



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2006



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, January 12, 2006

Time: 4:30 – 6:00 p.m.

Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Catherine Berris
Stephen Quigley

Members Absent: Bob McKay
Linda Moore

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

Presenters/Guests: Tom Miller and David Roppel, Intracorp; Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB; and 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 December 13, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP05025: Theological Lot 51 – St. Andrews Hall Site

Lisa C. introduced the staff report and the background for the project. The Panel had previously seen a 9 storey application for this lot by the architect Hancock Brückner Eng + Wright on behalf of Intracorp. Prior to that, a pre-application concept by Bastion Development had been explored and withdrawn.

Tom Miller, Intracorp Westridge Development Ltd., introduced the current proposal for a 6-½ storey, 39-unit residential development on Lot 51 in the Theological Neighbourhood. Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB presented the architectural design for the building and sustainability submission. Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates presented the landscaping and pedestrian circulation for this project.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- The reference to future buildings on the site plan was an AutoCad error and should be disregarded.
- The roof plantings would reduce runoff, but the applicant is not claiming REAP points for this feature (not significant enough).
- Request for relaxation of setbacks are 18 ft on the north side, 12 ft on the south side, and 22 ft on the east side.
- There has been no discussion with the Curtis Law building regarding sharing of the service lane. Faculty of Law is not ready yet with their proposal, and this project is moving along now.

The Panel had the following comments:

- The scale of this proposal is more appropriate than the previous version and fits within the neighbourhood context.
- Convincing scheme but further detailing and sense of fun is needed to take design to the next level.
- Architectural composition needs rigour. Front architectural projection is not fully resolved to achieve added interest. Horizontality and verticality of building not resolved.
- Corners need more rigour to make them genuine architectural features.
- Revisit materials on elevations to try to address massing. Consider something more creative such as colour to articulate massing.
- Proposal has not taken opportunity to maximize on the requested relaxation.
- Building is massive. Townhouses read more as a base; townhouses need to be more legible.
- Landscaping needs a transition for the south facing lower units, eg. Terracing.
- Trellis design is tight and intrusive in front of 2 units on lower floor.
- There should be discussions with the Faculty of Law to investigate opportunities with shared access and increase landscaping for St. Andrews.
- More opportunity should be taken on roof planting.

Applicant responded that the details for the townhouse are shown in the elevation, which include Juliet balconies. Trellis does need work and will be reviewed. Further planting on roof decks will be reviewed.

Panel support for the proposal for the Theological Lot 51 Residential Development was DENIED.

4.0 Main Campus Plan Review

Nancy Knight introduced the report on the UBC Vancouver Campus Plan Review that went to the Board of Governors for information in December 2005. Nancy summarized the process and methods anticipated for this review.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Process needs to be open and transparent
- A technical diagram of how UBC works would be useful
- Understanding the collective agreement on governance is important
- Secondary and tertiary planning is important
- Include physical determinism in plan
- Public realm is key to plan
- Members on committee should include people from outside the University
- Identify the heart(s) of campus
- Include whole 1000 acres, not just the academic core. (N. Knight responded that adopted OCP and Neighbourhood Plans in residential areas should not be re-opened at this time. Most critical need is for updated guidance on physical development of Academic Core.)
- Public outreach, more education and communication required
- Include involvement from students, faculty, staff, other organizations

5.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, February 16, 2006

Time: 4:30 – 7:00 p.m.

Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members Present: Joost Bakker (Chair)
Stephen Quigley (Co-Chair)
Bob McKay
Catherine Berris
Linda Moore
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan

Staff: Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure & Services Planning; Dianna Foldi, LBS Project Manager; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Tom Miller and David Roppel, Intracorp; Martin Bruckner and Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB; Kim Perry and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Graeme Silvera, UBC Properties Trust; and Jeff Cutler, Space2Place Design Inc.

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.

The Chair introduced Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe, Professor and Head of Art History, Visual Art and Theory Department, and Panel members welcomed him to the meeting.

Lisa Colby updated the Panel on the South Campus subdivision plan, which is currently undergoing revisions.

2.0 Approval of Minutes January 12, 2005 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Resubmissions

3.1 DP 05025: Theological Lot 51 – St. Andrews Hall Site

Lisa C. introduced the staff report and highlighted the changes to the project and summarised the panel's comments from the last meeting. Lisa C. outlined the legalities of sharing the lane between academic and residential use. One Panel member commented that the public easement over the lane should be left flexible to allow for future possible access with the Faculty of Law.

Martin Bruckner and Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB, highlighted the changes, outlined in Attachment B to the staff report, to the architectural design and streetscape details for the building. Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates presented the stormwater management and landscaping details for this project.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Panel members commended the applicant on the changes made to the project, including greater vigour of building architecture, the stronger streetscape, greater attention to

stormwater management, more granite on Iona Drive, more light to the south facing patios, and positive contribution to the neighbourhood.

- Location of bike racks needs to be revisited as they are far from the entrance.
- Building is not consistent between the front and back and richness needs enhancement.
- Carry low retaining walls clad with granite around the whole building.
- East elevations landscape is important with views towards the Curtis Law Building.
- Overlook issues from the proposed highrise to the south needs to be addressed.
- Building is in a prominent location with direct views from the northwest.
- The variances are only for the height and setback, there is not change to the floorspace or density.

The Panel unanimously SUPPORTED the revised proposal for the residential development on Lot 51 in the Theological Neighbourhood and the height amendment from a design point of view.

3.2 DP 03055: David Strangway Building Signage

Lisa C. provided the background for the Shoppers Lifestyle Photos on the David Strangway Building. Steel stud walls are behind the windows with 4 inches between the wall and the glass. Changes beyond the breezeway, including the opaque windows on Wesbrook Mall can be incorporated into a design solution. Lisa C. introduced Graeme Silvera to present some of the alternatives to the Lifestyle photos, including coloured panels, or UBC imagery and benches to be placed in front of the columns in the breezeway.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Suggested options:
 - Text based piece to celebrate UBC scholars.
 - Something that would contribute to the University
 - Artist's glass, but this is very expensive.
 - More dynamic display
 - Lighted glass, with selected colours, can't have too many colours or it's too vibrant, as the building is somewhat reserved.
- Bird's eye view of campus could be used for opaque windows on Wesbrook Mall.
- University Boulevard Architectural Design includes the area to the walls of the David Strangway Building. Details have not been finalised yet.
- Display cases are nice idea, but displays are not changing frequently enough.
- Breezeway is not being used very much at this time, only as access to parking and the bus stop.
- Use of breezeway is very important, eg. wayfinding. Benches would be recommended in this space.
- Shoppers has a 15 year lease for this location.
- Philosophical debate regarding corporate culture on campus and level of corporate participation needs to occur. University needs to be more involved with the choice of tenants, corporate versus local.

4.0 For Information

4.1 IP 06002: Stores Road Redesign – Sustainability Street

Lisa C. introduced David Grigg, C&CP to present the project of the redesign of Stores Road, which will include stormwater, solid waste, recycling, and energy initiatives for teaching and research purposes. Dianna Foldi, LBS summarised the process of this design from workshops and design charrette

including occupants from all the surrounding buildings. Jeff Cutler, Space2Place Design Inc. presented the materials, including granite salvaged from the Iona building, to be used in this project.

The Panel discussed the following with the Applicant:

- Phase 1 will be completed for the World Urban Forum, June 2006. The whole project is expected to be completed by 2008.
- All building users were involved with this process and participated in the design.
- Panel members appreciated all the connections are being maintained and accessible. Panel members were delighted with the project.
- Economic was part of the sustainability equation. Budget is coming from a number of places including research facilities, Sustainability Offices, cyclic maintenance and minor capital.
- Hydrogen fuelling is a more of demonstration project, so traffic impacts should be at a minimum.
- Important that water is visible on the surface for demonstration and education purposes, e.g. the water feature compared with groundwater filtering.
- Review of a more prominent location for such an important project?
- Review further expansion of project across Main Mall to the Beaty Biodiversity Research Centre to incorporate Fairview Square.
- Ensure Barn Coffee Shop is still visible from Main Mall, for animation along Main Mall.
- Applicant is reviewing the possibility of having horticultural plots between Macmillan and the Barn.
- Communications plan is required to ensure sustainability measures are followed through.
- Carry these initiatives into practice on campus.

The Panel were enthusiastic and unanimously SUPPORTED the proposal and recognized the need for a communications plan as part of this initiative for the Stores Road Redesign.

5.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, March 2, 2006

Time: 5:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Venue: Cedar Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

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

Members Absent: Joost Bakker
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Staff: Joe Stott, Director C&CP; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure & Services Planning; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, Hanson Ng, Paul Young, Barb Tully, Jennifer Craig, and Zena Mills UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman and Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; Kim Perry and 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 5:00pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

Other Business:

Lisa Colby discussed with the Panel if they were interested in providing preliminary review for a new Athletics sign to replace the existing sign in front of GSAB at the corner of University Blvd and Wesbrook Mall. The Panel expressed interest in such review.

2.0 Approval of Minutes February 16, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 DP 06001: South Campus Site SC3B

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the two co-development projects on Sites 3B and 3D in the South Campus Neighbourhood. The Chair prefaced the applicant's presentation with no package having been submitted prior to the meeting, the project will be reviewed as a preliminary application and no vote will be taken.

Paul Young, UBC PT, introduced the team for the two co-development proposals for a 72-unit apartment building on Site 3B and the 53-unit townhouse development on Site 3D in the South Campus Neighbourhood. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, summarised the process of the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, provided the general layout of the neighbourhood and presented the architectural design, materials, and the sustainability submission for the two projects. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the stormwater

management conceptual design along the green streets and the proposed site layout and circulation for both projects.

Trees will be cleared on an incremental basis. Roads would be cleared first, remaining trees will be reviewed for retention and lots selectively cleared individually afterwards as required. Innovative sustainability initiatives include every building to contribute to the car cooperative at 1 per 100 residents and ground source heating for hot water in every building. A mill will be set up on-site for felled trees. Green streets will be pedestrian only. No emergency vehicles will be allowed on the green streets. UBCPT will design and build all green streets and then they will be turned over to shared properties. A master set of guidelines will be in place. Stormwater management will handle small events, up to 95%, but still need pipes for 1 in 200 year flood event.

The Panel discussed the following:

Neighbourhood – Overall

- UBC Farm is designated as a Future Housing Reserve area and will require a future planning process before any change will occur. An agricultural component will be retained for this area.
- Size of blocks continues to be a concern; finer-grained neighbourhoods are recognized for a higher degree of connectivity and a more comfortable overall scale, including that of individual buildings. With many paths going deep into heavily landscaped areas, security should be carefully considered.
- Deep buffer of trees along 16th Ave is a challenge for connectivity to campus
- The neighbourhood needs variation in housing form and density, and different character in each development.
- Ensure neighbourhood is not an exclusive enclave of high priced housing. Commercial village is connection to rest of campus. The calming of 16th Avenue will also help in connection. Also co-development is targeted only to Faculty and Staff.
- Serious concern was expressed about the large amount of infrastructure being built for such low-density development.

Green Streets

- Green streets are key to the success of this neighbourhood but the extent appears excessive. Several panel members noted that the cost of a high quality green street, including long term maintenance is likely higher than a well-designed conventional street. UBC should establish a serious maintenance program (perhaps through strata groups) for these key routes.
- The housing interface with the green streets and the character of the green streets are very important.
- Incorporate stormwater management in a more urban approach, e.g. Western Harbour, City of Malmö, Sweden
- Too many green streets can become problematic. Encourage contrasting opportunities to bring a variety to pedestrian experience. Ensure design elements for security.
- UBC standards for reduced pesticides and irrigation should be adopted in the neighbourhoods.
- Concern with overburdening of maintenance costs to the UNA. Ensure surfaces are low maintenance.

Site SC3B – Apartments

- The implied architectural separation is not really convincing and will be a concern for other sites. The applicant responded that the site is too narrow and having separate elevators and stairs in each building is expensive.
- Breezeway needs a lot of work, as it is too narrow.
- One member commended applicant on selection of materials and relatively unimposing wall and landscape edge to park.

- One member suggested the road on the east side should meander and follow the forest's edge, rather than being straight.
- Care should be taken to avoid blowdown of retained trees.
- Hard to get village feel, need smaller buildings to achieve that.
- One member appreciated the vocabulary of the building but concerned it will get lost with the scale of the building.

Site SC3D – Townhouses

- Overall scheme is successful. Strong street front to courtyard and interesting unit designs.
- Limited innovation in building design. This should be further explored.
- Front and back entrances are a good design feature.
- Parkade layout is good for saving existing trees.
- Gaps between buildings are very narrow, should feel more spacious.
- Tree retention will be very critical. Smaller trees (max. 16 ft) will be transported off-site during construction and replanted.
- Buildings are very repetitive. Differentiation should be introduced through colour, materials, massing.
- Siding will be shingles and lap siding.
- Public realm (wood) elements on site will be made from wood milled on site.

4.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2006
Time: 4:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Bob McKay
Linda Moore
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris

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

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, Paul Young, Jennifer Craig, and Zena Mills UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; Kim Perry, Michael Patterson, and Steve Clarke, Perry & Associates; Gordon Horsman and Kim Maust, Bastion Development Corp.; James Hancock and Gwyn Vose, IBI / HB Architects; and Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust.

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 March 2, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 DP 06001: South Campus Site SC3B

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the co-development project, Keenleyside Apartments, on Site 3B in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Matthew Carter, UBC PT, introduced the team for the 72-unit co-development apartment building on Site 3B in the South Campus Neighbourhood. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, provided the context for the project and presented the key changes to the architectural design and materials from the preliminary information presented at the last AUDP meeting. Steve Clarke, Perry + Associates, presented the key elements of the landscape plan and sections of the project.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Members asked the applicant to summarize what they considered to be the 3 most innovative features of this project include:
 - Faculty & Staff Co-Development Project, reduces commuting to campus
 - Unique West Coast architectural vernacular
 - Milling trees onsite and reuse of wood, eg. landscape benches and introducing plants from the UBC Botanical Gardens.

- Members asked questions and clarification of applicants:
 - Comparison of the elevations before and after
 - Q. Why is roof on eastern portion of building higher in revised plans than original proposal?
A. Not intended to be. Will be seeking lower pitch.
 - Q. Why is landscape character difference between 2 sides of building?
A. Streetscape with landscaped walls is more formal and parkside is more natural as a result of handling the grade change across the site. Native plants are being used throughout the site. Two sides should be more consistent.
 - Q. Why is there no peak on the eastern end of the building?
A. The east end of the building has no gable because of difficulties with the L-Shaped building.
 - Q. Can greater emphasis be made on both ends of the building to counter balance central entry and help project?

The Panel made the following comments:

- Focus required on how the shape of buildings can reinforce the park and define the street.
- Traditional West Coast architectural style is based on housing design not to 4 storey buildings, so difficult to bring into project of this scale.
- Members still expressed concern with fundamental issue of having 1 building looking like 2.
- Split between the 2 buildings is not great enough.
- Trellis needs to be redesigned as a bolder element. It is too high and narrow, needs to be low and intimate and possibly add glazing.
- Flat roof is good, but can it be pushed out further from edge of building?
- Flatten sloped roof, would make design stronger.
- Add pitched roof or gables to east end of east portion of the building.
- Flat roof balances the pitched roof.
- Expressed structure on pitched roof with roof rafters and soffits are important to complement flat roof expression.
- Screen lattice element on balconies needs to be larger to be more proportionate on building.
- Stone wall weakens as it extends into the park, needs to be stronger.
- Central focus of entrance, with stone clad wall was visually stronger in first rendition.
- Opening up the entranceway with the glass and moving the elevator is much stronger, allowing a better visual connection through to the park.
- Execution of details is critical for the project.
- One member commented that the image boards are very strong but the actual drawings are too busy and don't sufficiently capture the spirit of the images.
- With this project being first in South Campus, it needs to set a standard.
- Landscaping between streetscape and parkside needs to be more consistent with a clear strategy for defining the public realm.
- Some members suggested heavier landscaping, integrated with the building would have more of a west coast look.
- One member commented that less and more organic landscaping would be more consistent with the tradition of West Coast style.
- Articulate stairway in east end of building by increasing the glazing. This will also help to break the building massing down.
- Increased rotation of building away from the street should be reversed to allow a more consistent landscaping treatment on the parkside.
- Proportion of elements and scale of building are important. The applicant was encouraged to address this carefully; this project is setting the standard for the precinct.

The applicant responded to AUDP commentary. They agreed with the strengthening aspect and can bring the wall closer to the street. They will consider lowering the trellis and eliminate the glass foyer parapet. The applicant wanted informal landscape on the street side and not the typical street trees.

Panel support for the proposal for the South Campus Lot SC3B Co-Development Apartment Building was DENIED.

4.0 For Information

4.1 Wesbrook Village Centre

Lisa C. introduced Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust and consultants to discuss their general layout and design ideas evolving for the Wesbrook Village Centre in the South Campus Neighbourhood. No specific village projects have been initiated at this time but layout within general landuse designation of the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan will set context for future grocery store, retails and seniors applications.

Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, provided the context and the principals considered in the evolution of the Village Centre layout. AUDP commentary was welcomed into this process.

The Panel discussed the following:

- There is a difference in character between “Village in a Forest” and clearing the buffer strip to allow more visual ties from 16th Avenue to the neighbourhood.
- Day-to-day traffic to school is a practical consideration and a strong connection to school and community centre through vehicular access is important.
- 16th Avenue will be reduced to 2 lanes (1 in each direction) with a roundabout proposed for the intersections of Wesbrook Mall, East Mall and SW Marine Dr.
- Seniors housing is linked across the green street with a pedestrian overpass.
- Courtyard mews is smaller in scale with single storey buildings.
- Locating the grocery store with its back to 16th Avenue may be ‘introverted’.
- Need lots of eyes on the street in a mixed-use zone.
- No residential is proposed above inner courtyard, only possibly 2-storey retail.
- Depths of retail units are critical; confirm dimensions to ensure vitality of businesses.
- Commercial should be added to 4-storey residential building on the southwest corner of Wesbrook and the green street, to ensure traffic to that intersection.
- Consider reducing the landscaping in the village centre to be more urban.
- Parallel parking will be along Wesbrook Mall.
- Pedestrian circulation from East Mall needs work.
- Design should be fine-grained. Compare this with Edgemont Village in North Vancouver.
- Connection to rest of campus is important.
- Where village fronts on 16th Avenue, it should be more opened up to have more deliberate connections.
- One member was concerned that roundabouts can cause confusion for pedestrians trying to cross into the neighbourhood. A conventional intersection would be preferable.
- A strong visual cue is needed on the corner of Wesbrook and 16th Avenue to draw people into the square. The proposed single storey retail is weak.
- Grocery store should be more transparent. Signage will be critical.
- Clarity and simplicity of layout for retail is important. Current configuration appears confusing and should be simplified.
- Whole Foods in Park Royal another good example of a grocery store.
- Location of retail units west of ‘Main’ street (Wesbrook) risks dispersing vitality.

5.0 Preliminary Applications

5.1 Theological Site A

Lisa C. introduced Gordon Horsman, Bastion Development Corp. who wished to make a preliminary introduction to the Panel for ideas on Sites A and G2 in the Theological Neighbourhood. This presentation was for information only and does not constitute the formal AUDP review of these projects. Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB, presented initial design ideas for the Site A Apartment, Duplex and Townhouse project. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape ideas for the project.

The chair of the AUDP thanked Bastion for the preliminary information on Site A and suggested members might offer preliminary feedback for this project site. Due to time constraints, informal review of Site G2 would not be possible until the next meeting.

The Panel discussed the following regarding Site A:

- Existing Chancellor Building will be demolished by June 2006. Vancouver School of Theology has moved their facilities to the Iona Building.
- Members felt the building program was far too dense for this site, in spite of the applicant's comment that the density transfer of 9000 sq.ft from Sites G2 to Site A works out to be only 18" extra around the perimeter of the 2 apartment buildings, and height and setback requirements are met.
- Courtyard is very dark, from shadow of 2 apartment buildings and too tight.
- Added density does not help given level of quality of building.
- This site is a major gateway to the university. Development does not acknowledge University.
- Commend applicant on the quality of the materials and details of project.
- Neighbourhood is getting grayed out. More attention should be given to materials and finishes.
- Some members commented the mix of duplex designs was too much and should be simplified. However, the larger apartment building could benefit from some of this design exuberance. The duplexes also appear too institutional in scale.
- The neighbouring sites should have been added to the background of the 3D presentation. The applicant was asked to ensure that the context for the project be comprehensively presented to the design panel in the future.
- More variation in landscape should be added.
- Design needs to be simplified.
- Context is very important and lacking in presentation.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, May 4, 2006
Time: 3:40 – 6:40 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joost Bakker
Linda Moore

Staff: Dennis Pavlich, VP External and Legal Affairs; Joe Stott, Director C&CP; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Brad Foster, Manager – Communications; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Al Poettcker, Matthew Carter, Hanson Ng, Jennifer Craig, and Zena Mills UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman and Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; Michael Patterson, and Steve Clarke, Perry & Associates; Gordon Horsman, Hugh Tangye, and Kim Maust, Bastion; James Hancock, Gwyn Vose, and Sergio Jaramillo, IBI / HB Architects; Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust; and Jeff Friedrich, AMS VP Academic.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:40pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes April 18, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 DP 06001: South Campus Site SC3B

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the co-development project, Keenleyside Apartments, on Site 3B in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, highlighted the changes to the architectural design for the building, including increasing the transparency between the buildings, sloped roof for both sides, extension of the stonewall, and increase in glazing for the building. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the fine network of pathways for the South Campus Neighbourhood. Steve Clarke, Perry + Associates, presented the changes to the hard and soft landscape details.

In response to questions, the following clarifications were offered:

- The applicant advised that the floor to ceiling glass facades were located on the top floor units instead of ground level, because units on the ground floor with floor to ceiling glass would be more difficult.
- The height of the landscape wall varies across the site and is not higher than 18”.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- Members commented that many positive improvements have been made to the design of the project and appreciate the integration of the landscape in the design.
- One member questioned the addition of the sloped roof, instead of keeping it flat.
- One member commented the sloped roof works better with the dormers and soffits.
- Addition of glass to facades is a good improvement.
- Could explore opportunity for more glass on ground floor.

Landscape:

- Trees along parkside are big leaf maples. View into park is critical. Tree selection is too aggressive for landscaping and should be reviewed.
- Water has not been to the site or in surrounding areas, may have been the graphics used, and much more visible now.
- Amend landscape plan to lighter screen of trees on parkside.
- More opportunity for variation of landscaping along the streetscape.
- More opportunity with rainwater, e.g. treat the wall as an aqueduct
- Keep some of the big leaf maple, but not all.
- Park and streetside are too similar and should be differentiated.
- Path on westside of building is not shown on the plan and there is no easement. Recommend an easement for network connections.

The Panel unanimously SUPPORTED the revised proposal for the residential development on SC3B in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

3.2 DP06013: Theological Site A (Coast)

Lisa C. introduced the project for the market residential development on Site A in the Theological Neighbourhood. The rental housing proposal on Site G2 (and includes both market and non-market rental housing) must be approved, before Site A can get approved by the Development Permit Board. Lisa C. summarised the variances the applicant is requesting for both sites (see report). Gordon Horsman, Bastion Coast Homes Inc. introduced the project. Gwyn Vose of IBI/HB, presented architectural design for the Site A project (apartments, duplexes and townhouses) and responded to the Panel's comments from the preliminary review at the last AUDP meeting. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape design for the project.

The Panel requested the following clarifications:

- Mews is the required 6 m width for Fire access. Parkade entrance is on the east side of the site.
- Material palette includes stone, painted concrete, cream coloured metal spandrels and greenish-blue glass
- 6 ft shift of building reduced the terraced edge on the parkade entrance side but did not necessitate a further set back variance.

The Panel made the following comments:

Context Information:

- Applicant is missing materials board, model, and complete shadow study to include the equinoxes. Context is very important and lacking.
- Further review of overlook issues and shadow studies.

- Need more streetscape views with landscaping to get better understanding of design.
- View corridor is only from Iona Drive; there is no view from courtyard.

Architecture:

- One member commented that the elements were good but needed to simplify and strengthen design.
- Very heavy and grey palette.
- One member questioned the form of the duplexes.
- No resonance between scale of townhouse to apartment building and duplexes. Should be more complimentary.
- Overall refinement required.
- Demographics of building do not include small children, usually teenagers.

Massing:

- Panel members were not supportive of massing for the site and a model would have helped the assessment of the project. Also a complete sun shadow analysis and colour palette was needed.
- Consider reducing the townhouses. Possibly received with apartment on northwest corner of apartment building.
- Building needs to be simplified and open courtyard.
- Scale of courtyard still a concern. Building footprint in the Theological Neighbourhood Plan is much smaller, works conceptually. Character is being lost with massing.
- Too much, too busy and too heavy.

Accessibility:

- No accessibility to duplexes.

Landscape:

- Mews needs more landscaping, too much hard landscaping on site.
- Courtyard should have an open lawn, with grouped seating and gathering space. Space should be varied and more dynamic.

Panel support for the proposal for the Theological Site A (Coast) residential development was DENIED.

3.3 DP06013: Theological Site G2 (Westpoint)

Lisa C. introduced the project on Site G2 in the Theological Neighbourhood for a half market, half non-market rental building. James Hancock, IBI/HB, presented architectural design for the building. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the context of the site and the landscape details for the project.

The Panel obtained the following clarifications:

- There is a forested park to the south of the Iona Building.
- Somerville House is the building to the northwest of the site. The corner has common spaces inside, so there are no overlook concerns from this project.
- The distance between Somerville House and Westpoint is 20 ft.
- Materials include metal spandrel panels, white steel, stone.
- Angled setback is required to allow for view corridor to Iona Building.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- Members commented that the building is handsome, with clean modernist lines. Elegant student housing.
- The physical relationship between Somerville and Westpoint is too crowded and concern with the corner. Corner is too constrained.
- Model and materials palette would have been useful.
- Review possible separate access gates to join ramps.
- Two ramps destroys corner.

Landscape:

- Landscaping needs to accommodate view corridors to the Iona Building.
- Too much hard landscape, not enough soft.
- Ramp location is unfortunate. Landscaping between ramps is important.
- Add planting between two ramps.
- Moving ramp over is a concern with the smaller courtyard.

Panel support for the proposal for the Theological Site G2 (Westpoint) Rental Building was DENIED.

4.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, June 1, 2006

Time: 4:00 – 6:30 p.m.

Venue: Room 1330, Life Sciences Centre, 2350 Health Sciences Mall

Members Present: Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan
Joost Bakker
Linda Moore

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

Presenters/Guests: Dan Bock, UBC Properties Trust; Joe Wai, Joe Wai Architects; Kim Perry and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Gordon Horsman, Hugh Tangye, and Kim Maust, Bastion; James Hancock, Gwyn Vose, and Sergio Jaramillo, IBI / HB Architects; and Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust.

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

Stephen Quigley was elected chair for this meeting only and called the meeting to order at 4:00pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes May 4, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 DP 05007: Library Gardens

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the rehabilitation of Library Gardens, between the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre and Main Mall.

Dan Bock, UBC Properties Trust, introduced the project team Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, and Joe Wai, Joe Wai Architects. K. Perry presented the site, context, historical images, and landscape details for the project.

The Panel made the following comments:

- Re-name 'Learning Walk' the 'Library Walk'
- Natural water systems to improve landscape
- Reintroduce Fine Arts Gallery (outdoor art display) under larger section of the Sedgwick Plaza. This could animate the garden and may help integrate the two buildings.
- Can stairways to Main Mall be strengthened and widened?

- Outdoor space will encourage outdoor library activities; should be rain-protected where possible.
- There should be plenty of seating spaces offering different kinds of seating.
- Light wells might not provide enough light to Sedgewick. Sections would have been helpful.
- Permeability of connection to grass and formality of hedges.
- Base plan should be done right now, and leave room for further improvement in subsequent projects.
- Animation for paved spaces is important.
- Pull back from Sedgewick. Historically, lower level was a rock garden. Could water be introduced?
- Interface with Irving K. Barber entrances should be looked at in more detail

The Panel SUPPORTED the proposal for the rehabilitation of Library Gardens.

3.2 DP06013: Theological Site G2 (Westpoint)

Lisa C. updated the Panel on the Public Open House for both Theological Sites A & G2. No comments were received for Site G2. Comments were received regarding Site A and included concerns with the overall density of the neighbourhood, lack of traditional architectural references to existing buildings, height of apartment buildings and UNOS for the neighbourhood. Lisa C. summarised the variances the applicant is requesting for both sites (see reports).

Gordon Horsman summarised the revisions from the last meeting including increasing the slope of the parkade ramp, changes to the plaza and adding angular windows to increase views of the Iona Building. Sergio Jaramillo summarised the materials for the building.

The Panel discussed the following:

Ramp:

- Two ramps continue to compromise the corner with the prominent plaza.
- Have options to move ramp to east end been explored? Yes, the east side has a 7 ft grade change and would need a larger opening with Corus, which would end up encroaching on UNOS. Having two ramps on each side of the open space is also not a good option. Sharing ramp with Somerville is not technically feasible with the slope and grade.

Architecture:

- Coffee shop is 550 sq.ft, which is only commercial space in building.
- General design and concept are well done.

Landscape:

- Why are there trees around the UNOS? Trees should be deciduous for summer shading and open in the winter. Canopy should be open to maintain views to Iona Building.
- Walter Gage Road has too much hardscape and not enough soft landscape. Streetscape design and more trees are very important for privacy from street.

The Panel SUPPORTED the revised proposal for the market rental building on Site G2 in the Theological Neighbourhood.

3.3 DP06013: Theological Site A (Coast)

Gwyn Vose of IBI/HB summarised the revisions from the last meeting and presented the shadow study, model and material palette for the project. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the revised landscape design for the project.

The Panel discussed the following:

In general, a number of improvements have been made to the project but it does still seem to push outer limits on all fronts.

Architecture:

- Only 2 of the 5 duplex styles are similar but same material palette for all.
- Each duplex needs its own identity.
- Views are not affected with the requested relaxations. From Intracorp's Stirling House, views are available from the fifth floor. Intracorp is objecting to the 4 ft height variances. Staff to follow up on the technical confirmation of height variance.
- Panel members preferred the contemporary massing of the eastern duplex rather than the more traditional Tudor massing.
- Review adding roof decks to townhouses.
- Roof overhangs and balconies are not included in FSR. Balconies are very large, as a design element they are very attractive but they are adding to the scale and extension of the building. Possibly reduce roof overhangs to lessen visual impact.
- Duplex design could be simplified more restrained and elegant. Could be trimmed back.
- View study not thorough or accurate.
- Model is inaccurate, entry into courtyard is steeper.

Landscape:

- Water is being recycled through a cistern and reused for irrigation.
- Needs to have substantial landscaping and hedges along the duplexes.
- Courtyard has greatly improved but still need more privacy from overlook between townhouses and apartment buildings.
- Expanding opening at entry is good – it was important.

Catherine Berris left the meeting at 6:05 pm.

The Panel SUPPORTED the revised proposal for the residential development on Site A in the Theological Neighbourhood.

4.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, July 6, 2006
Time: 4:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Linda Moore

Staff: Joe Stott, Director C&CP; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Darren Chung, Adera; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; and Victor Juan, Matrix Architecture and Planning Inc.

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

The chair introduced Caroline Eldridge, the new Land Use Planner for Campus & Community Planner. The chair called the meeting to order at 4:00pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes June 1, 2006 Meeting

Stephen Quigley went through changes to the minutes that were distributed with the agenda packages. There was one additional correction under Agenda Item 3.1; the third bullet should read 'Fine Arts Gallery'. The Panel approved the minutes as circulated. Panel members requested the format of minutes in future to indicate whether the vote on resolutions is unanimous or just a majority.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP 06015: South Campus Site SC2G – Pathways

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the proposed apartment building on Site SC2G, called Pathways, in the South Campus Neighbourhood. Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, provided the background to the extent of the servicing work for the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Darren Chung, Adera, introduced the project and provided the background, context and sustainability features for the project. Dale Staples, Integra Architecture, presented the architectural details and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape details for the project.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- The applicant had explored other concepts but proceeded with this one as it was more urban, restrained, and appropriate for the location.

- Materials include stained natural cedar with Kettle Valley stone.
- Balcony overhangs are due to an interior room element.
- C&CP received comments from the Fire department that the entrance is further than the required 15 m from the curb. Whether the entrance needs to be re-designed or not is still under discussion.
- Applicant still finalising details whether to have geothermal, solar or both.

Landscape:

- The foliage right next to the building are small deciduous trees and have a small, open canopy to provide engagement and contrast to the building.
- 48 bicycle stalls are required, 50 are proposed.
- The framework for the green street design has not been finalized yet. Responsibility for installation of green streets will be with UBC Properties Trust. There will be no emergency vehicular access on the green street, only pedestrian and cyclists. Sidewalk will be 3 m in this portion and the green street will be 17 m wide, with a boulevard of trees.
- Only general guidelines for green streets available so far.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- Overall arrangement and concept is supported by panel members.
- West Coast design for this project could be more modern.
- One member commented that there was a heavy overlay on corners which worked against the verticality of the building
- The visual vibrancy of the building is missing.
- Balcony overhangs are out of place.
- Panel members recommend that the applicant go beyond the goal of a Silver REAP.
- Flat roof overhangs have excessive projections, not visually successful.
- Overall detailing and resolutions of proportions and transparency needs to work.
- Design should be a reflection in both private and public space of the south Campus Neighbourhood concept of a 'village in the woods'.
- Stone needs to be lighter above - less stone and more glass on top storey.
- Architecturally sound but overall safe. Should have a lively, richer attitude.

Landscape:

- More resources should be put into public spaces.
- Greater detail of private space and connection with across the street.
- Comprehensive plan needs to be shown for green streets and UNOS before this design's integration into that context can be properly considered.

The proposal for the apartment building on Site SC2G, Pathways in the South Campus Neighbourhood was NOT SUPPORTED by the Panel.

4.0 For Information

4.1 St. Marks Duplexes

Lisa C. introduced Victor Kuan, Matrix Architecture and Planning, as the architect currently preparing the plans for the 8 duplexes on the St. Marks site on the corner of Wesbrook Mall and Chancellor Boulevard in the Theological Neighbourhood. Mr. Kuan had some preliminary sketches of the duplexes (but none of the east corner unit). Mr. Kuan wanted preliminary feedback from panel members on the architectural style and the notion of side variances on the west and east end of the project to allow the end units to better address those spaces.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Context should be included in the drawings when an application is prepared. Include the streetscape of the adjacent duplexes to the St. Marks site.
- More details of the corner duplex are needed before comments are possible. Design should relate to both other streets.
- Design should also relate to St. Marks institutional building behind.
- Role of duplexes differs from other duplexes on Chancellor Boulevard, as there are no apartment buildings behind.
- The repetitiveness of design, in general, is more appropriate for the duplexes but given the design of others along Chancellor Boulevard to date, it doesn't fit.
- Visit Sharpe and Thompson house on Wesbrook Crescent for comparison.
- Individual duplexes should have more diversity in design, e.g. subtle variety within the form.
- More consideration should be put to refinement of Chancellor Mews.
- Where is visitor parking going to go?
- Panel was open to the proposed architectural style, subject to refinement and detail, individuality between units.
- Panel was open to the idea of entertaining setback variances on east and west ends of the project to allow these units to better address Wesbrook Mall and the UNOS open space. Without plans to review, more concrete support is not possible.

5.0 Other

The chair updated the panel on the Vancouver Campus Plan and the upcoming events.

Joe Stott updated the panel on the University Boulevard design and the new architect, KPMB, assigned to the project.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, August 3, 2006

Time: 4:15 – 6:30 p.m.

Venue: Room 212A, Student Union Building, 6138 Student Union Blvd

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Linda Moore

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Al Poettcker, Dan Bock, Jas Sahota, Hanson Ng, and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Rob Beaton, Downs/Archambault Architects; Robert Barnes, and Judy Stoyko, Perry & Associates; Darren Chung and Norm Couttie, Adera; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Robert Brown, Resource Rethinking Building Inc.; Mark Whitehead and Mark Anthony, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership; Lance Brown, ASPAC; and Grace Fan, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg.

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 July 6, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Business Arising

3.1 REAP Presentation

Lisa Colby introduced Jorge Marques to present information and background on the Residential Environmental Assessment Program (REAP). Jorge M. provided the background and history of the program. He also outlined the procedures now in place. REAP assessment is now a required step referenced in the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan and was approved by the Board of Governors this past spring. REAP is based on the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program but caters to 4 storey residential wood-frame buildings.

The Panel discussed the following:

- C. The REAP checklist, outlining the commitment to a certain points level is submitted at the Development Permit Stage and a final version is submitted at the Building Permit Stage. The level of points must be the same or better between the 2 stages. Only changes in where the points are allocated can change, but the number can't be less.

- Q. Members asked how REAP advances Sustainability at UBC. Has it been successful?
- A. J. Marques advised that voluntary credit has been embraced by developers. Every developer has gone further than mandatory.
- C. AUDP expressed concern that developers are only going through motions of sustainability but are not pushing the envelope. Jorge M. replied that there have been no outstanding examples but developers are doing better at UBC than in other areas.
- C. AUDP would like mandatory level to be increased by the University. Should be insisting on Silver REAP.

4.0 Development Application

4.1 Irving K. Barber Learning Centre – Landscape

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the proposed landscape plan for the east side of the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre. Notably the proposal calls for removal of 6 trees along East Mall for better framing of the building and to allow better construction access. L. Colby also noted staff preference that removal of only 4 trees of the 6 trees proposed for removal be considered at this time, deferring consideration of the 2 on the SE corner until post-occupancy.

Dan Bock, UBC Properties Trust, provided the background to the extent of the landscape plan in context with the Library Gardens and Student Union Blvd. Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape details and Rob Beaton, Downs/Archambault Architects, presented the architectural details for this project. R. Beaton underscored the architect's preference for clearing trees in front of the new Irving K. Barber Learning Centre main entry. This Building is intended to shine like a lantern at night at the main entry and corner access points.

The Panel discussed the following:

Overall

- Given the stature of this building as one of the key 'civic' buildings of the campus, the proposed landscaping should be used to reinforce and enhance the associated public realm. The current proposal falls well short of this.
- Landscape should complement building. Low-level interest in planting is missing. It is anonymous and austere. There is a need for more detail and colour.
- Landscape design falls short of magnitude of buildings status. Lower landscape anonymous and austere.
- Need more detail and colour.
- Larger context along East Mall to the new Administration Building, part of University Blvd, the Student Union Building, the Bosque, and Student Union Blvd was missing from design drawings and presentation.
- Connections to pathway context connections beyond this site are missing.
- Central axis of building has no axis across street and enlarged width in this area on the library side appears to add little benefit to public realm.
- Some selective tree removal would be acceptable, however, it is important to consider the landscape treatment for the library in the context of the trees on the opposite side of East Mall with the possibility of creating a legible allee of trees consistent with the significance of this precinct.
- Selective tree removal would be okay.
- Student Union Blvd Study will not be complete until the fall.
- AUDP Panel members present recommended installation deferral of landscape installation until after Student Union Blvd. study.

Trees

- Applicant has explored relocation of trees but specimens were not good candidates.

- On-site discussion with the arborist and plant operations staff regarding trees have indicated as many trees as possible should be retained. Also, trees have not been maintained with construction of Learning Centre.
- Panel members support trees be pruned and thinned.
- Removal of 2 trees on southwest corner of sites are more for architectural visibility than access issue.

Pavers

- Need to highlight design detail of pavers to make more of them.

Director of Planning noted that AUDP comments will be taken under advisement while further revisions/review of landscape plan may still be undertaken, removal of the 4 central trees may have to be sooner.

Notes:

1. Citing a desire to avoid any potential conflict of interest, Stephen Quigley abstained from discussion and voting on this item. Hence, there was no quorum for this proposal for the landscape plan for the east side of the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre.
2. The staff report erroneously stated that specific trees had been authorized for removal by the Board of Governors, however the UBC Governors Policy is a general commitment in principle to improving the view of the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre.

4.2 DP 06015: South Campus Site SC2G – Pathways

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the proposed apartment buildings on Site SC2G, called Pathways, in the South Campus Neighbourhood. This project is resubmitted for consideration, with changes proposed in order to address AUDP concerns raised at the July 6, 2006 meeting.

Darren Chung, Adera, introduced the revised project and provided the background, and context for the project. Dale Staples, Integra Architecture, presented the materials, architectural detail changes from the last submission. Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape details for the project and the green street. Robert Brown, Resource Rethinking presented the details for the REAP submission to achieve a Silver level.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- The Applicant described the materials for the building to include granite, hardiplank and hardipanel shingles. Granite is a rougher finish than in Mid Campus.
- Fire equivalencies have been resolved

Landscape:

- Details of the stormwater process were described by the landscape architect. The tertiary system will be dry during the summer and wet in the winter. There will be no standing water in the summer; the channels are designed to flow. Each site will have a filtration system, such as rain gardens, before entering the stormwater.
- Trees over slab are generally small (2 ft soil depth) with a 3 ft soil depth for larger trees.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- Generally, project has improved. Encourage further work on glazing, finishing, detailing & proportion.
- Looks better, crisper now. Concept clear and logical.
- Proportion in west coast vernacular intended to bring lightness – more work recommended on elevations to achieve this.
- Material palette is very busy. One member suggested using single material for each building.

- One member had concerns with the roof 'hats' on the building.

Landscape:

- One member commented that the rendering without the smaller trees is more interesting than the landscape plan.
- Concern with reflection from the south-facing pond.

Sustainability:

- Commendable effort on sustainability and encourage applicant to raise the bar.

The proposal for the apartment building on Site SC2G, Pathways in the South Campus Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.

5.0 For Information

5.1 South Campus Site SC2A – Highrise

Lisa C. introduced Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership, as the architect for a highrise proposal Berton Avenue, just east of the seniors housing in the South Campus Neighbourhood. No application has been received to date. The applicant seeks preliminary feedback. Mr. Whitehead presented some preliminary sketches of the highrise with a context model and model of the building with materials. Applicant is working with Rob Brown for the REAP submission and they are aiming for Silver REAP level. Grace Fan presented the landscape concept for the project.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- One member liked the tough, elegant design of the highrise. Has westcoast qualities.
- Materials include glass, egg-crate over current wall, pre-cast and cast concrete and tindall stone. One member commented that highrise appears too much like a downtown commercial building and encouraged the applicant to consider the modernist precedents he presented, where strong solid walls relieve expansive glass areas. Building needs to bring the idea of a "village in the woods" to the design. Applicant responded that the context of the forest with the highrise could be very strong.
- One member commented that more opportunities with wood could be added, eg. the townhouses.
- Punched window portion could be expanded.
- Solid parts add to residential effect.
- Sensibility of early modernism as character study for highrise with the sculptural and clean design is supported. Asymmetry and trellis are good, but reflecting the 6 storey seniors next door makes building busy. One member suggested punched window portion could be expanded; solid parts add to residential effect.
- Several members expressed concern that the clean, crisp aspect of the facades will be difficult to achieve with the proposed 'window wall' system and suggested this be carefully investigated.
- Strong evocative character will give nice variety in neighbourhood.
- Silo feature, for light, ventilation and stairs to the roof deck, is very powerful with scale of townhouses. Dissuade applicant from repetitive, over-scaled rooftop silos on townhouses.

Landscape:

- Entrances to the building include the main entrance over a bridge with a pond with recirculated water. A path runs on the east side and there is a more casual public sidewalk on the west side. One member commented that the main entrance needs to be more formal.
- There are green roofs on the north side of the townhouses and private decks on the south side.
- Level of detail and formality of landscaping is important.

- Enhance visitor parking with landscaping, too much paved surface. Consider trees between visitor parking. Once parking along fire lane is mirrored on neighbour site, will otherwise be too much paving. Consider this in the context of future courtyards along this street taking a similar approach.
- Commend applicant on landscape richness being shown. That experience is important for residents.
- Worry about disconnect from front to back of tower. Landscape treatment should be carried through.

The applicant was thanked for coming to the panel to discuss design issues before submitting a complete application.

6.0 Other

No other business was raised.

7.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

Workshop Notes

Date: Thursday, August 3, 2006
Time: 2:30 – 4:15 p.m.
Venue: Room 212A, Student Union Building, 6138 Student Union Blvd

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Linda Moore
Stephen Quigley

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Al Poettcker, Dan Bock, Jas Sahota, Hanson Ng, and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; and Robert Barnes and Judy Stoyko, Perry & Associates.

Green Streets Workshop

Joe Stott commenced the workshop noting that the workshop is a follow-up to the joint DP Board and AUDP workshop on the South Campus neighbourhood Plan held on January 18, 2006/ The Green Street context is one of three areas that will be covered. Others include UNOS design and the public realm/urban design for the commercial village. Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust, presented the background for the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan and the green streets. Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates, presented the components and general design of the green streets and the tertiary scale of the green street design, which is emerging in project proposal like Pathways and Keenleyside.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Q. What is the length of all the green streets?
A. The exact distance is not known.
Update on Green Streets:
Width - 15 meters
Length (from East PL along Wesbrook to West edge) - 320 linear meters
- Q. Is the whole context shown?
A. Details are mainly for the eastern side only. The South Campus Neighbourhood Plan provides the context for the green streets, open space and stormwater management for the neighbourhood. The green street consists of a lit 3 m multi-use trail for pedestrian and cyclists. Trees will be saved within the green street and supplemented with native plantings. The design will be more ornamental, closer to Wesbrook Place, and gradually more natural. Seating opportunities will be created with social spaces at the nodes. Waterways for stormwater management will be adjacent to the trail with connections to the individual projects.
- C. No image boards for precedents or examples of green streets design.
A. Arbutus Village and Yaletown have examples of easement but no landscape design as most are a roadway and not pedestrian only.

- Q. What does publicness mean in legal agreements?
- A. A right-of-way for a walkway, no gates are permitted. Easement and lease will have to be enforced.
- C. Trees are too close to the buildings and screen the buildings on both green streets and especially on the traditional paved streets.
- Paul Y. described the landscaping of the roadways, which will have street trees and grass to ensure a large degree of openness and visual permeability.
- Q. Have special trees been mapped? Will pathways go around the trees?
- A. Significant trees are surveyed on a site-by-site basis. Only the roadways are being cleared right now. Many criteria will have to be factored in to save the trees. In general, the medium sized trees are better as there is less chance of wind throw.
- Paul Y. described the stormwater details of the flow direction and grade for the east side of Wesbrook Place. The pond level will only fluctuate a foot or two and overflow into the aquifer. An amenity stream will have water running through it throughout the summer months, with water being supplemented by well water.
- Q. Is there a more comprehensive plan for water on a larger scale?
- A. No, there is no plan, but it does not preclude implementing a system for recycled water in the future.
- Q. Is there anything planned for the nodes?
- A. The nodes will be small-scale gathering spaces with a variety of design treatments.
- C. Panel members recommended that nodes be identified for their significance in the green streets network and diverse treatment be explored, especially to facilitate wayfinding but also to provide a less monotonous experience.
- C. There needs to be a balance from the wall of trees and stronger connections to campus.
- A. 16th Ave will be narrowed to 2 lanes with a roundabout for the 16th Ave and Wesbrook Mall intersection, to slow down traffic and improve pedestrian crossing. 2 others are proposed along 16th Ave at East Mall and SW Marine Dr. A mid-block pedestrian crossing is proposed between Wesbrook Mall and East Mall as an extension of the greenway through Thunderbird Park to Wesbrook Village. Connections will also be made to the existing trails in Pacific Spirit Regional Park. The western half of South Campus will begin servicing work in 3-4 years.
- C. The panel noted that all connections proposed across 16th Ave deserve further consideration to ensure they are effective in linking this neighbourhood with the rest of the campus - connections being a key tenet of sustainable communities.
- Q. What is the timeline for the first few projects?
- A. Pathways are to be complete by early 2008. The UNOS will be finished before occupancy of the residential units.
- Q. What is being done for wayfinding? There are challenges that need to be addressed when separating the cars and pedestrians.
- A. Addresses will be from the traditional streets, no addressing will be provided from green streets.
- C. The panel strongly recommended further exploration of how the green streets network will function, considering wayfinding, addressing for all units with front doors on the green streets and loading and delivery (eg: How is emergency access addressed? How would a resident deal with loading large, unwieldy items onto a friend's vehicle? How would delivery of a pizza be facilitated?)
- C. Diversity of green street design is very important.
- A. Design will be different across the neighbourhood, with more urban character closer to Wesbrook Village in transition to a more natural character near the buffer with Pacific Spirit

Regional Park. For example, some will have water, some not, different building types adjacent to the green street – townhouses, versus apartment buildings, and the different intersections with other green streets and roads.

C. The panel requested that further refinement of street network be undertaken to provide a better understanding of the design treatment being proposed both in this area and throughout the development.

C. Further refinement of street network would be welcomed.

Q. What paving materials are proposed?

A. Concrete sidewalk with pavers at the nodes to add design elements. Coloured or stamped concrete is a possibility. Asphalt is proposed beyond a certain distance of the Commercial centre. Stratas adjacent to the green streets are in charge of maintenance.

C. The panel expressed concern that individual stratas taking responsibility for the public realm may lead to inconsistency in the maintenance of the green streets network.

Joe Stott summarised comments received from AUDP members. AUDP members asked that the design of the green streets return at a later date with more details to address the above comments. When finalised, a design brief will be added to the Development Handbook.

3.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, September 19, 2006

Time: 4:15 – 6:30 p.m.

Venue: Room 212A, Student Union Building, 6138 Student Union Blvd

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris
Bob McKay
Linda Moore

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Mark Ostry and James Brown, Acton Ostry Architects; Jan Timmer, Jan H. Timmer Architecture; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Mark Whitehead and Mark Anthony, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership; Lance Brown, ASPAC; and Chris Phillips and Grace Fan, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg.

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:15pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes August 3, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP06021: Friedman Building Renovations

Lisa C. introduced the applicant Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects, for the renovation of the Friedman Building. The Friedman Building Renovation is a UBC Renew project comprised mainly of internal changes. However, proposed replacement of an existing staircase, a new sheer wall and changes to the façade on the south side of the building have triggered a development permit application for those portions of the project. Landscaping will only patch and repair existing landscaping.

Proposed changes are considered minor and have staff support. The project was brought forward mainly as an information item for the Panel. Mark O. presented the project plans.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- Sand blasted concrete will be used on the sheer wall.
- Existing stairs are steel too, just replacing them.
- UBC Renew has a 67% threshold to decide whether the building can be retrofitted or a new one is required. Friedman used to be hold Anatomy and will now be used by Audiology and Speech Sciences and Rehabilitation Sciences.
- Majority of ramp was existing, just a new accessible connection.

- Colour is going to stay the same as existing.

Landscape:

- Only patching and repairing existing hardscape. There is no budget for landscape with UBC Renew.
- Whole courtyard needs work beyond scope.

Sustainability:

- The project is LEED Silver design and just points away from LEED Gold.

The Panel thanked the applicant for the presentation and had no concerns with the project.

3.2 DP 06022: Iona Archives

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the underground VST/Iona Archives development permit application. It also includes a parking garage extension to Somerville House. Jan Timmer, Jan H. Timmer Architecture Ltd, presented the details for the project including the context and the layout for the archives/parking garage. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the pedestrian connections, landscape plan and materials for the project.

Staff has no concerns with the proposed underground use, layout, or density, but requested AUDP design perspective particularly on the proposed landscape plane above.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- C. The skylight against the Iona Building could be treated more like a glass pavilion.
- A. Applicant had contemplated other options but chose this one. There will be an 18" railing in front and the glass is on a 30-degree angle.
 - Garbage and handicap parking and access are at the back entrance; no fire access from this side.
 - The formal front door for the Archives is on the west side and provision was made with the Iona renovations.
 - Due to project costs asphalt is now proposed instead of concrete on the roadway.
 - Pathway is handicap accessible from Walter Gage Rd to the Archives entrance.

Landscape:

- Lawn has low retaining walls, which double as seating.
- Soil depth for trees will be a minimum 3 ft.
- Stormwater management measures will retain pre-construction run-off volume through absorption.
- Pathways will have low-level bollard lighting, no pole lighting.
- University Neighbourhoods Associations will maintain the commons area.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- One member encouraged the applicant to use concrete pavers everywhere on the surface driveway and parking to integrate better with the neighbourhood.
- One member was concerned with the glazing against the heritage building.
- Design does not have the sense of formality and prominence an archives should. The entry is lost in comparison to the prominence of the handicap parking and garbage facility. Celebrate archives entry more.
- Skylight could use some revision and work with entry to make more prominent.
- Visitor parking dilutes sense of place. Does it need to stay in this location?
- Reinforce diagonal view to Iona Building from Walter Gage Rd at St. Andrews Walk.

- Diagonal path and north-south path should meet in a more defined space. Review treatment.

Landscape:

- Larger common area in the Theological Neighbourhood Site Plan was a better plan as it was more formal.
- Ensure soil depth is sufficient for trees.

The proposal for the Iona Archives and extension of the Somerville parking garage on Iona Commons in the Theological Neighbourhood was SUPPORTED (not unanimously) by the Panel.

3.3 DP06023: South Campus Lot 1 – Highrise

Lisa C. introduced Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership to present the ASPAC highrise proposal in the South Campus Neighbourhood. This application did come to the Panel at the pre-application stage and the applicant has modified the proposal since. Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg, presented the landscape plant details.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- C. There could be more weight on the corners and on top of the highrise.
- A. The architect felt that with the trees as the backdrop, it would be powerful enough without additional detail on top. The Ellipse is like a cap to the building.
- Details of limestone and materials were discussed.

Landscape:

- C. Landscape looks disjointed from the building.
- A. The landscape separates the public from the private space. The topography is set from the parkade. Path on both sides is now accessible. Could try making pathways a stronger feature in relation to the tower.
- Natural planting should be used.

Sustainability:

- Q. Can the project reach gold for REAP?
- A. The project is well within the Silver level but there are still some challenges to reach gold. Also, difficult to use REAP for the tower. The REAP points and benefits were designed more with lower wood-frame buildings in mind.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture:

- The setting is critical to the project.
- This project is setting a precedent for the neighbourhood. It should have a special residential quality that differentiates it from commercial highrises downtown.
- The substance and quality of limestone and level of detail is key for the project. The colour will distinguish the building. The material presented should be used – not a cheaper substitute.
- One member commented that the base expression of the stone wall is too heavy and could be alleviated by replacing the punched window pattern in the first two storeys with two storey openings to create a less solid mass at the ground.
- One member commented that the original curtain wall was better in some ways. The proportion of the wall and the window shape/dimension should be changed, possibly with square windows similar to the original version.

Sustainability:

- Panel members encouraged the applicant to push the sustainability emphasis as it plays a key role in this neighbourhood.

The proposal for the highrise and townhouses on Lot 1 in the South Campus Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.

4.0 Other

No other business was raised.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, October 5, 2006
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Catherine Berris
Byron Braley
Bob McKay
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joost Bakker

Staff: Joe Stott, Director Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Paul Lebofsky and Victor Kuan, Matrix Architecture and Planning Inc.; Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects; Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership; and Paul Young and Hanson Ng, UBC Properties Trust.

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 September 19, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP06025: St. Marks Duplexes

Lisa C. introduced Paul Lebofsky, Matrix Architecture and Planning, the applicant for the 8 duplexes on the St. Marks site on the corner of Wesbrook Mall and Chancellor Boulevard in the Theological Neighbourhood. This application came to the Panel at the pre-application stage and the applicant has modified the proposal since. The REAP checklist is being finalised and the project will comply with the mandatory level. A visitor parking stall is missing from the site. Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects, presented the landscape plan details.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture:

- View line from Iona Building is a neighbourhood requirement.
- Summary of the materials and colour palette of duplexes.

Landscape:

- Removal of trees is required for pavement for turnaround.
- Access to Wesbrook is for fire only; bollards are in place to prevent other vehicular access.
- Major fir tree is on corner of site, other trees are large cedar hedge trees.
- Current landscape design needs strengthening.

- Re-building Wesbrook and Chancellor intersection would greatly help. Applicant cannot afford these extra costs. Long term configuration of intersection may change, but no detailed design at this time.
- Campus & Community Planning is working with the applicant on campus entry signage for the corner.

The Panel made the following comments:

- Panel members thanked applicant for bringing the model and context drawings.

Overall Site:

- Eastern corner of site is an important entry and transition to the University.
- Rebuilding intersection would help and then hammerhead problem would disappear.
- Consider other alternatives to turnaround.
- One member suggested bringing buildings closer to the corner and open up the landscape to view the building.
- Could buildings be shifted to save trees? UNOS is on both sides of site, so there is no room to shift.

Architecture:

- Architecture is very well done and attractive with the mixed rooflines.
- Suggest incorporating subtle differences in identity of garage doors. Ensure detailing of gates and lighting are successful.
- Design of two end buildings is well done.
- A view rendering of the corner from a car would have been useful to help understand the corner.
- Architecture will be stronger if quality and detailing are carried through.
- Develop gables further, too flat and articulated.

Landscape:

- Landscape on corner is not strong enough. Not enough public amenity value as space is too small to have a park.
- Carry street trees around corner to along Wesbrook.
- Buildings are very close together. If possible, adjusting sidewalk to incorporate more green between buildings is desirable.
- Look for creative alternatives for paving materials for the hammerhead area to soften look.
- Need to incorporate continuity of existing landscape, something as strong as existing Douglas fir tree.

The proposal for the St. Marks Duplexes in the Theological Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.

4.0 Other Business

4.1 DP06023: South Campus Lot 1 – Highrise – Setback Variances

Lisa C. provided an update on a setback variance, which was missed earlier and should have been identified during consideration of the highrise proposal in the South Campus Neighbourhood at the previous meeting. The Development Handbook requires setbacks for highrises with podiums (3 m to the podium base, and 9 m to the tower above) and does not anticipate other building forms such as the ASPAC proposal of a highrise with no townhouse podium base. Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership, outlined the setbacks required for the project. Lisa C. advised staff consider the proposal attractive and support the 4.5 m setback to the tower base in this specific context. It has raised questions of whether setbacks for all future highrises on this stretch should be reviewed prior to further highrise application in the area, should they hold a common line, be staggered etc. AUDP commentary is invited on the issues. Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust discussed the townhouses requirement along the green street to create a more urban feel.

The Panel discussed the following:

- No rationale for the 9 m setback. In the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan, a 2.5 m setback is required.
- Zone setbacks should be flexible, not too prescriptive
- Support for the ASPCA proposal remains but resolution of further highrise setback question should not be concluded before the urban design of the streetscape is more defined and understood by UBC.
- Satisfactory public realm along the street is the required end result.
- Likely would not want all high-rises to build to the same setback line. Would be too strong a form. Probably should be staggered.

5.0 For Information

5.1 Curtis Law Site Urban Design Brief for distribution

Lisa C. provided Panel members with the Urban Design Brief for the Curtis Law Site.

The Panel made the following comments:

- Heritage plan needs should be incorporated.
- Would benefit from more information regarding Hollingsworth Building.
- Buchanan Building is not mentioned under site lines and relationships.
- Panel comments from draft were sent to Roger duToit in the draft phase.
- Consideration for existing building users, as they will have to be moved if anything does happen on the site. University has very little swing space for this kind of project.
- General objectives are good, too detailed can be problematic.
- Nancy K. updated the Panel that this is just first of many such design brief's that the University Architect will provide and has been missing in the past. Funding for this project is at the very early stages.
- This project should have more characteristics as a gateway to the University.
- One member commented that the location of the loading dock of the Chan Centre was unfortunate given the gateway potential for this area as noted in the Curtis Law Design Study. Perhaps the Chan Centre loading area could be revisited at some point in the future.
- Residential project to the east will be a key player and relationship to it needs to be adequately addressed.
- Significant greenspace needs to be incorporated into design brief.
- NB: Where the panel understands that plans and images are not intended to set building footprints, it was strongly recommended that significant articulation of the building in plan and section be allowed for in the document. Related to this, the panel also suggested softening the target density to provide a range instead of a number that appears concrete.

6.0 Other

No other business was raised.

7.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, November 2, 2006
Time: 4:00 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Joost Bakker
Byron Braley
Bob McKay
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Catherine Berris

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

Presenters/Guests: Gordon Horsman and Kim Maust, Bastion; Gwyn Vose, IBI / HB Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates; Joe Redmond, Nick Maile, and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust, Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg; Norman Sippert, Director ELA; Karen Marler and Roger Hughes, Hughes Condon Marler Architects; and John Wall, Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects.

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 September 19, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as revised to add the following comment to the discussion of the Curtis Law Site Urban Design Brief:

- One member commented that the location of the loading dock of the Chan Centre was unfortunate given the gateway potential for this area as noted in the Curtis Law Design Study. Perhaps the Chan Centre loading area could be revisited at some point in the future.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP06012: Coast (Site A) – DP Amendment

Lisa C. introduced Gordon Horsman, Bastion Coast Homes Inc. to present an amendment to the project for the market residential development (Coast) on Site A in the Theological Neighbourhood. Gord H. had received a number of comments from potential buyers at the sales centre suggesting the courtyard should be expanded to all more views. Gwyn Vose of IBI/HB presented the design changes around the courtyard including reducing the townhouses from 3 to 2 storeys and adding a landscaped roof, with minor changes to the 2 apartment buildings and no changes were made to the design duplexes design. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the landscape changes for the project.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Staircases to the second level in the courtyard were removed to meet the ground oriented counts.
- Glass guardrails are on all 3 sides of the light wells for the townhouses.
- Ground plain has planting all around. It would be difficult to access guardrails and look down, as one would have to go over the planting first.
- Light wells are 4 ft.
- Lawn area is a visual green with seating in the centre along the path. Public access will be limited to hard surfaces.
- Views of water are from the 4th floor and above.
- Retaining heritage features from Chancellor Building in the amenity space, no change from previous design. Stone on back of townhouses has been removed.

The Panel made the following comments:

- Articulation of townhouses, rather dull and flat. Needs to be stronger and more vibrancy.
- Courtyard design has generally improved.
- One member preferred original courtyard.
- Townhouses should be more engaging with rest of complex.
- Townhouses should be raised a little more, instead of depressed in the street.
- Open courtyard to west side. Applicant responded, units have been sold, so can't change design of apartments.

The proposal for the amendment to the Coast project on Site A in the Theological Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.

4.0 Pre-Applications

4.1 Henry Angus - Sauder School of Business

Lisa C. introduced the preliminary application for the addition and renovation to the Henry Angus Building for the Sauder School of Business. Nick Maile, UBC Properties Trust introduced the architect Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects to present the details of the project.

The project will be phased, so that swing space will not be required while work is underway. This project will incorporate 4 buildings: Henry Angus Building, the original built in 1965, with the E.D. MacPhee north and south additions built in 1976 and the David Lam Management Research Centre built in 1992. Mark O. presented the floor plans and space programming through the building. The addition will be made to the west side of the building above the existing lecture theatres. The façade on Main Mall will be unified with curtain wall, using fins to attach to the building. The E.D. MacPhee sections will be opened up to allow natural light in. Café and store will be added to the ground floor, with a terrace opening out onto Main Mall.

Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg, presented the Main Mall principles discussed at previous AUDP meetings and the relationship of Henry Angus to Main Mall. Trees along this side of Main Mall are in the worst condition and measures will be taken to improve health.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Façade changes are only to the Main Mall side, it does not wrap around to University Blvd. Details of the edge conditions have not been finalised yet.
- Sustainable elements will be incorporated into the additions.
- Entry to David Lam would be reorganized.
- West Elevation is still preliminary and design of roof is not finalised yet.

- There will be two entrances from Main Mall on either side of the café for Undergraduates and Graduates.
- Ensure commitment to public spaces along Main Mall will be followed through.
- New lecture theatre will be a combination of 2 theatres.
- Programming of space on ground level is still being finalised.
- University Blvd and Main Mall is a very important corner. Has no animation. Programming is key to provide a sense of active inhabited spaces, especially at the ground level.
- Phases should be prioritized to ensure funding and to decide what design initiatives are critical to the school's image, function and contribution to the public realm.

The Panel made the following comments:

- While panel members agreed the façade treatment was an improvement over the dreary state of the current façade, several expressed concern that the taut glazed surface might become prevalent along Main Mall (Electrical Engineering is another example) and they did not see this as appropriate. The Chemistry Building opposite should be considered in the larger composition.
- Logistics of combining two lecture theatres needs some work. Round lecture theatre design makes it difficult for presenter to stand in the middle.
- Ensure infrastructure in existing building, electrical and mechanical, will work with new addition.
- Concern with the sun on the fully glazed wall on west side. This should be addressed in sustainability initiatives.
- West side of building has least amount of traffic, as it is the backside of the building.
- Unify building with a more consistent approach. It was suggested that the clean, simple, modernist composition of the original building (prior to all later additions) be considered in the new design.
- Setback of building is significant along Main Mall. More active ground level spaces that might spill out onto the Mall were recommended (eg: extending café and related spaces along this façade).
- One member preferred a previous version of the design where the addition was onto Main Mall.
- Business school is image conscious.
- Not clear of treatments on ground level.
- Greatest value to University and Sauder is the ground level.
- Atrium is a key aspect of bringing life to this building's dull interior. Extent of skylights indicated in rendering will be critical to achieving this.

4.2 University Boulevard

Nancy Knight provided preliminary C&CP commentary on Phase 1 of the University Boulevard project that includes the plaza at University Boulevard and East Mall, plus Buildings A1 and A2 of the University Neighbourhood Plan. Phase 1 of this project received Board of Governors Board 1 approval in July 2006.

Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust, presented the background of the project, including history and details for the University Boulevard Neighbourhood and Design Competition. There are two staged options, depending on funding. Phase 1 is the base scheme and the second phase (if funded) includes a great roof. Building A1 would be a 2-storey administrative building and Building A2 would have 2 storeys administration with 3 storeys of residential above.

Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg, presented the landscape plan, vehicular circulation, bus entrance and trolley drop-off area and bus stops. The existing bookstore parking along University Boulevard would be removed and a sustainable water feature would be designed for this area. A knoll, to replace the existing one is proposed in front of the Westbrook Building. The stairs would be oriented

to the transit station from the bosque, and a history wall could be added to the transit station to help animate the space below grade.

Clarification was provided as follows in response to Panel questions:

Transportation

- Vehicular traffic from University Blvd westbound to East Mall is left only, with right limited.
- Parallel parking will be on both sides of University Blvd.
- Trolley bus stop will be on the south side of University Blvd. TransLink is requesting a smaller drop-off location on the north side. Trolley buses will be eliminated in the long-term.
- Aplin and Martin and TransLink are working on the bus station design.
- Buses entrance from University Blvd to station will have an 18" green wall along the length.
- There will be parallel parking along University Blvd.
- Landing between levels will be zone to pay fares.
- Transit station is funded through UBC and TransLink.
- Escalators would be highly recommended for exiting the transit station.
- View angles from East Mall around the corner to University Blvd need to be reviewed.

University Square

- Ground level retail will have transparent walls to space.

Building Design

- Building A1 is only 2 storeys to ensure sunlight into the square.
- Alumni Association are hoping to have a ballroom for events at the north end of the square. If Alumni Association does not take space, than space will become rental office space.

Overall

- Housing is proposed along University Blvd and in the Gage South Neighbourhood.
- The use of granite has been the architectural expression to date.
- AMS have concerns that buildings are encroaching too close to the southwest corner of the SUB.

The Panel offered the following preliminary commentary:

Transportation

- One member commented that the current 'front door' to the University is dismal.
- Arrival experience at the bus station (lower level) is very important, as this is where the majority of people will enter the campus. This should be reflected at the station level as well as in the treatment of the proposed stairs, feature wall and landscaping that connect the station to the square.
- Trolley bus infrastructure, especially at the terminus turnaround needs to be a considered part of the design due to its central prominence in University Blvd. Integrating public art and weather protection were suggested.

University Square

- Members compared the square with SFU's Convocation Mall, as they are similar in size. Convocation Mall is an uncomfortable space as it is so large and there is very little going on at the edges. Works well for convocations but the rest of the year, when empty and the weather is grey, the space is dismal.
- Edges of the square are very important and the retail component will generate 'people activity'. To further encourage this, ensure rain protection is provided around all edges.
- Scale of overall space is very important and needs further study.
- Arcades generally don't work well in our climate however, a two-storey, south-facing arcade can be made to work.
- Very few enclosed spaces. Common spaces along square need to be engaging.

- There should be significant landscaping throughout space. Introduce a water element.
- Entering square from transit station should be made as easy and pleasant as possible. One member expressed concern with the orientation of the access.
- Arrival at square compromised by location/nature of the stair void.
- Nature and tenants of retail are absolutely critical to success of square.
- Square should be flexible to allow a variety of programming and reflect student life.
- Include the southern edge, along East Mall, within the context of the square.

Roof (Great Roof)

- Great roof is imposing and uncomfortable, however, lower option appears inconsequential. Roof can offer positive balance to mass of A2 building.
- Roof should be somewhere between the 2 options presented. Using the roof to define the spaces in the square should be explored; with the great roof, the space remains completely open because the containment is too high. Layering of the space using the roof will be important.
- Ensure plenty of lighting throughout the space – generous daylight during the day and a night lighting strategy appropriate to this key public space.

Building Design

- Generally, the monolithic nature of Building A2 results in an uncomfortably large mass even in the context of the relatively large buildings around it like the SUB. It also appears overly institutional. Methods for mitigating this include breaking the overly large roof, introducing a less taut and slick expression for the façade that would reflect the residential uses. This might also include small balconies to provide more animation for the square and/or expressing common areas of the residences to the exterior.

Overall

- Not enough density in neighbourhood for a building of this mass.
- A stronger sense of arrival to this precinct would be achieved with a narrower entrance at University Blvd and East Mall.
- Ambition of design as an animated center/town square has not yet been achieved. Boundary of the square as suggested by the paving pattern was questioned with the suggestion that focusing on the square itself may result in a better-defined public space.
- One member commented that the design is not representative of UBC or a Town/Square design.
- One member also noted the Goddess of Democracy could be given more presence.
- Lack of clear connection to the SUB from the square. Integration of the SUB into the overall design strategy was encouraged.
- Area adjacent to trolley bus stop, north side of Copp Building should have a use that provides more animation (eg: commercial space).
- Area in front of Wesbrook Building also needs to be revised.

Grassy Knoll

- Knoll is symbolic on campus. Should have more engaging edges.
- Location of knoll is problematic and may not be the solution. It was suggested that different ways of representing the knoll be explored (eg: introducing grassy steps), especially to ensure a positive relationship with the adjacent building.

The Panel thanked the delegation for their preliminary presentation of the project design and look forward to seeing the final design during the formal application review process.

5.0 Other

No other business was raised.

6.0 Adjournment

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

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, December 7, 2006
Time: 4:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Venue: Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

Members Present: Joyce Drohan (Chair)
Catherine Berris
Byron Braley
Stephen Quigley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joost Bakker
Bob McKay

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Joe Stott, Director Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager, Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; David Grigg, Associate Director Infrastructure and Services Planning; Patrick McIsaac, University Landscape Architect; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Tom Bell and Amela Brudar, Gomberoff Bell Lyon Architects; Senga Lindsay, Senga Landscape Architecture; Nick Maile, Matthew Carter, Hanson Ng, and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Mark Ostry and James Brown, Acton Ostry Architects; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg; Paul Merrick and Richard Seedorf, Merrick Architecture; Kim Perry and Carolyn Kennedy, Perry + Associates; Peter Hume, UBC PT Retail Consultant; and Mike Fong, Overwaitea.

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 November 2, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as amended to add the following comment to the preliminary review of the University Boulevard Design:

- Include the southern edge, along East Mall, within the context of the square.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP06029: South Campus Lot 16 Townhouses

Lisa C. introduced the proposal for 24 3-storey townhouses located at Lot 16, in Wesbrook Place. Lisa C. summarised the review from the staff Development Review Committee. One variance is requested with regards to not providing any handicap parking on site as none of the units are visitable. Tom Bell from GBL Architects Group Inc. presented the details of the project, including site layout, architectural design, floor plans, materials and accessibility. Senga Lindsay from Senga Landscape Architecture presented the design for stormwater management and details of the planting for the landscape design.

The Panel discussed the following:

- The maximum permitted density for this site is 29 units; only 24 are proposed.

- One member suggested the units along Gray Avenue should have a continuous façade, unbroken to create a more urban experience. The applicant responded they wanted permeability through the site.
- Walkway along west side of property is open to the public. There are no easements for this walkway.
- Basement level is 5 ft below grade at the lowest point.
- Basement level is optional as a secondary suite.
- Ramp is shared and located on the site to the west. This will require an easement.
- Soil depth over parkade slab is 2 ft.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture

- This site should be denser.
- Stylistic approach should be cleaner, west coast modernism.
- Architectural expression isn't in the west coast modern direction; it's more of a hybrid Georgian/Victorian. Did applicant have access to designs of other recent projects in South Campus? (Yes) Emerging architectural context of neighbourhood suggests more west coast contemporary references would be appropriate.
- Sustainable features should be reflected in the architecture.
- The split-level on the north side is very dark. Consider a different treatment or design compared to south side.
- One member expressed concern with location of doors in basement, if units are used as secondary suites.

Landscape

- Conifer species should be native to fit with proposed theme of landscape. The applicant responded that species were chosen for width and size of tree, to create more openness but can look for more native alternative.
- Trees fronting neighbourhood park should be coniferous, not deciduous.
- The rain garden at the east end of site too small for such an important feature on the site.
- Less concrete around rain chains would improve design.
- More seating should be placed around rain gardens.
- Recommend an easement on the western walkway.
- There should be sufficient space along the easement on the western walkway to include landscaping.

The proposal for the townhouses project on Lot 16 in the South Campus Neighbourhood was NOT SUPPORTED (2-support, 3 non-support) by the Panel.

3.2 DP06028: Henry Angus Addition and Renovation

Lisa C. introduced the project for the addition and renovation to the Henry Angus Building for the Sauder School of Business, which had a preliminary review by the Panel at the last meeting. Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects presented the history of the building, layout and plans for the design and the landscaping along Main Mall.

The Panel discussed the following:

Architecture

- David Lam component is not being expanded as it does not fit the programmatic relationship of the building as this section is for doctorate students' research, whereas the addition is for undergraduates.
- Leadership centre is divisible with a tiered lecture theatre.

- Penthouse on tower will be expanded into a larger meeting space.
- Exterior wall design will be continued along both sections.
- South facing walls of addition will have glass fins to control sunlight.
- Cedar soffits run the whole length of the arcade.
- Project will be phased with the addition, atrium and the whole ground floor, including the front of the building along Main Mall. Still reviewing the possibility of including the façade in Phase 1. Phase 2 will be all the renovations on the upper floors.
- Timing of phases should be compressed as much as possible. It is possible for students having to deal with construction for their whole 4-year degree.
- Coloured detailing of how panels will be coloured has not been finalised yet.
- Floor slab will be concrete, not white.
- Existing lecture theatres are being demolished for the addition.

Landscape

- Water from trenches along façade will be draining into planters.
- Paving along Main Mall is a separate project.

The Panel made the following comments:

Architecture

- The applicant was commended on a clear presentation and on the creative treatment of the façade.
- One member commended the applicant on keeping the toughness of the original design in the strong interplay of the horizontal with the vertical concrete walls and a reasonable rounding of the corner (to University Blvd).
- One member expressed concern that the SE corner of the building is foreboding and requires additional design consideration.
- One member expressed concern regarding the appropriateness of the proposed colours for this institution. One member commented that colours do not suit greyish climate.
- One member commented that choice of colours is good and noted that with the help of technology, it will age well. It was recommended that the technique for giving colour to the concrete walls be carefully researched to ensure aging is adequately addressed.
- Another level of detail is still needed in design.
- New façade is critical in this project's contribution to Main Mall. Panel members recommended that the façade be included in the first phase.

Landscape

- One member commented that landscaping details of bamboo and rock along forecourt does not fit with Main Mall.
- Edges should be engaging.
- Landscape in front of café, along Main Mall should be softened.
- Landscape along lane should be enhanced.
- One member was concerned with rocks proposed as landscape elements. Wonderful rock specimens will be critical to make this work.

The proposed design for the renovation and addition to the Henry Angus Building for the Sauder School of Business was SUPPORTED by the Panel.

4.0 Pre-Applications

4.1 Update on Village Core and South Campus Grocery Store Design

Lisa C. introduced Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust and consultant team, Paul Merrick and Richard Seedorf, Merrick Architecture; Kim Perry and Carolyn Kennedy, Perry + Associates; Peter Hume, Retail Consultant; and Mike Fong, Overwaitea to discuss their general layout and design ideas evolving for the Wesbrook Village Centre in the South Campus Neighbourhood. Kim Perry provided the context and Village Centre layout. Paul Merrick presented the preliminary design of the grocery store building with the market rental housing above.

The Panel discussed and offered the following preliminary commentary:

In general, the panel noted the following concerns regarding current design in the Village Centre area as the Panel feels it should be the 'heart' of the South Campus Neighbourhood.

1) Visual / Physical Connection to rest of UBC:

The Panel suggests stronger visual connection between the Village Centre area and the larger campus. The food store should be clearly visible from 16th Avenue. The Panel feels connection is critical to integrating campus community as a whole. South Campus is one of the largest neighbourhoods and should offer strong, legible linkages, the Panel thinks the food store should not turn its back on 16th Avenue as it will serve the greater community.

2) Architectural Style:

AUDP suggests a more contemporary architectural and landscape expression would be appropriate to the sense of place in this area (northwest coastal environment). AUDP further suggests the architecture in the Village Centre area should express sustainable initiatives as much as possible (local material, deep overhangs, generous access to daylight, native landscape etc.).

3) Public Realm Organization / Focus

AUDP suggest further clarification and organizational focus are needed in the public realm to create a strong social heart. More retail energy should be directed to the high street (Wesbrook Mall).

Overall Village Core

- Bring energy of foodstore over to Wesbrook side
- Panel discussed the approach of the design of the core with the retail spread out compared to a denser core.
- Members felt the parking lot ends up feeling like the village core with the Norman Mackenzie Square and the Grocery Store Square competing with each other as the heart of the Village.
- Design feels like lots of 'little hearts' but no strong core.
- Strong retail signal at entry to neighbourhood
- Surface lot can be closed off and used for events on weekends, such as farmers market.
- Central area is open and edges are animated.
- Focus on where animation should be directed.
- Community centre also faces onto parking lot.
- Village centre should be denser.
- Public space versus a piazza.

Building Architecture

- Keep architecture clean and contemporary
- Marry lower grocery level with upper level residential, design is disconnected.
- One member recommended student housing above grocery store, not just rental for anyone.
- Security issue with permeable edges of grocery store needs to be taken into consideration.
- Grocery store does not have to turn its back on 16th Avenue. Should be more visible from 16th Avenue.
- One member requested example images of design of rooftop garden.
- Access to residential component is from clock tower on east side and an additional entrance on north side of building. No direct access to the square.

- Ensure green roof is highly innovative and useable, especially considering this particular building at this location.
- North façade needs work.
- Concern with vehicular circulation around the loading bay and pedestrian traffic.
- Form of architecture should be West Coast contemporary. Don't get too 'Whistlerised'.
- Architectural style/form should be cleaner, simpler, more modern with more articulation.
- Ensure food store requirements such as garbage, noise, loading docks and overlook concerns are dealt with in conjunction with residential above.

High Street

- Focus should be on high street. Design has village turning its back on the high street.
- High street is disconnected from village core.
- Retail is on both sides of building along western edge of high street, to ensure connections to grocery store. One member commented that this draws attention away from the high street and should be more concentrated.

Transportation

- 16th Avenue will be narrowed to 2 lanes. The first phase starts from the eastern side of Hampton Place to East Mall with a roundabout at 16th Avenue and Wesbrook Mall. Work will be starting next summer. The second phase along 16th Avenue will include 2 more roundabouts at East Mall and SW Marine Drive and narrowing to 2 lanes for this portion too. A crossing will be added mid block between East Mall and Wesbrook Mall. From the Thunderbird Fields.
- One member commented that roundabouts are not an improvement for the intersection. These may slow traffic however, they are confusing and awkward for pedestrians.
- Be conscience of connection to rest of campus across 16th Avenue and especially the connection to grocery store. Currently, this is extremely weak but should be one of the strongest aspects of the plan.
- Surface parking (100 stalls) is ~ 1/3 of total parking in Village and is in addition to the approximately 200 underground parking of Overwaitea.
- This parking is intended for the long term, no additional retail will be built in this location; it will be on the periphery.
- One member commented, that there is too much effort in accommodating the automobile and not enough in creating a desirable pedestrian experience.
- The development lacks connections to the surrounding community and would gain a lot particularly by having a connection directly east

5.0 Other

No other business was raised.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.