should be done all at once and not incrementally to ensure continuity and materials are still available. Panel recommends reducing the 5 year window, possibly to 2008.
- One member preferred light background, as the dark looks similar to a road. The adjacent greenery will be enough of a backdrop for the buildings.
- Suggest the green edge context also be installed with the paving sample.
- One member felt a larger paver size was better, given the scale of the mall.
- The horizontal banding should be simplified and one member preferred the horizontal banding that was aligned with the tree edges of the mall.
- Concern with black and white strip as more trendy than timeless.
- Integration with major intersections and significant adjacent public spaces should be demonstrated. Illustration of at least three diverse locations would be useful.

The Panel supported the notion to prepare and install additional samples of materials.

5.2 DP05023: Mid Campus Lot 15

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report and provided the background for the 9-townhouse units proposed on Lot 15 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood.

Howard Airey of Formwerks Architectural Inc., summarised past AUDP commentary given to the previous submission for this site, and introduced the new design for this site. The 9-townhouse units are 3 storeys, with the main level 2-3 steps up from the Logan Lane. The architectural style is made up of iconic identifiable images on campus. Colours of material include painted rubble brick to the second storey black framed windows with lots of texture.

Jane Durante, Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects, provided the context and landscape plan for this project. There is a small hard or soft surface area at the front door and the back walkway is publicly accessible and wheelchair accessible to all the lock-off suites.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Material for the retaining wall will be simple and elegant with painted brick or a heavy rock palette.
- There are no gates along the common pathway. It is physically possible to install one in the future if security becomes an issue.
- Colour on the building will be monochromatic but with lots of texture including the painted brick and mortar on the first 2 storeys.
- Fence between the main suites will be stucco and metal with hedges on the ground floor.
- A scenario of use of space was discussed.

The Panel had the following comments:

- One member liked the use of grades to create the different units and the flex space in the basement.
- Some members were cautious of the finish on the building, stressing that enough shadow and detail is needed to ensure building is properly executed. Detailing on building is very important. Ensure durability of paint on the brick.
- Front entry porch should be larger for rain protection and to encourage the use of these covered outdoor areas.
- Pathway should always remain public in the back. Need to have assurance that it cannot become private in the future.
- Review the front elevation to ensure a stronger three-dimensionality is achieved to relieve the relative flatness of the façade.
- Review possibility of diminishing outdoor space at rear and increasing it at the front of units, especially to encourage more animation on the park side of the development.
- In lieu of the proposed stucco garden wall, review a granite wall to provide a more dignified, higher quality element, appropriate to this project's location on a key University open space.
- One member had concern that some of the spaces may become illegal additional suites.

The applicant responded to some of the comments. The style of the brick will be similar to a previous project the applicant completed on the 2500 block of Vine Street, near 10th Avenue. The parking ramp would restrict whether or not the building could be set further back. The basement is not meant to be a bedroom, it is a storage area or could be used for a gym or theatre and the window would be provide some natural light and air circulation to the room.

The Panel supported the 9-townhouse units on Lot 15 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood.

CARRIED

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, October 6, 2005
Time: 4:40 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Catherine Berris
Byron Braley
Joost Bakker
Bob McKay
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Byron Braley
Linda Moore

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Norm Couttie, Adera Group of Companies; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust; Norman Hotson and Kate Gerson, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects; Douglas Birkenshaw, Bregman & Hamann Architects; Chris Philips, Philips Farevaag Smallemberg; Graeme Silvera, UBC Properties Trust.

1.0 Welcome new member Catherine Berris and Call to Order

The Chair introduced Catherine Berris, Catherine Berris Associates Inc. and Panel members welcomed her to the meeting. The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:40pm.

2.0 Approval of Agenda

The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

3.0 Approval of Minutes September 1, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 DP05022: Mid Campus Lot 8 – The Legacy

Two members of the public joined the meeting as observers for this application.

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report and provided the background for the 55-unit apartment building proposed on Lot 8 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood. A correction was noted for the staff report regarding the parking for this project. Handicap parking as proposed does not require a variance to the Development Handbook although adequate justification for layering handicap parking over other tenant and visitor parking requirements must be justified and accepted at the Development Permit Board.

Norm Couttie of Adera Group of Companies introduced the project team and summarised the details for this project. The L-shaped building is situated on a triangular shaped lot. The 4-storey building is stepped to accommodate the slope of the site. The architectural style of the building includes a flat

roof, generous windows and balconies, cement siding, brick cladding, metal and granite fencing, with a west coast modern character.

Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, provided the context and landscape plan for this project. Separating the patios will be lush layered plantings of trees, shrubs and ground covers. The approach to the main entry is over a bridge element spanning a west coast forest floor below. An intermittent stream possibly fed by the building storm water leaders flows along the north edge of the project conceptually linking the Adera 'Journey' project to the reflecting lagoon and possibly draining into the dry creek of Hawthorn Park.

The Applicant answered panel questions as follows:

- The fencing depicted on the drawings is existing fencing to delineate the property line.
- Plantings will be a fairly similar continuation to the park plantings.
- Landscape materials will be brick not granite. One member requested detailed drawings of the fencing on the park side.
- Lawn is only open for ground floor units. The park can only be accessed through the building exit, not by individual ground oriented units. Pond is only a visual amenity.
- Roof should incorporate pavers to provide more texture and interest. Nothing extends above the height of the handrail.
- Entrance is clad in cedar with brick.

The Panel had the following comments:

- General support for the height variance; a suggestion was made to accentuate the height at the SE corner.
- West coast modern expression needs to be taken further with a stronger sculptural quality as seen in the applicant's examples of west coast projects. In particular, further refinements to the corners, roof, and entry of the building are recommended to achieve this. For example, further consideration for the flatness of roof through the roof treatment, finishes, overlook concerns, and variation.
- More glass would increase reference to west coast modern style.
- More attention to SW corner configuration suggested especially to reflect west coast modern orthogonal geometry.
- Plane of wood at entry is cut off by roof. Could shoot up. More looseness and elegance associated with the west coast expression should be introduced.
- Reconsider proposed hardiboard. Better quality materials more consistent with west coast modern style should be provided.
- Materials board would have been useful. Quality of materials is important. Look carefully at finish patterns on roof considering the overlook.
- Stormwater management details need to be reviewed. Possibly incorporate pond.
- Relationship of building to the park: Facilitate access to the park. Landscaping needs to have a stronger relationship to the park through fencing, plantings, and wall treatment. Exit stairs need generous dimensions connecting to parkway system. Blend between park and open space needs improvement.
- Add privacy screens between patios.
- Plant list does not show drought tolerant plants, inconsistent with presentation.

The Panel supported the 55-unit apartment building on Lot 8 in the Mid Campus Neighbourhood.

CARRIED

The two members of the public left the meeting.

4.2 DP05024: Marine Drive Residence – Phase II

Two members of the public (from the Wreck Beach Preservation Society) joined the meeting as observers for this application.

Lisa Colby introduced Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust to the present the details for this project.

Norm Hotson, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the site location, context, site panning principles, site layout, history, shadow studies, character, and materials for the Marine Drive Residence Phase 2 project. Chris Philips, Philips Faarevaag Smallemberg, provided the context and landscape plan for this project.

The Panel members prefaced their remarks to clarify that they would only question and comment directly on this application and not on broader issues such as the jurisdictional issues between the GVRD and UBC, or the public debate regarding whether the project could be seen from different areas of the Pacific Spirit Park tidal zone.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Removing the towers would result in 12-13 storey buildings, which would run the full width of the site.
- There are no plans for the Lower Mall Research Building site. This area is designated the Student Housing precinct in the Main Campus Plan, which is currently under review.
- Housing and Conferences prefer the same colour, but the architect is reviewing the introduction of other colour options.
- A ground level restaurant is proposed for the retail space.
- Garbage will be brought to the basement of each building.
- 2.64 m (8.7 ft) floor-to-floor height and 604 m² (6500 ft²) floor plate.
- There are no balconies on this project for aesthetic, security, cost, and safety reasons.
- Stormwater management is difficult to do on-site with the proximity to the cliffs.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Consensus on the overall improvement of project, especially in reduction of bulk, outdoor space, and distribution of towers.
- One member expressed concern with location adjacent to parkade and University services buildings.
- Inconsistency between 'green fingers' depicted in the Main Campus Plan and the landscape plan for this project to be addressed.
- One member suggested working with the GVRD to plant coniferous trees on other side of Marine Drive to fill in gaps between trees.
- More variety between towers should be introduced e.g., colour, height, and detailing of the top floors including the roof.
- Signage and wayfinding for site is important.
- One member suggested a review of heights of the southerly block to reduce the overshadowing on and mitigate the verticality of the outdoor space shared with the block to the east.
- It was suggested that elements of the current proposed buildings, especially at the ground level (eg: trellises, entry canopies and other freestanding landscape structures) be designed to complement the concept for the future communal facility.
- The project provides the opportunity for a greater number of students to enjoy this prime site on the campus.

The Panel supported the Marine Drive Residence Phase 2.

CARRIED

The two members of the public left the meeting.

5.0 Resubmission

5.1 DP03055: Mixed-Use Building, Wesbrook Mall and University Blvd. Discussion of Retail Storefront and Signage Design Criteria (No quorum for this item)

Lisa C. re-introduced the *Mixed-Use Building's Design Criteria for Retail and Signage* for information. Graeme Silvera from UBC Properties Trust and Joost Bakker from Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden presented the renderings of the Retail Storefront and Signage for the Mixed-Use Building. The LED lighting behind on the UBC logo is intended to fade between the UBC corporate colours. Tenants have been assigned to the units: Shoppers Drug Mart, Café Crepe, coffee shop and Mahoney & Sons Public House.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Guidelines should be refined to set general parameters for signs and lighting on this project. A certain amount of control is required that would also allow some variation. This would be in keeping with a campus gateway building that also provides retail opportunities.
- Exact details for signage above the Dental Health Centre are not available yet.
- Lighting control 1 ½ metres from storefront is controlled by UBC Properties Trust.
- One member recommended that UBC Properties Trust create an approved signage manufacturers' list to ensure consistency.

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, November 3, 2005
Time: 4:40 – 6:00 p.m.
Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joost Bakker (Co-Chair)
Catherine Berris
Linda Moore
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan
Bob McKay

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter and Hanson Ng, UBC Properties Trust; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates.

1.0 Call to Order

The Co-Chair called the meeting to order at 4:40pm.

2.0 Approval of Agenda

The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

3.0 Approval of Minutes October 6, 2005 Meeting

Staff was requested to amend the draft minutes for agenda item 4.2 to include reference to the following:

- The Panel members preface their remarks to clarify that they would only question and comment directly on the Marine Drive Residence application and not on broader issues, such as the jurisdictional issues between the GVRD and UBC or the public debate regarding whether the project should be seen from different areas of the Pacific Spirit Park tidal zone.

The Panel approved the minutes as amended:

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 DP05027: East Campus 6 Townhouses

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report and provided the background for the 70-units of market rental townhouses in 7 building clusters proposed on Site 6 in the East Campus Neighbourhood. Fifty-six of the 70 units would be designed to allow separate rental of a portion within that unit in a "lock-off" arrangement (mainly at basement and ground level).

Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust introduced the project team and summarised the details for this project, including the context and sustainability measures. Dale Staples of Integra Architecture presented the architectural details, and character of the stacked townhouses. Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, provided the context and landscape plan for this project.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Distance between building faces is 12 ft. Is this wide enough? There is 4 ft from the pathway to the building face.
- The items in REAP that were not achieved were mainly under the energy category because it is the most difficult.
- Stormwater management details include collecting rainwater and slowing rate of flow water, with an overflow to the storm sewer. Low point of site is Wesbrook Mall. There is a possibility to also drain the north side of the site towards the east, along the green strip between EC6 and Spirit Park Apartments.
- Site coverage is 40%, which only includes the footprint of the buildings. Site coverage would be higher if all hard surfaces were included.
- 3 handicap accessible units are proposed on the ground floor level adjacent to the handicap parking stalls.
- Parking includes 70 stalls for tenants and 72 stalls for adjacent Spirit Park Apartments (replacement ratio of 1 to 1 for Spirit Park Apartments) and also provides secure bicycle parking, which they don't currently have.
- Windows are not directly across from each other in opposing units to enhance privacy.
- These units will always be rental, as protected by covenant.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Some members were concerned with the density on this site. Apartment format housing may be preferable to townhousing.
- Intimate spaces with narrow walkways are read as private rather than public. The transition between public and private should be more defined.
- Explore stormwater management on both the east and west sides of the site.
- Walkway in the middle of the site, around the parkade ramp needs more work beyond moving the stairway.
- Explore better access from Spirit Park Apartments to parkade.
- Explore shortening the parking ramp to allow for more open space.
- Consider the context of the site with new Winter Sports Centre across Wesbrook Mall.
- Architectural design needs to be pushed further.
- Align peaks of buildings to create more open space.
- Turn dormers into lanterns.
- Push sustainability initiatives further.

The Panel unanimously supported the 70-unit townhouse complex on Site 6 in the East Campus Neighbourhood.

CARRIED

5.0 Other Business

None.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, December 13, 2005

Time: 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Catherine Berris
Linda Moore
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Joost Bakker
Bob McKay

Staff: Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Michael Cunningham and John Patkau, Patkau Architects; Chris Philips, Philips Farevaag Smallemberg.

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 circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes November 3, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Other Business

Lisa Colby updated the panel on the following items:

1. DP 05027: EC6 – The DP Board deferred consideration of this project at the December 7, 2005 meeting. Further design revisions are under way and will return to the AUDP in January, 2006.
2. The Board of Governors has adopted South Campus Neighbourhood Plan. A workshop will be scheduled for the AUDP and DP Board in mid-January, 2006. Members will be contacted with schedule options.

Joyce Drohan requested Nancy Knight to present a summary of the Main Campus Plan workshop at a future meeting.

4.0 DP05012: Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre

Lisa C. provided the background for the project. The AUDP had previously supported the Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre conditional upon resubmission for final design review prior to final Development Permit issuance. The project received Board 3 approval in July 14, 2005. Additional design work has now been completed and was presented by Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust. Rob B. introduced John Patkau and Michael Cunningham, Patkau Architects and Chris Philips, Philips Faarefaag Smallemberg, to provide the details of this project.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Is the third courtyard in the budget? A gravel path, fixing the grade, and cleaning up the area between Biodiversity and the Food, Nutrition, and Health Building is in the budget.

- Entrance to the courtyard from the south (between the café and the south building) is intended to be open.
- Aluminium screen is for sun and rain protection. It is suspended 5 feet from the building and there is a roof overhang. This screen allows for large sliding windows to be installed for natural ventilation and cooling.
- Plans for the lantern building have changed. There is no wall inside and it is more transparent. The larger artefacts will be suspended from the ceiling and shelving and display cases will be kept low for smaller artefacts. Large-scale artefacts will most likely be marine mammals and a budget is set aside to purchase one. Artefacts must have died from natural causes.
- Building materials will be similar to AERL but more complex with the white brick used on end walls and charcoal colours behind the aluminium rain screen. Pool will be 6” deep with concrete wide banning.
- Detailing will be similar to AERL.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The panel noted that this project is an eloquent reinstatement of UBC’s modernist direction and saluted the legibility of the interior program in the exterior expression – especially where openings are created in the sun/rain screen to expose the public and common areas within.
- It was also noted that the success of the project depends on the realization of the proposed landscape design. The panel strongly recommended that the university seriously consider a creative funding strategy for this and other projects incorporating significant pieces of the campus public realm.
- Is it possible to make corridor on SW corner, next to the café, a breezeway to be more open? A stronger connection is needed to Fairview Grove and across the campus.
- Elimination of the display wall in the ‘Lantern’ portion is supported.
- Regarding Landscape options for Fairview Square, one member questioned the importance of extending this space across Main Mall.
- One member expressed concern that the proposed screens could make rooms dark, always looking through a screen, might feel jail-like and create a separation between inside and out. Another member noted that the screen would reduce the glare from the pool and soften the building expression to the courtyard.
- Details of materials and lighting are still lacking. Attention should be paid to maintenance issues related to extensive overhangs.
- Ensure there is budget commitment for the ‘Lantern’ building and the large artifact proposed as exhibit or it won’t become a complete picture.
- Stormwater management for the pool is an integral component for this project and should be considered in the design and working drawings. A cistern to store water for irrigation was supported.
- Pool should be accessible around the whole perimeter for maintenance purposes.

Applicant responded that the design for this project does not preclude the future of Fairview Grove and Square but allows for flexibility when other pieces come into play, such as the Earth and Ocean Sciences.

The Panel unanimously SUPPORTED the revised proposal for the Beaty Biodiversity Research Building.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.