



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2007



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, January 11, 2007

**Time:** 4:15 – 7:00 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  
Joost Bakker  
Bob McKay

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Al Poettcker, Jas Sahota, Mike Redmond, Matthew Carter, and Hanson Ng, UBC Properties Trust; Peter Ridgway, Toby Russell Buckwell & Partners Architects; Judith Reeve, J. Reeve Consultants Ltd.; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architect Inc.; Kim Perry, Carolyn Kennedy, and Karin England, Perry + Associates.

#### 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 December 7, 2006 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as distributed at the meeting.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP06033: Totem Park Common Block Addition and Renovation

Lisa C. introduced the project for the addition and renovation to the Totem Park Common Block for Housing and Conferences. Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust, presented the location and general site layout for the project and introduced the project team Peter Ridgway, Toby Russell Buckwell & Partners Architects and Judith Reeve, J. Reeve Consultants Ltd. Peter R. presented the history of the building, layout and plans for the design and Judith R. presented the landscaping changes for this project.

*The Panel asked for further clarification on the following items:*

##### Architecture

- Final material for the spandrels has not been finalised. The colour would be slightly off-white with the material above the door in the same material.
- Student Lounge has large doors opening out into courtyard.
- Stair enclosure should have a story separate from architectural expression of building.
- Handrail details are not finalised yet.
- Mullions will be a dark brown.

#### Landscape

- Some existing walls in the rhododendron garden will be removed and some will be replaced with stepped walls to provide extra seating. Same materials will be used as existing walls.
- Plant species should be drought tolerant species.

#### Circulation

- Rationale for the vehicular drop-off changes was to blur the line of the zones in this area.
- Bus stop exists. Only passenger cars would go through this drop-off zone, not buses or emergency vehicles. This is only a drop-off for the Commons Block. The other residence houses have a separate unloading area.
- Columns along walkway are 16-18 feet between each.
- Wayfinding and directional signage is important for the site.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

#### Architecture

- One member commended applicant on design of addition.
- Spandrel on stair portion needs to be revisited.
- Is angle of overhang at ground level necessary?
- Lack of clarity with design approach of new addition.
- Architectural design of addition should either be much more direct as a 'beacon', or blend right in to existing building. Current design is caught in the middle.
- One member commented that design needs to be much stronger and more playful.
- Architectural expressions needs to be simplified and strengthened.
- Access to south lounge has a generous entrance but the addition creates a pinched entrance.
- Language of the canopy, entrance and new door needs to be revised.
- One member concerned with east elevation of the building. Scope of project falls too short.
- Entrance is not strong enough and the addition is obscured by trees.
- Break at entrance is good but should have stronger horizontal lines.
- One member commented that addition is good to have its own identity from existing building.
- One member had concerns with the 45-degree angle and soffits and the butterfly entrance.

#### Landscape

- One member commented that overall landscaping is heading in the right direction with seating walls and courtyard design.
- Ensure grass and seating walls are south facing.
- North plaza design should draw people into the space. For example, continue permeable paving material into space.
- Site plan of existing conditions should have been included to compare with plan.

#### Circulation/Way finding

- Overall drop-off area a concern. Space is not constrained in this area, so drop-off should be designed separate from the walkway. Turnaround needs revision.
- If totem can be moved, new location integral part of way finding and linking to the front door.
- Way finding is critical for the project.
- Sense of arrival is critical and lacking in design.

The proposed design for the renovation and addition to the Totem Park Common Block for Housing and Conferences was NOT SUPPORTED by the Panel.

## 4.0 Pre-Applications

### 4.1 Update on Village Core and South Campus Grocery Store Design

Lisa C. introduced the context work underway for the Village Centre in South Campus for a third and final opportunity for AUDP input, noting it is not an application itself. This context work is being undertaken by UBC Properties Trust and consultants to obtain a good sense of objectives for the area prior to proceeding with development projects. Individual applications will be required to come forward for each component part of the Village Centre on a project-by-project basis when more detailed design input will be possible. The South Campus Neighbourhood Plan currently outlines the basic landuse, density, height, and character issues of the Village Centre but this context work is intended to further refine the organization, circulation and general initial retail priorities within the area. Limited commercial floorspace is available throughout the area and priority areas for distribution is proposed. UBC PT and consultants have worked closely with staff in the development of these ideas and have incorporated AUDP commentary twice before from previous discussions. These urban design context ideas are now brought back to AUDP for a third time and final commentary is requested. Subsequent projects within the area are awaiting guidance from the context work in anticipation of applications in early spring to meet community demand for the grocery store as soon as possible.

Al P. outlined planning process from the Official Community Plan, Comprehensive Community Plan, through the South Campus Working Group to the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan. Al P. highlighted the changes from the last design presented to the AUDP.

The Chair summarised the comments from the last AUDP meeting including the need for a stronger visual connection between the Village Centre to the rest of UBC, a more contemporary architectural and landscape expression and further clarification on the public realm organization.

*The Panel discussed and offered the following preliminary commentary:*

#### Overall Village Core

- One member commented that layout of village is good.
- Ensure details of all public spaces eg. lighting and streetscapes, are of high quality.
- One member commented a variety of buildings and architectural styles throughout village.
- Ensure animation will extend to community centre side.
- Design will be critical for success of village. Ensure future applicants receive previous successful applications.
- One member thanked UBC PT for presenting historical context.
- Vitality of village centre critical.

#### Grocery Store

- One will only see top 3 storeys of the residential above the grocery store through the trees along 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Only entrance to residential on from 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, grocery store can only have 1 entrance, which will be from the village side.
- More prominent corner on Wesbrook at 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Should have a more urban edge.
- One member requested a rendering of view of food store at the street level from 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue, turning onto Wesbrook Mall, also from Thunderbird Fields across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Keep planting low and ensure visibility from 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue on north side of grocery store.

#### High Street

- Different retail on both sides of high street and also different retail on both sides of west building along high street.
- Ensure vitality over phasing of retail in village.
- Quality and placement of retail is key.

- Future retail will be added along Wesbrook Mall and at the base of building at the south end of the surface parking lot.

#### Transportation

- Wesbrook Mall will be accessible from both Marine Drive and 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Student drop-off should be separated from Village Centre. One member commented that traffic pattern for student drop-off is confusing. Applicant trying to encourage more traffic through Village.
- Circulation loop is encouraged for student drop-off.
- Only staff parking on east side of school.
- Some members were concerned that student drop-off traffic would disrupt the village centre circulation; student drop-off parking circulation should be restricted to the west side of school grounds.
- Ensure safe pedestrian crossing over 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. One member recommended a pedestrian bridge across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Applicant mentioned that pedestrian bridge needs to be accessible, so would be a very large structure. Another member suggested flashing lights at crosswalks.
- A lot of pedestrian crossing through village, review possibility to add another north-south street for vehicular traffic.

#### **5.0 Other**

No other business was raised.

#### **6.0 Adjournment**

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, February 1, 2007

**Time:** 4:10 – 5:15 p.m.

**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

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

**Members Absent:** Joyce Drohan  
Joost Bakker  
Bob McKay

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Mike Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; Peter Ridgway, Toby Russell Buckwell & Partners Architects; Judith Reeve, J. Reeve Consultants Ltd.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes January 11, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as distributed at the meeting.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP06033: Totem Park Common Block Addition and Renovation

Lisa C. summarised comments from the last AUDP review for the addition and renovation to the Totem Park Common Block for Housing and Conferences. Peter Ridgway, Toby Russell Buckwell & Partners Architects, presented the changes to the site layout and architectural design for the project and Judith Reeve, J. Reeve Consultants Ltd. presented the landscaping changes for this project.

*The Panel asked for further clarification on the following items:*

##### Architecture

- View of addition from driveway approach. Existing beech trees are mature and visible underneath
- Exposed slabs will require soffit for insulated floor; look won't be as clean over entrance as rendering indicate.
- Roof and sunscreens could be simplified.

##### Landscape

- Access to north courtyard is circuitous.
- Existing coniferous is high-branched so clear visibility for pedestrians. Ground cover along walkway is 3-4 ft.

#### Circulation

- Bus stop is only for small shuttle buses.
- There is a path and a bench between the 2 trees for the bus stop.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

#### Architecture

- Commend applicant on changes to project, both architecture and landscape.
- One member commented focus is too narrow with regards to east elevation of the building.

#### Landscape

- Ensure north courtyard has enough light and is visible from main walkway.
- Drop wall even further and sooner to open up space.
- New monument location in courtyard needs artwork as a focal point, if monument is not moved.
- One member concerned with usability of north courtyard being dark and damp with the weather.

#### Circulation/Wayfinding

- One member was concerned with trampling of landscaping at bus stop.
- Wayfinding still needs to be clearer for main entrance from West Mall.

**The proposed design for the renovation and addition to the Totem Park Common Block for Housing and Conferences was SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

#### **4.0 Other**

No other business was raised.

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, March 1, 2007  
**Time:** 4:10 – 7:00 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

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

**Members Absent:** Catherine Berris  
Bob McKay

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director Planning; Patrick McIsaac, Landscape Architect; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Joe Redmond, Dan Bock, and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Kim Perry, Perry + Associates; Catherine Alkenbrack, Associate Director F&CP; Tony Robins, AA Robins Architect.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. Joe Stott summarised changes to the agenda including the deferral of the Wesbrook Village Grocery Store to the next meeting, Library Gardens project has been withdrawn. A preliminary review of the University Boulevard project was added to the agenda. The Panel approved the agenda as revised.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes February 1, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as distributed at the meeting.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.2 DP 03031: Irving K. Barber Learning Centre - Landscape

Joe S. introduced the staff report for the proposed landscape plan for the east side of the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre.

Patrick McIsaac presented the neighbouring context of the Student Union Boulevard. All neighbours around the Student Union Blvd. were involved in workshops to develop a design for the Student Union Blvd. Patrick presented the final design of the boulevard.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

- Intention is to restore the Victory Garden, which was built in commemoration for alumni who fought in WWI, but was destroyed when Women Studies was built.
- Traffic consultant has not been involved yet to determine the road circulation to/from parking the garage.
- One member had concerns with the functionality of vehicular traffic, convenience of drop-off to SUB due to distance, and connection from North Parkade to SUB across a field that could get very wet during the winter months.



- SUB lease extends beyond the building on the north side. Covering to loading dock would be on their property. Patrick M. is under discussion with SUB to see if they will cover the loading dock.
- View of Irving K. Barber front entrance stairs will be seen from Wesbrook Mall, once one row of trees is removed in the bosque.
- Gage surface parking area was outside of study area.
- Context with Vancouver Campus Plan should also be considered in a project of this significance.
- One member expressed concern with timing of implementation of the plan in context with neighbours.
- Future of East Mall as a street has not been addressed. What are the long-term goals, will it be closed and how does it relate to the new Law building?

Dan Bock, UBC Properties Trust, provided the background to the extent of the landscape plan in context with the Library Gardens. The Library Gardens project is currently on hold. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, presented the site layout and landscape details for the project.

*The Panel asked for further clarification on the following items:*

- No major trees except around the heritage core. Christmas tree was located here.
- One member commented removal of all 6 trees at once.
- One member commented that a capital phasing plan for the landscaping should be required for Library Gardens.
- One member commented that there should be an overall landscape concept for the whole campus.
- East side of IK Barber is very bleak.
- One member commented that the paving material does not relate to material for Koerner Plaza.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Coloration of paving materials should have some consistency.
- Design is not very sophisticated when it stops right at the property boundary, should go beyond to consider interface with adjacent properties.
- Library Gardens design has been watered down.
- One member commented that landscaping is stark on the west side of the building. Edge should be softened, eg. low landscaping instead of lawn.
- One member commented on hierarchy of projects:
  1. Connection from IK Barber to Sedgewick
  2. Main Mall
  3. Library Gardens
- Hard to know what plan will be due to vague timelines. UBC has no strategy for maintaining landscape.

**The proposed landscape design for the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre was SUPPORTED (not unanimous) by the Panel.**

#### **4.0 Pre-Applications**

##### **4.1 Education Relocation to Ponderosa**

Joe S. introduced the staff report for the proposed relocation of the Faculty of Education from the Scarfe Building to new buildings on the Ponderosa site. Joe S. introduced Tony Robins, AA Robins Architect to present the project. Tony R. presented the location and general site layout of the buildings on the Ponderosa Site, which includes the University's Arboretum.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

#### Overall

- One member commented this is a good location for Education
- This would be the largest building complex on campus.
- Half of existing occupants are part of Education. Other half is a variety of different departments and plans already exist for moving other constituents. Scarfe will be available.
- General programming layout of each of the buildings was presented.
- St. John's College is kitty corner from Ponderosa site.
- Estimated budget is \$65-70 million
- Courtyard area/arboretum as a public venue versus inner sanctum for one faculty.
- A lot of possibilities for public access to the arboretum.
- Courtyard should be generous enough for a public space.
- First Nations House of Learning acts as 4<sup>th</sup> wall to complex.
- Still a little too early for detailed sustainable measures, but intention is to take as many measures as possible.
- Applicant wants to achieve Gold LEED.

#### Architecture

- Ponderosa Building is a heritage building.
- One member commented that this is an interesting proposal to utilise Ponderosa in a new way.
- General layout of Ponderosa building has the entry at the main floor with access to the roof with a glass canopy.
- Invigorating proposal reflects the ethos of the Faculty of Education.
- Design helps to define this end of University Boulevard.
- Massing for site, 5 storey building on Lower Mall, and 4 storey on West Mall, building heights will be flat across top with grade change on site.
- One member commented that buildings are very long and scale needs to be broken down.
- It was noted that the building framework is very flexible, allowing interventions to break up the continuous volume as well as lending itself to a phasing strategy.
- Concern was also expressed regarding the vitality of the ground floor.
- Glazing will go to the ground to have a transparent view through building.
- Words on glass could represent a historical barrier. Reviewing possibility of being able to change the words, have the glass on a separate wall.
- The mirror boxes are casual meeting spaces inside, 20 x 20 ft, 2 storeys high, with one-way glass (see outside, but not inside).
- One member commented on the number of mirror boxes and if it was possible to reduce number or to consolidate them.
- One member was concerned with maintenance of mirror boxes.

## **4.2 University Boulevard**

Joe S. introduced Joe Redmond, UBC Properties Trust, to present an update on the design changes to the University Boulevard project using a 3-D animated flythrough of the design and layout.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

#### Overall

- Proposal much improved from previous plans.
- Wesbrook Building has no current plans, but new building for corner is planned. The panel commented that this would be a positive move, offering much better containment of the larger area than the Knoll. New building should be much closer to sidewalk along University Blvd and East Mall.
- Applicant summarised the general uses of each building.

- All residential is student housing.
- Applicant summarised sustainability initiatives for square, eg. heat recovery from bus loop vents to heat buildings and geothermal.
- Define the true extent of the project, especially to focus limited funding.

#### Transportation

- Bus loop requires 10x20 ft stack for venting. Stack is attached to the elevator and stairways to create a landmark feature. One member commented this piece is architecturally important for the scheme; it might also be used for other building ventilation.
- Applicant summarised vehicular movement along University Boulevard and East Mall.
- One member commented that the intersection should be normalized (ie: streets meeting squarely) as opposed to U Blvd meandering.
- University Blvd and East Mall intersection needs to be more defined as a terminus. Plan future buildings for final intersection design, with all 4 corners much tighter.
- Urban streetscape needs to be more strongly defined.

#### Retail

- 34,000 sq.ft (20 units) of retail in University Square.
- Retail space is broken up by walkways to connect to Aquatic Centre, Empire Pool and SUB.
- Retail podium will be facing into the square.
- Store frontage should each have some individuality but need a balance with architectural integrity.
- Retail consultant review will incorporate all retail from SUB, Wesbrook Village, University Village and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### Architecture

- Student housing building doesn't have a residential expression. Presentation is currently only showing the massing.
- Board and Senate Room moving to square. Senate Room has been moved back with breakout room on Square side.
- One member commented Board and Senate Room should have more presence on Square as key symbolism.
- One member commented that moving Board and Senate room is not a positive move.
- Alumni and Development Office will be moving to space above Board and Senate.
- Roof over bus loop has grass roof with glass openings.

#### Public Realm

- All Panel members commented that 'Troll' (the 1 storey building with stairs to the top at the north of the Square) is not appropriate for Square.
- 'Troll' should have more of a building form; it should be more transparent and relate to both Bosque and Square.
- One member was concerned with the Knoll as landscaping; needs to work formally.
- The public realm should be defined by breaking up the pavement – in lieu of current 'wash' of treatment across square and intersection.
- Overall the project has made many positive moves; still some concern with open space, especially as the Square relates to the intersection.

### **5.0 Other**

No other business was raised.

### **6.0 Adjournment**

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, April 5, 2007  
**Time:** 4:10 – 7:15 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

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

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Matthew Carter, Al Poettcker, Jas Sahota, Rob Wood, Hanson Ng and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; Kim Perry, Michael Patterson, and Carolyn Kennedy, Perry + Associates; Ray Letkeman and Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architect Inc.; Paul Merrick, Merrick Architecture; Rob Brown, reSource Rethinking; Richard Drudl, Urban Systems; Andrew Bakker, Aplin & Martin; Peter Hume, UBC PT Retail Consultant; Mike Fong, Overwaitea; Ken Bogress, Concert Properties; Nigel Baldwin, NB Architects; John Davidson, DYS Architects; and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes March 1, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP 07003: Wesbrook Village Grocery Store

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the proposed grocery store with 3 floors of residential above, and an adjacent building with restaurant on the main floor, office on the second and a third floor of institutional use, which has had three preliminary reviews by the Panel. Lisa C. introduced Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust and the consultant team to present the context and general layout of the Wesbrook Village Centre in the South Campus Neighbourhood. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, provided the context of the Village Centre, the site and landscape details. Paul Merrick, Merrick Architecture, presented the various perspectives of the 2 buildings. Rob Brown, reSource Rethinking, presented details of the sustainability measures to achieve a Gold REAP level.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

##### Architecture

- Main entrance to residential portion is on east side, with a secondary one on the west side.
- Previous design had a tower; current design has an attic space on roof of grocery store building.
- Restaurant tenant has not been identified yet, but there have been discussions with some businesses to ensure space will work.
- Northwest corner needs to be more transparent.

- Mezzanine in food store will be used for administration and baked goods production.
- Storefront and Signage guidelines will be critical for Village.

#### Landscape

- Stormwater management is still in the design stage.
- Kim Perry summarised details of tree buffer and landscaping on north side of building to 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

#### Circulation

- There are no curbs along the street in front of the grocery store entrance.
- There will be curbs along Wesbrook Mall; prominent pedestrian crossings will have a bump up and down.
- Surface parking treatment is with pavers and coloured concrete.
- Dumpsters for restaurant off lane from Wesbrook Mall, which is also fire access for residential portion. The dumpsters will be enclosed. Garbage for residential and grocery store is underground.
- Richard Drudl summarised traffic counts for typical peak hour of parking ramp, which is ~ 250 cars. Other similar places are much higher than this.
- Smaller 30 ft trucks will be used to service Save-On-Foods. 12 Deliveries/day will be scheduled, mostly in the earlier part of the day.

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

##### Architecture

- There was general consensus on improvement of the overall design.
- One member commended applicant on design and layout of foodstore
- Careful design of signage, lighting and canopies will be critical to the overall appearance of the commercial.
- Suggestion to keep cashiers further away from entrance, to allow space for displays.
- Commend applicant on achievement of incorporating heat recovery and geothermal.
- One member was still concerned with north elevation of grocery store. Needs to have more connection and transparency with the rest of South Campus.
- Tower needs to be a stronger feature. It has diminished from the previous iteration.
- Suggestion to increase transparency of mezzanine uses in food store at 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue elevation.
- Buildings framing the entry area to this parcel need to be revisited to ensure the uses, especially at grade are appropriate to this important point of access – eg: treatment of the loading bay was noted as a concern.

##### Landscape

- Stormwater management needs to be addressed in an interesting and progressive way, especially with rooftop run off
- There are a number of stark areas around the parking lot. More landscaping to make a friendlier more comfortable space.
- Water feature at corner of 16<sup>th</sup> Ave and Wesbrook more decorative than a stormwater.
- Courtyard is dark.

##### Circulation

- Addressing access from north has been improved but needs to go much further
- Concerned with logistics of loading bay and pedestrian entrance to village. The former needs further consideration especially in terms of traffic congestion and disturbance to residents. The latter needs to create a very strong, very clear and comfortable pedestrian link to the 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing.
- Traffic circulation beyond project boundaries needs to be revisited. It was suggested that an access on the south side of the lot (previously explored as an option) be considered to alleviate the congestion anticipated by the many uses being served – residents, food store, CRU's and Community Centre.

**The proposed grocery store and adjacent building on Lot 48 of the South Campus Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

## 4.0 Pre-Applications

### 4.1 DP07010: Three UNOS Parks in South Campus – Khorana, Smith, and Nobel Parks

Lisa C. introduced the proposal for the installation of the three UNOS parks in South Campus. There was no staff report as the applicant submitted the drawings late, but the Panel may consider this presentation as a formal review as there are timing constraints for the project.

Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust, presented the background and context for the project. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates summarised the circulation for Wesbrook Place and presented the open space strategy, draft Design Guidelines, stormwater management, and the detailed design of each of the three parks.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

- Stormwater management and the pumping and re-circulating water from the aquifer. Studies have been done that there are benefits of drawing water from the aquifer. Water levels will be controlled to ensure water throughout the year.
- Mixture of hard and soft edges.
- UNA will maintain parks, UBC Properties Trust are just installing.
- Only installing 3 parks as 1 park is adjacent to the school and will be designed and built together, the last park will go ahead once site servicing for the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase of Wesbrook Place is installed.
- Request by UNA to have park facilities available to residents prior occupancy of first projects.
- Approach to community gardens is to designate areas but not have them available until residents decide they want them.
- Nobel park has a curving stonewall wall along Wesbrook, and community gardens area would be behind this.
- UNOS designated for residents is comparable to City of Vancouver. Designation includes greenways and green streets. Ratio is lower if only park areas are counted.
- Connections to parks are important.
- Next meeting, green streets will be brought to AUDP for information.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Further detailed design of connections and stormwater are necessary, as they will influence the park design.
- Design of Khorana Park is very busy.
- Buffer between 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Birney Ave – 30m is permanent and 30m is managed forest edge.
- One member commented that this is valuable land and recommended developing park plans with possibilities for the future – ie: leaving opportunity to address needs of the future established community.
- Ensure community gardens in Nobel Park have a formal aspect as they may not be maintained year round – eg: a border of evergreen shrubs or the like.
- Smith Park centrepiece is busy.
- One member was concerned with designing parks at this stage, before residents are there.
- Parks are too busy and too complex.
- Simplify forested element to create a balance.
- Ensure parks space is flexible.
- Commend applicant on high design around parks.
- Celebrate stormwater.
- Need to soften edge treatments.

Paul Young responded to some of the comments. The parks may have phased components to them. Smith Park already has two approved projects on either side of the park. Survey was conducted of current residents on campus and general consensus was to ensure parks designed for everybody as there was a multigenerational aspect of the community. Compliment buffer with new plantings for Khorana Park and may tree to salvage trees and shrubs from sites. Smaller trees on site may be retained.

**The proposed landscape plans for three parks – Khorana, Smith, and Nobel, in the South Campus Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

## 4.2 ENQ 0610: Seniors Residence in South Campus

Lisa C. introduced the proposal for the senior's residence project in South Campus. Lisa C. introduced Ken Bogress, Concert Properties who introduced the team Nigel Baldwin from NB Architects, John Davidson from DYS Architects, and Bruce Hemstock from PWL Partnership to present the programming, location, general site layout of the buildings, preliminary elevations, and landscaping for courtyard and rooftop patio.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

### Overall

- There is direct access to the green street.
- Servicing entrance on north side is located in the middle for access to the retail and the senior's centre. Parking for Centre's bus and car will also be here.
- Brain gym is for researching ways of improving your memory.
- No additional retail on ground floor of condo tower.

### Architecture

- Flyover in design is not finalised but anticipating it to be transparent and white. Would like to make passageway more animated.
- Base material will be coarse, possibly concrete block, nothing specific at this time.
- Quality of materials important. Should be more colourful. Stone grey and buff brick are being contemplated.
- One member commented that bridge looks awkward. Possible to have amenity wall not flush with exterior wall. Architect responded that they had reviewed this possibility but actually found solution presented works better.
- Dramatic roof element. Breaking the roof plane at the entrance takes away from overall roof. Corners of building appear weak with this strong roof.
- Glazing and material expression between the two buildings.
- One member commented that the sidewalk edge of south end of condo needs to be improved.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

### Overall

- One member commended applicant on the effort to create a rich ground floor frontage.
- It was also noted that the contemporary design of this project was a refreshing approach in keeping with the spirit of this brand new neighbourhood.
- Ensure retail is as dynamic as seniors amenity space. Consider additional separation of some spaces in seniors' amenity space to provide more choice – ie: contemplation, private conversation, games and active socializing should all be accommodated.
- Revisit loading location, especially to mitigate impact on adjacent street.
- Retail on condo building would strengthen high street.

### Architecture

- Bridge design needs some work. Gateway is a good idea. Light and simple design is good. Integrate landscaping in some way.
- Northwest corner roof design does not fit with rest of roof design. Needs to be modified.
- Vertical volumes flanking entry to north building appear overly powerful.
- Quality of materials important.
- More colour in design is encouraged, especially to provide some diversity over a relatively long building mass.
- Glass should be used for guardrails.

## 5.0 Other

No other business was raised.

## 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 3, 2007  
**Time:** 4:10 – 6:30 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories, 2185 East Mall

**Members Present:** Joost Bakker (Chair)  
Catherine Berris  
Byron Braley  
Bob McKay  
Stephen Quigley  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

**Members Absent:** Joyce Drohan

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Mike Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; and Larry McFarland and Craig Duffied, Larry McFarland Architects.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes April 5, 2007 Meeting

The minutes were amended to correct an error as follows (see bolded text):

- One member was still concerned with ~~south~~ **north** elevation of grocery store.

The Panel approved the amended minutes.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP 07014: New Daycare Facility

Lisa Colby introduced the staff report for the proposed four new daycares to be housed in two new single storey duplex buildings, with surrounding outdoor play areas for Phase 1 and a fifth one for Phase 2 in the Acadia Park Residence, across from the existing daycares. Lisa C. introduced Larry McFarland to present the context, Childcare Society Goals and Mandates, site layout and materials for the new daycares.

Lisa C. noted that concerns raised at the staff DRC meeting included minimal sustainability strategy in architecture, and low density of the proposal. Lisa C. acknowledged the unique program requirements favouring low density but asked the Panel to also speak to those issues in their deliberations.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

Overall

- Not possible to renovate existing residences as they are at the end of their life.
- Budget was a constraint resulting in lack of sustainable features for project.
- Disconnect between capital and operating budgets for promoting green features in the project.
- 146 new spaces will be created to the 331 existing spaces and there is a 1300 waitlist for the daycares.



- Limited connection of daycares with Early Childhood Education.
- Overall master plan for daycares around campus should be implemented. Why all in one place?

#### Architecture

- Applicant advised that having a contiguous play area with the floor area is important, so difficult to have a second floor to the daycare.
- Too much maintenance with stucco finish.
- Value of cupola is ~ \$6000 for each duplex. There is no budget for this.
- One member commented that design and layout of project is good.
- Concept of the small modules for the daycares is for the different groups using each daycare.
- Vaulted space was used to hang art to individualise each space.
- One member commented that the collection of all the daycares in same architectural style is relentless.

#### Landscape

- No play equipment is included with budget, only berming, bicycle loop and landscaping.

#### Density

- Overall density on site is too low.
- One member commented that the land is worth a lot and can UBC afford to keep developing land at such a low density.
- One member commented that that the notion should be explored to incorporate other uses on-site.

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

#### Overall

- One member commended applicant on detailed presentation.
- One member requested a rendering of daycare site.
- Existing daycares along Osoyoos Crescent is monotonous. Should update daycare masterplan vision and tuck into other places on campus.
- One member suggested street treatment to link both sides of daycare into a 'tot-town'.
- Should have a more urban/village atmosphere.
- Longer term planning needed.
- Create alternatives, options for the fifth site since it is by itself.
- Need to introduce imagery/identity of daycare.

#### Architecture

- Create more opportunities for playfulness. Looks too much like a 'project'. Needs more trees/banners/special paving. Basic site planning okay but not enough money to make it work.

#### Landscape

- Play area behind existing daycares not aging well. Ensure durable materials used.
- Create more visible public landscape.

#### Density

- Overall concern with land efficiency in this area.

#### Sustainability

- Expected better sustainability program
- Life cycle costing/utilities benefits would offset sustainability measures
- Landplaning at this density cannot continue. Look at other options before Phase 2.

#### **Panel Resolutions:**

**The Panel offered commentary that the proposal is NOT SUPPORTED as an efficient land-use/land planning scheme.**

**CARRIED**

**The design and architecture of the proposed daycare buildings in the Acadia Park Residence, assuming the land density as an accepted context, was SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

**CARRIED (not unanimous)**

#### **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, June 7, 2007  
**Time:** 4:10 – 7:00 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 212A, Student Union Building, 6138 Student Union Blvd

**Members Present:** Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe (Chair)  
Catherine Berris  
Byron Braley  
Bob McKay  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:** Joyce Drohan  
Joost Bakker

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Ken Bogress, Concert Properties; John Davidson and Colin Shrubbs, Davidson Yuen Simpson Architects; Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership; Robert Brown, reSource Rethinking; Paul Young and Hanson Ng, UBC Properties Trust; and Kim Perry and Carolyn Kennedy, Perry + Associates.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes May 3, 2007 Meeting

The minutes were amended with the following:

- Add the following under the density section Comments:
  - Explore alternative ways of provide daycare within increased density.
- Correct the Members Absent to include Catherine Berris

The Panel approved the amended minutes.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP 07017: South Campus Seniors

Lisa C. introduced the proposal for the senior's residence project in South Campus. Lisa C. introduced Ken Bogress, Concert Properties, who in turn presented the site layout and unit breakdown of the project and introduced the team John Davidson from DYS Architects, Bruce Hemstock from PWL Partnership, and Robert Brown, reSource Rethinking. John D. presented the context, amenities, architectural drawings, floor plans and materials; Bruce H. presented the guiding principles and landscape details for the courtyard and rooftop patio; and Robert B. summarised the details of the REAP submission.

Committee member Bob Mackay declared conflict of interest in the seniors application and withdrew from discussing and voting on this project.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

Overall

- South end of south building is set back from Wesbrook. One member commented that the building should be closer to that street edge to maintain the building presence and high street edge. Applicant responded that this would be a significant change to the proposed and did not feel that the setback diminishes street presence in this case. Grade also falls off at the corner.
- Retail distribution is limited; more cannot be added.

Architecture

- South exit of bridge is enclosed and has French doors to the outside
- Eastside of bridge is concrete with coloured glass
- Railing around roof terrace is glass. Perforated metal guards will be utilized on curved balconies.
- Internal width of bridge is approximately 12 ft
- Parking stall dimensions is towards larger size. Applicant also contemplating adding valet parking.

Sustainability

- 50% of roof is green; 50% is hard surface
- Roof of the bridge portion is not green, has a gravel surface.
- REAP details still in progress.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

Overall

- One member appreciated applicant's response to Panel's preliminary comments from the last meeting.

Architecture

- One member compared project with the O'Keefe and this one needs that next level of details. Colour and design scheme changes are a success with O'Keefe; possible to introduce change in material but in same colour palette.
- Strong animation along street but need more variety to help breakdown size of building.
- Condo entry is understated.
- South building does not have animation of amenity in ground floor. Should have more connections between 2 buildings on ground floor.
- NW corner looks severe and may need more relief like other pieces.
- Curved elements at NW corner need to be softened.
- Need further differentiation between buildings.
- One member commented that setback of south building provides variety and green space along street.
- Bridge element looks heavy in elevation, and might make project look top heavy, especially on East Elevation. Bridge could be signature element for this project.

Landscape

- Missing opportunity of no access to green roof.
- More outdoor space is important, make the most of it.
- Front entry area too small to feel comfortable. Needs more greenery.
- Diversify plant material to attract more birds.
- Roof surface of condo building is hot and stark. One member suggested rubberised material to incorporate outdoor fitness classes.
- Green Street should be green with more variety and softness.

**The proposed seniors development Lots 10, 49, and 50 of the South Campus Neighbourhood was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

## 4.0 For Information

### 4.1 South Campus Green Corridors

Lisa C. introduced the proposal for the South Campus Green Corridors. Design details will be incorporated into the Development Handbook. This is the final of the three openspace components – Village Centre Public Realm, UNOS Parks and Green Streets. Kim Perry from Perry + Associates provided supplementary material to the packages sent to the Panel and presented the six categories for the green streets.

*The Panel discussed the following within the presentation of the six typologies:*

1. Formal Without Water
  - Topography determines whether water can flow thru to storm system.
  - More green space could be incorporated into Senior's portion.
2. Formal With Water
  - Details of location of aquifer water being drawn to surface are still being finalised.
  - Water will be purified through filtration system when adding surface water is being sent to aquifer.
  - No one regulates the aquifer; best practices are used.
  - Catherine B. mentioned she did a project in Richmond where water was high in iron so had an orange colour. When community members were informed of cause, did not mind the colour.
  - So far no projects require fire access on green streets and trying to continue that way. Some portions will require utility access, but trucks are smaller than fire trucks.
3. Transitional Without Water
  - Discussion of block sizes and permeability of connections
4. Transitional With Water
  - Water flow needs to be continuous to ensure strong stormwater message (e.g. at the SW corner of Khorana Park).
  - Sustainability relating to material selection and street furniture was discussed. Ensure local materials are used.
  - Green streets are dedicated corridors; UBC PT will design and build the whole thing, except the portion under the senior's project.
  - Adjacent projects along the green streets also contribute stormwater.
5. Informal Without Water
  - Formal and Transitional - 3 m wide, more of the east-west streets with lots of doors to streets, so more pavement.
  - Informal - North-south streets have fewer connections from projects, so are only 1 ½ m.
  - There are many pedestrian and cycle connections to main campus.
  - Should be a formal entry from Pacific Spirit Park to Campus.
6. Informal With Water
  - Ensure all paths are barrier free.
  - Pathway across fields to South Campus should be aligned. The gym from the new school will block the alignment.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

#### Overall

- Success or failure will depend on the details and maintenance of the streets.
- One member commented that without knowing individual projects and details difficult to comment on design.
- One member commented that typologies were confusing. Big ideas need to overlay individual pieces. Structure the categories differently.
- One member commented that it is good to establish framework for whole piece.
- Ensure guidelines reflect a consistency throughout but maintain flexibility with each neighbouring project.
- One member was concerned with use of aquifer for water. Campus and community members are well informed of stormwater management.

- One member was concerned with perception on campus of safety.
- Ensure easy maintenance of streets.
- View corridor from Life Sciences atrium to South Campus should be maintained and not blocked by school expansion.

#### Pathways

- Ensure nodes have individual characters.
- Little difference between transitional and informal. Make difference stronger, less formal in informal portions.
- Pathway system has one dominant corridor and some have a secondary path to connect to individual projects. Bicycles are intended on dominant path. Ensure path is clear, which is which.
- Pathways are 4.5 m of the total 15 m width of the green street.
- Celebrate all the entries from Pacific Spirit Park.

#### Circulation

- Additional connection across 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue critical.
- Consider adding other modes of transportation to connect to campus, such as golf carts.
- One member suggested a bridge connection over 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue and make it a show piece to be seen from flagpole plaza.

#### **5.0 Other**

No other business was raised.

#### **6.0 Adjournment**

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 4, 2007

**Time:** 4:10 – 7:30 p.m.

**Venue:** Room 337, Michael Smith Laboratories, 6138 Student Union Blvd

**Members Present:** Joyce Drohan (Chair)  
Joost Bakker  
Catherine Berris  
Byron Braley  
Norm Couttie  
Mark Thompson  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Freda Pagani, Acting University Architect; Daniel Sirois, Manager Development Services; Lisa Colby, Manager, Policy Planning; Jim Charlebois, Planner and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Walter Francl, Hazen Sise, and Robert Lemon, Walter Francl Architects; Richard Drdul, Urban Systems; Jeff Cutler, LANDinc; Mark Ostry and Adam James, Acton Ostry Architects.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes June 7, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 For Information

Joe Stott introduced Norm Couttie to replace Bob MacKay in the developer position on the Panel. Lisa Colby has a new role as Manager, Policy Planning and is working on the Vancouver Campus Plan and UBC Okanagan. Daniel Sirois is the new Manager, Development Services.

#### 3.1 Vancouver Campus Plan Update

Joe Stott provided a brief background to the UBC Vancouver Campus Plan (VCP), which is an update to the 1992 Main Campus Plan. The first three phases of the VCP review have been completed. The Planning team is currently undertaking the preparations for a series of design workshops that will be held in February 2008. Joe S. introduced the following four technical studies of the campus as part of Phase 2 of the VCP:

- Built Form and Heritage Resources (Walter Francl Architecture)
- Public and Open Spaces (Catherine Berris Associates)
- Access and Movement (Urban Systems)
- Natural Features and Systems (LANDinc)

## **Built Form and Heritage Resources**

Walter Francl, Hazen Sise, and Robert Lemon, Walter Francl Architects

*The Panel discussed the following:*

- C. One member commented that the consultants should review everything on campus, no limit or restrictions on studies.
- A. Only academic neighbourhood being reviewed, this is only an update of the Main Campus Plan.
  - East-West routes need to be strengthened to have campus tie together. These are essential axes in the campus framework, second only to Main Mall.
  - Detailed assessment of buildings for Heritage study is required. Historical value should not be the only measure.
  - Policy for Heritage needs to be in place first, then Heritage Management Plan can follow.
  - Incentives for Heritage should also be in place
  - Ensure heritage designation does not preclude change in building.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Campus requires a Heritage policy
- Ensure planning process is simplified to ensure effective implementation of the campus plan.
- Campus needs to be densified.
- Recommendations regarding funding should be stronger
- Complex solutions with simple ideas.

## **Public and Open Spaces**

Catherine Berris, Catherine Berris Associates

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Expand focus to link open spaces to public spaces in buildings – essential parts of the public realm
- Movement through spaces is limited and should be further investigated. Built form does not reflect pedestrian movement.
- There are many spaces identified. Suggestion to concentrate on selected spaces.
- One member suggested changing designation of a negative to a positive. If space is unused, consider leaving it unused and make more natural, not unkempt.
- Revise courtyard maps to add numbers to make more readable.
- Remove Botanical Gardens from list as it is designated under a separate category.
- Huge potential to overlap Built form and Open space studies should be considered.

## **Access and Movement**

Richard Drdul, Urban Systems

*The Panel discussed the following:*

- Rapid transit is expected to UBC. Termination point will be accommodated in the University Boulevard Neighbourhood, most likely adjacent to the new Transit Hub. This keeps all transit centralised on campus. Rapid Transit terminal location pivotal to vision of area.
- UBC is a town not a campus.
- Huge impact on reclaiming road once roundabouts in place and number of lanes are reduced.



*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Not having Marine Drive connected through is a fantastic idea as there is a much stronger connection to the beach.
  - Rapid Transit and where it goes effects design. Density and use should be in a similar location.
  - It was strongly recommended that a second station for South Campus residents be added to the rapid transit line. At the very least it should be planned for to allow for future addition of the station.
- C. Pedestrian movement should be given more attention in study. Walking routes are critical to the overall movement network and should be thoroughly investigated.
- A. A study on pedestrian routes and volumes has been requested.

### **Natural Features and Systems**

Jeff Cutler, LANDinc

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- C. Comprehensive stormwater is needed for the campus.
- A. C&CP just started a committee to create an Integrated Stormwater Management Plan
- Keep as much natural space as possible.
  - Scope of study is too general.
  - How is 'natural' defined in study? South Campus Farm isn't really 'natural'.
- C. One member concerned with buffering the entire campus as it could be seen as a loss of property/ownership.
- A. Tree buffers are incorporated into the OCP.
- Complete absence of natural landscape on campus. How could it be incorporated?
  - Ensure corridors and connections are created across campus.
  - Concern was expressed with the advocacy tone of the study (i.e. conserving tree stumps).

### **3.2 Hillel House**

Mark Ostry presented the proposal for the new Hillel House. The existing Hillel House will be demolished and the new building site will be in approximately the same location. There is very little room to expand the building footprint as the site is small, between Brock Hall and the North Parkade, and servicing is on the north, west, and south sides. The south side also has a steep grade to the window well for Brock Hall. Lisa C. provided some background information to the project including the site location and density. The design addressed the Student Union Boulevard Concept Plan.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

Overall

- C. The building line of the Student Union Boulevard Concept Plan was intended to extend in front of Brock Hall and the North Parkade.
- A. Site is very constrictive and relocating Utilities too expensive for project budget.
- Change programming of building to create more animation at front of building. Possible to bring banquet functions to south side?
  - One member commended applicant on design within constrained site. Also commends applicant on contemporary use of materials.

## Building

- Need to exaggerate features on façade.
- C. The applicant should be cautious of solar gain on west side, with all the glazing.
- A. There is a 12 ft overhang from second floor balcony.
- Material on south side has wood louvers over glass.
- More glass needed at street level on south side to create transparency into building.
- Entrance is lost. Entrance needs to be stronger, more visible, e.g. distinguish entrance both with landscaping and architecture – eg: a canopy that extends out to the walkway.
- Interior layout of lounge area is very narrow.
- Lacking sense of arrival to second floor, which holds the main banquet space. Consider how the stairway/bridge access arrives at this space.

## Landscaping

- Pull courtyard piece out to connect the two, can still have two separate characters.
- Ensure safety with roof garden.
- Green roof, still under discussion, would be an asset.

## 4.0 Other

No other business was raised.

## 5.0 Adjournment

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, November 1, 2007  
**Time:** 4:10 – 5:30 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories

**Members Present:** Joyce Drohan (Chair)  
Catherine Berris  
Byron Braley  
Norm Couttie  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:** Joost Bakker  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Daniel Sirois, Manager Development Services; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Mark Ostry and Adam James, Acton Ostry Architects.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 3.0 Development Application

##### 3.1 DP 07024: Hillel House

Joe Stott introduced Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects, to present the new Hillel House project. Mark O. summarized comments from the last AUDP preliminary review of the new Hillel House and presented the changes to the architectural design for the project.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

##### Building

- Front elevation changed to include louvers from 6" to 12" (and greater if possible) on windows for solar shading.
- Atrium has a skylight from third storey. No louvers on stairs, all open.
- Slot window on southwest corner of basement level will be as large as possible and will go to the ceiling.

##### Landscaping

- New landscaping is mostly the addition of hard surfaces on the courtyard area and cleaning up existing landscaping. No trees will be removed, all are existing.
- Front door entrance now on Student Union Boulevard with a canopy extended out.
- Canopy will have a thin profile - steel plated with ¾" wood soffits.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

##### Overall

- Overall good changes to project.
- Updated plans should be available to Panel Members prior to the meeting.

## Building

- If lounge area is pulled forward, south elevation needs to have a stronger expression. More visibility from Student Union Boulevard.
- Light coming from lounge area is critical and will look different between day and night.
- Front door is still too recessed. Should have more presence on the street.
- Canopy design is not strong enough.
- Column material should reflect weight and proportion of building.

## Landscaping

- Courtyards are an asset and positive changes have been made. Possibly introduce more permeable surfaces that are also accessible.
- Courtyard acts like a front garden to the house. Lighting is critical in this area.
- More connection is needed to SUB Lawn.

## Sustainability

- Strategies for green roof should be explored.
- One member commented that design should have an exemplary sustainability component in keeping with UBC's mandated to be an innovator in sustainable development.

Applicant responded to comments regarding the front entrance design. Hillel House offers a home away from home so design is more reserved than an institutional building.

**The proposed new Hillel House was unanimously SUPPORTED by the Panel.**

## 2.0 Approval of Minutes October 4, 2007 Meeting

Panel members discussed the protocol for the Advisory Urban Design Panel minutes. They are a record for the project under review and distributed (not verbatim) to the approving body (Development Permit Board or Board of Governors). Information items, Panel members provide advice on studies and information is relayed to consultants.

The minutes were amended with the following:

- Add the following under the Natural Features and Systems section Comments:
  - Concern was expressed with the advocacy tone of the study (i.e. conserving tree stumps).

The Panel approved the amended minutes.

## 4.0 Other

No other business was raised.

## 5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*



## Advisory Urban Design Panel

### MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, December 6, 2007  
**Time:** 4:15 – 6:45 p.m.  
**Venue:** Room 101, Michael Smith Laboratories

**Members Present:** Joyce Drohan (Chair)  
Joost Bakker  
Catherine Berris  
Byron Braley  
Norm Couttie  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:** Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Joe Stott, Director; Gerry McGeough, University Architect; David Grigg, AD Infrastructure and Services Planning; Daniel Sirois, Manager Development Services; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Jas Sahota, Matthew Carter, Christian Desmazes, and Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects; Kim Perry and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates; and John Tompkins, Hampton Journal.

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

The chair welcomed the new University Architect, Gerry McGeough and called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes November 1, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 For Information

##### 3.1 SC Lot 11 Faculty/Staff Rental Housing

Gerry McGeough, University Architect, introduced the project and project team. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, provided the context of the site and presented the details of the street edge along Wesbrook Mall, details of the architectural plans, elevations and renderings of the building. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, presented the character of the neighbourhood and surrounding streets and the landscape details at the corner of Birney Ave and Wesbrook Mall and courtyard area with connections to the green street.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

##### Building

- Material used between window wall at corners is aluminium, although there will be more glazing than aluminium.

##### Landscaping

- Q: How does the setback on Wesbrook compare between the Seniors and Lot 11?  
A: The setback is roughly in line. The sidewalk is aligned. The wall could not be flush against the sidewalk there is a setback for some landscaping.
- The water feature on the corner is still under discussion; applicant is considering eliminating it.

- The FSR is just under 2.0.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

#### Building

- Panel members offered options for a different building configuration to better relate to the context. These included:
  - 1) a less symmetrical approach that might better respond to the greenway frontage versus the street edge at the north and south sides.
  - 2) a reversal of the plan, locating the courtyard on the street side. The current location has liveability challenges especially for the proposed corner units. The applicant noted challenges in achieving the emergency response distance requirements. (NB: this could be achieved with a remote annunciator.)
- Concern was expressed regarding the treatment of the corners which appear to be more commercial in character – a more residential treatment is suggested.
- Simplify the southern corner of the building.
- Add more glazing to the townhouse units to make more dramatic
- Roof is too heavy, other elements (including townhouse projections) would also benefit from a lighter treatment.
- Generally, the design approach would benefit from a simpler approach. There are many elements creating a busy composition; treatment around the main entry is an example.

#### Landscaping

- The relationship between the courtyard and the public green space should be reworked to optimize visual and physical linkages between the two as well as providing a better connection to the nearby park.
- Considerations were made to move the courtyard to the west side but it needed to be quieter and the intent was for a more urban feel at the street.
- The courtyard is likely to be dark given the proposed tree locations. Placement should be carefully considered. The courtyard design should contribute to the life and uniqueness of the building.
- The corner landscape treatment needs more attention.

### **3.2 SC Lot 47 MBA House, South Campus**

Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, introduced the project and project team. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, provided the context of the site and presented floor plans, elevations, and materials of the building. Kim Perry, Perry + Associates, presented the details for the Norman Mackenzie Square.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

- Parking appears under-provided. Other alternatives discussed with Sauder were transit and a car co-op. The applicant noted that anticipated community events are relatively small and don't draw big crowds. The panel noted that if the building is to be used for receptions and the like, parking will need to be addressed even if offsite.
- The nature of the greenway to the west has not been designed yet. The retail wrap around will be further north with outdoor terraces on to the green street.
- It was suggested that the road west of the building should be paved to provide a more pedestrian-friendly environment complementing the other public spaces around the village centre – especially to provide a high level of pedestrian connectivity. The streets will be treated in a similar fashion but the scale and tree selection will be different.
- Should go further in pedestrian connectivity.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

#### Building

- Elevator location seems awkward and might benefit if it were moved further south to link it more directly to the lobby.
- Butterfly roof appears to be overly large in the rendering. Applicant noted section is more indicative of intent. Detailing of this roof will be critical to avoid a heavy look.

- Student Housing: more information will be necessary to fully address this aspect of the proposal.
- Steel and glass canopies over the entryway doors will provide weather protection on the ground floor; consider a more continuous treatment on the public faces of the building (ie: frontage at square and primary street).
- Rethink the function of the building and kitchen if the intention is for larger gatherings.

#### Landscaping

- Design of the square will need to be pushed further to connect the greenway on both sides; there is a good opportunity for public art here.
- Concern expressed about what will happen to the west of the square; it will be important to see through the square to the greenway continuing west from Tapestry. Construction of two buildings to west of the square and MBA House.
- C: Concern expressed regarding viability of proposed retail. Integrate retail to ensure survival. A: Retail is open to the public in MBA House-Copy Centre/office.
- The square is very sombre and polite; it would benefit from public art and a less rigidly formal design to address greenway connectivity and offer a more identifiable public space – eg: exploring a paving pattern distinctive from the general residential surfaces in the development.
- Parking will be an issue additional information will be required at the next review.

### 3.3 Vancouver Campus Gates

Gerry McGeough, University Architect, introduced the project for the scoping out of gateway signage for the campus. David Grigg, AD Infrastructure and Services Planning briefly went through *The University of British Columbia Sign Standards and Guidelines* and specifically the UBC Boundary signage section. There will be 4 locations around campus: 1. Wesbrook Mall at University Blvd; 2. Wesbrook Mall at Chancellor Blvd., 3. SW Marine Drive and 4. 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue at Hampton Place.

*The Panel discussed the following:*

#### General signage

- Q: Why black blades for destination sign blades?  
A: These provide a high contrast for higher clarity. The design is different to distinguish it from road signage.
- Signage for all of the academic buildings has been addressed first.

#### Gateways

- The actual locations have not been finalized (eg: in the roundabout or on the divided parkway at Hampton).
- The material for the gateway signs will be aluminium, with vinyl lettering which is highly reflective and easily replaceable.
- Each neighbourhood will have its own identity and it is anticipated that the gates would respond to this.
- Funding is available in March with Phase 4 beginning after the March 2008 launch.
- Consultants have been hired to look at the Landscape and Main Campus Plans.

*The Panel made the following comments:*

- Concern expressed that the proposed process is too short, there needs to be more background done by the consultants addressing the complex issues associated with the gates. There will be opportunities and constraints at each entrance (eg: the greenway connection to Pacific Spirit Park). These need to be identified and addressed.
- The stature of the gates and the sense of arrival they provide calls for noble materials that evoke the importance of the university campus. The current proposal does not achieve this. For example, University Blvd. presents a great opportunity for creating a sense of arrival which provides the first impression for the visitor to the campus. It is important to ensure a high quality gateway design here and in the other proposed locations.
- It was noted that previous attempts to create gateways have been unsuccessful. Strategies like engaging public opinion on the web should be explored for receiving feedback from stakeholders.

#### **4.0 Other**

Joyce Drohan and Harold Kalke recently made a presentation to UBC's Board of Governors' Property & Planning Committee addressing the importance of the Public Realm. They noted that as a university aspiring to be 'one of the three great universities in Canada', UBC needs to pay more attention to public realm design – a critical aspect of the student experience. As funding is one of the key challenges for enhancing the public realm, it was recommended that more creative ways of achieving funding be explored as follows:

- Endowment Fund: 90% currently committed to academic items. If 10% could be allotted to the public realm annually, this represents opportunities for significant improvement to the campus environment.
- IIC funds: Dedicating a portion of the infrastructure funding to the public realm would be an appropriate strategy.
- Interior-exterior approach: Where donors are reluctant to fund outdoor spaces, they are generally prepared to support indoor spaces. It was suggested that a strategy for combining indoor and outdoor public realm spaces for specific building projects might be a creative means of funding both.

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.*