



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2008



Advisory Urban Design Panel

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, February 7, 2008

Time: 4:00 – 7 30 p.m.

Venue: Room 309, Peter Wall Institute

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

Members Absent: Catherine Berris

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect; David Grigg, AD Infrastructure and Services Planning; Cathy Passion, Assistant Civil Engineer, Daniel Sirois, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder) and Nena Vukojevic (Planning Assistant), (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Michelle Paquet, Christian Desmazes, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates; Rob Lin, Rize Alliance; Richard Henriquez, Henriquez Partners; Steve Forest, Adera; Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes December 6, 2007 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Application

3.1 DP 07034:SC MBA House

Gerry McGeough, University Architect, introduced the project and presented the context, facility program and floor and unit breakdown. Gerry McGeough stated that the project was well received at the preliminary AUDP meeting on December 6th 2007 with some minor issues raised such as:

1. Elevator location
2. Butterfly roof overhang is too large
3. Rethink the function of the kitchen if the intentions are for large gatherings
4. Consider continuous weather protection on public frontages of the building

Comments by Staff not raised at the last AUDP meeting:

5. Composition of south and west façade
6. Outdoor shelter on roof terrace

Gerry McGeough, introduced Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust to present the project. Michele Paquet introduced the design team Ray Letkeman from Raymond Letkeman Architects and landscape architect, Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates and summarized the changes to the original design to

address design panel suggestions. Ray Letkeman elaborated on the design changes initiated by individual issues raised by Panel's comments and staff's suggestions.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Applicant has committed to REAP Silver.
- Target market for building is MBA and Masters of Management students, which are 16-month programs. Residence will be operated year-round and age group is mid to high 20s.
- Horizontal banding on elevations is stone material.

The Panel made the following comments:

1. Elevator location
 - Panel members supported change. Elevator's revised location with oversight from management desk is supported.
2. Butterfly roof overhang is too large
 - One member commented that the pitched roof design was not good.
 - The flat roof needs to be more dynamic. Review tilting flat portion to provide more interest.
 - The design suffers by changes done to the roof.
 - Unique aspect of the building provided by the previous roof needs to be recaptured.
3. Rethink the function of the kitchen if the intentions are for large gatherings
 - Panel members supported change.
4. Consider continuous weather protection on public frontages of the building
 - Weather projection canopies acceptable.
 - Concern was expressed with lifespan of canvas portions.
 - Review steel and glass canopy on corner with café.
5. Composition of south and west façade
 - Panel members supported change of additional glazing.
 - One member suggested turning stair would improve circulation on main floor.

Building

- Overall good changes to the project:
- Building security needs improvements.

Sustainability

- REAP needs to be improved from committed Silver to higher.
- Suggestion to review sustainability opportunities for the project with Robert Helsley, Assoc Dean, Sauder School of Business – recognized for his work in this area

Landscape

- Courtyard landscape needs to be softened.
- The trees on sidewalk need to be moved from the center to improve urban experience.

The proposed new MBA house was unanimously supported by the panel subject to the amenity space being converted to retail at a future date.

3.2 DP 08002:SC Lot 11

Gerry McGeough, introduced the project and presented the context, facility program and floor and unit breakdown. Gerry McGeough stated that the project was well received at the preliminary AUDP meeting on December 6th 2007 with some issues raised such as:

1. Building Symmetry, heavy eaves and complicated forms
2. Building interface with Street/greenway edges
3. Corners of the building to commercial in character and could be simplified
4. More glazing on townhouse units

Comments by Staff not raised at the last AUDP meeting:

5. Elevator location on basement and main floor
6. Courtyard location, design, access to light and connection to larger open network
7. Southeast corner of the site remains unidentified
8. Continuous fencing affects the vitality of the street and park

Gerry McGeough introduced Christian Des Mazes, UBC Properties to present the project Christian Des Mazes introduced the design team Ray Letkeman from Raymond Letkeman Architects and landscape

architect, Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates and summarized the changes to the original design to address design panel suggestions. Ray Letkeman elaborated on the design changes initiated by individual issues raised by Panel's comments and staff's suggestions.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Stairs from courtyard are connected to building and lobby.
- Railing is the same on the ground floor as on the balconies.
- Spandrel material is painted hardy plank
- Parking requirements are met. Bicycle parking is met on the green street.
- Applicant has committed to REAP Silver and is working with Sustainability Office for more points but uncertain about reaching Gold.
- Ensure glass in lobby is seen for safety.
- There is no amenity space in building.
- Courtyard stairs are mid level.

The Panel made the following comments:

1. Building Symmetry, heavy eaves and complicated forms
 - Mitigating roof length is essential and adding more articulation and interest to the roof line.
2. Building interface with Street/greenway edges
 - Panel members supported change.
3. Corners of the building too commercial in character and could be simplified
 - Expression of the townhouse units on the corner is too strong –the facade looks like a curtain wall and the corners should be tamed to reflect residential character of the building.
 - Using widows in a wall rather than window wall would minimize the overall commercial look.
4. More glazing on townhouse units
 - Panel members supported change.
5. Elevator location on basement and main floor
 - Lobby elevator needs more transparency.
6. Courtyard location, design, access to light and connection to larger open network
 - Push courtyard out to be more integrated, connect with public walkway.
 - Landscape in the courtyard needs to be redefined to create flowing connection with the surrounding landscape.
 - Access to the stairs in the courtyard needs improvement as does the integration of these stairs into the landscape to mitigate their impact.
7. Southeast corner of the site should make stronger connections between courtyard and public green spaces.
 - More engagement between these spaces-more succession of space instead of large long lawn.
8. Continuous fencing affects the vitality of the street and park
 - The panel expressed support for fence treatment.

Building

- Overall good changes to the project
- Glazed staircase in the UG parking is a safety issue.
- Roughing in security cameras in staircase should be considered.

The SC Lot 11 Faculty/Staff Rental Housing project was unanimously supported by the panel.

4.0 For Information

4.1 SC Lot 2 Highrise

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant: Rob Lin, Rize Alliance; Richard Henriquez and Rui Nunes, Henriquez Partners. Richard Henriquez presented the context of Lot 2 in the neighbourhood. The challenge was to stagger the buildings and create a plaza that accommodates the driveway and visitor parking. The building is oriented east-west and design draws on 1940's idea of enjoying the outdoors and utilizing the natural light and clean forest air surrounding the site. The building structure is concrete frame with glazed surface and balconies creating woven fabric feel. The front yard is a courtyard and there is a linear pattern in landscape creating an urban garden. The green roof is on the top of the parkade with overlapping panels of green treatment.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Material for landscape walls is same masonry that will be used on townhouses.
- Planter walls will be coloured concrete.
- Colour of copper strips on the façade will change over time. Panel member requests rendering.
- Physical connection between townhouses and high-rise is only through parkade.
- Balconies will have clear glass with a railing.

The Panel made the following comments:

Building

- Refreshing project for UBC from architectural perspective. Its effort to achieve simplicity of expressiveness and limiting the palette of materials are commendable.
- Good relationship between indoors and outdoors with offset balconies.
- The finishing of materials is going to be a challenge.
- The pattern is regimented, some restructuring suggested. Balconies have some privacy issues - some shading suggested.
- The connection of outdoors and indoors is great and celebrating the balconies is a great idea .
- Can projecting of balconies be varied instead of being of equal distance. Great thoughtfulness in the initial idea when it comes to orientation.
- Pushing the surfaces of the balconies in and out might be beneficial.
- The model rendering of the glazing shows same treatment on balconies and façade. Can that be achieved?
- Relationship between copper areas and adjacent areas – what happens?
- Approach to glazing – colour, patterning and detailing (especially supports for balcony railings) - will be critical to the success of the design.

Landscape:

- The entrance treatment and pedestrian connections need improvement.

4.2 SC Lot 42 and 17 – Apartment Buildings

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant for both projects Steve Forest, Adera. Steve Forest introduced project and the architect Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects. Bryce Rositch presented the site characteristics of the projects, architecture and townhouse and apartment floor plans. The site has a significant slope of 1.6 meters .The biggest challenge of the site is a courtyard that needs a particular care in treatment as it is very narrow. An idea of integrating water features in the courtyard is important for the architect and developers. There is a West Coast modern approach in architecture and Asian influence in landscaping. The buildings are to be also constructed with recycled steel frame. Four story building with roof terraces.

The Panel discussed the following:

- The Parkade entry will need to be addressed.
- The architecture character is good but too detailed. Reduce to strengthen elements and simplify
- What kind of landscaping treatment is utilized on the building and surrounding?

The Panel made the following comments:

Building

- The architectural character is appealing but needs to be toned down and allow for more simplicity.
- Reduce some of the strength of the elements and simplify. Proposed steel structure should be part of the architectural expression. The Pathways project was mentioned as a good representative of architecture with roof gardens, but they should be more celebrated.
- Lot 17 courtyard is very narrow and it would benefit from stepping down some massing /carving away to bring light into it. The project might need some leniency to achieve this.

Landscape

- How is the entrance to the parkade going to be dealt with? Concerns include reconciling site elevations and the approximate location of the entrance and greenway.
- Seeing into the courtyard is a great feature .It is becoming the signature of the SC area. The greenway on Lot 42 is linking positively and allowing views into courtyard.

Sustainability

- Sustainability can be achieved by utilization of water features and integrated storm water management plan. How to integrate water features with large roofs is an important issue.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, March 6th, 2008

Time: 4:00 – 7 15 p.m.

Venue: TEF3 - Boardroom

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

Members Absent: Joost Bakker

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect; Joe Stott, Director of Planning; Daniel Sirois, Manager of Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant; Nena Vukojevic, Planning Assistant and Rhonda Stevenson, Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Lin, Rize Alliance; Richard Henriquez and Rui Nunes, Henriquez Partners; Judy Stoyko and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnerships Landscape Architects Inc.; Cathy Poettcker: One-One-Five Properties Inc.; Terry Barkley: Cannon Design; Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates and Paul Young: UBC Property Trust.

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes February 7, 2008 Meeting

The Panel approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 DP 08007: SC Lot 2 High Rise

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant Richard Henriquez, Henriquez Partners Architects, to present the project of an 18 storey high-rise with townhouses on Lot 2 in the South Campus Neighbourhood. The project was reviewed and supported by the Development Review Committee.

Staff sought Panel comment on the following:

- Revised balcony guardrail design
- Front court entrance treatment and pedestrian connections
- Three requested variances:
 - Height overage: decorative architectural elements intrude 1.53 m above 53 m max. height.
 - West side yard setback: DH requires a 2.5 m setback, 2.0 m is provided.
 - South yard: DH requires a 2.5 m setback, 0.5 m is provided.

Summary of Panel Comments:

- Panel was very supportive of the project and its bold, innovative design, complementing the architect on a refreshing expression for the UBC campus.

- Too much pavement for the designated fire lane. Discuss further with the fire department to introduce more green.
- The transition of the treatment for pedestrians on the east side from the fire lane to the green street needs to be improved.
- The mound should be incorporated with the rest of the landscaping not just the front entryway. Suggestions ranged from lowering the mound height to eliminating it altogether.
- East side of Front Entryway could be simplified in design.
- Ivy or another form of greenery should be added to the ramp to add balance.
- Investigate the horizontal spandrel glass banding and how it will visually read. It may detract from the vision.
- It was suggested the crosswalk running across the plaza be treated as an extension of the entry path treatment which would still provide contrast with the drive material.
- At entrance portals, along the greenway horizontal element appears overly imposing; suggestion was made to investigate something, lighter, more transparent, i.e. glass.
- For a concrete building, Panel suggests pursuing REAP gold. The level of sustainability should reflect the courageous effort of this modernist design.

The Panel Resolved: to support the project and the three requested variances.

- **Passed unanimously**

The Panel Resolved: to request staff to pursue an amendment to the Development Handbook to allow architectural appurtenances to be exempt from height limits.

- **Passed unanimously**

3.2 DP 07003: Wesbrook Grocery Store Amendment

Gerry McGeough introduced an amendment to the Wesbrook Village grocery store's north facing wall. Proposed amendments to the application before the board are: changes to the material from Jerusalem Stone to a finished concrete; and an arched elevation facing 16th Avenue and to the west wooded area. Mr. McGeough introduced Hanson Ng, UBC Properties Trust, to present the project.

Staff sought Panel comment on the following:

- Cladding material change for the commercial level north and west facades.
- Revised planting plan between the food store and 16th Avenue

Summary of Panel Comments:

Materials:

- Panel requires samples of the material for comparison before making a decision.
- One member noted that as Jerusalem stone has a concrete appearance, the proposal for concrete in lieu of the stone and in combination with the granite corners on the building may be sufficient and will save the University money.
- Another noted that granite in a few areas may appear to be too great a compromise; suggest using granite in a way that is continuous and does not create a contrast that draws attention to cost saving measures.
- Another member noted that concrete may even be an improvement and should be carried all along the base and the ground should run low and not have any berms.
- The use of stone as opposed to concrete may maintain a higher level of quality and prove to be more worthy of preservation in the future.
- Whatever material is selected, it should be used in a consistent manner around the building.

Landscaping:

- It may be worthwhile to reinstate the berm that was previously in front of the building to mitigate the scale of the wall which appears very high.
- Suggestion: If any of the grade is raised, it should be done in a way that does not compromise the existing landscape.

- Vegetation will hide the wall. If grade is raised, it should be done carefully and only if it will not negatively affect the roots of the existing trees.

Panel Conclusions:

- Mixed concern over the material; if the concrete is well rusticated it may be a viable option.
- Previous treatment of the windows is more convincing than the latest proposal.
- Whatever landscaping is done it is important that it should enhance the wall not hide it.

Panel supports the project with the reservation that samples of the proposed material need to be examined.

4.0 For Information

4.3 UBC Athletic Fields

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant: Kathy Poettcker, consultant for UBC Properties Trust and design team: Terry Barkley, Cannon Design and Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates. UBC Properties in conjunction with UBC Athletics and Recreation is proposing a multiphase project focusing on UBC Thunderbird Park. Phase 1 was presented for the panels comment. The scope for Phase 1 includes: two soccer/rugby artificial fields, track and field facility, a baseball diamond and a multipurpose path which connects South Campus to Thunderbird Park.

The Panel discussed the following:

- Multipurpose path and pedestrian connections from Thunderbird Park to both main and south campus -- Need for better articulation of pathway treatment.
- Visual connections and a role of Thunderbird Park in overall public realm.
- The usage of bleachers versus berms for sitting.
- General area for outdoor gathering and celebration of sports.

Summary of Panel Comments:

General:

- To respond adequately to Phase 1 need for a master plan to outline overall context of the multiphase project and its relationship to surrounding areas and campus public realm. These fields and facilities have the potential to be and should read as a UBC Commons.
- A Pavilion or building for outdoor gatherings by the field house would be a worthwhile attribute appropriate to the stature and the size of this project (i.e. Recommended: see Burnaby Plaza)
- Where is the parking expected to be? It should be kept off of the Commons area.

Pathway:

- Connecting pathway requires disabled access into the playing fields
- Why asphalt for the path? As a significant pedestrian routes for the campus and the community alike, these paths should be given a higher quality treatment, especially once the field house is added.
- Where and how is the pathway terminated at 16th, especially to facilitate the connection to South Campus? Current approach is very weak and requires a much stronger solution.
- The impact of proposed perimeter berms on views of the Commons could further weaken the connection to the South Campus. If the berms are more than 3-4 feet the effect of this welcome open space on arrival at campus will be compromised.

The Fields:

- Concern was expressed over usage of artificial turf versus grassed field as follows:
- What is the level of the lighting and how will this light affect the surrounding areas? Response: The track and field will have low level lighting and there will be limited higher lighting for specific areas which are more distant from the neighbourhood.

- What is artificial turf's effect on ground water? Response: Climate in Vancouver means that the natural fields tend to become damaged over the winter season,; the artificial turf fields will mean less wear and tear on the natural fields.
- Logger sports *check this word* belongs to the Faculty of Forestry, any proposed plans designated for that area for development requires their approval and hence discussion with that faculty preceding its proposal to the panel.
- It was recommended that trees be added to the berms, should they go in so that people can use them for shade while watching. Removal of the tall hedge on East Mall should be considered to open up the views into Thunderbird Park.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rhonda Stevenson.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, Thursday April 3rd, 2008
Time: 4:00 – 7 15 p.m.
Venue: TEF3 – Boardroom

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

Members Absent: Joost Bakker; Mark Thompson

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect;
Daniel Sirois, Manager of Development Services; Nena Vukojevic, Urban
Planning Assistant and Rhonda Stevenson, Administrative Assistant
(Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Steve Forest: Adera; Keith Hemphill: Rositch Hemphill Architects;
Johnathan Losee: Johnathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture; Rob
Brown: UBC Property Trust; William Locking and Kristen Reite; CEI
Architects; Marta Farevaag; Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4: 20 PM. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of minutes of February 7, 2008 and March 6th 2008 meeting

Panel approved the minutes with the following changes:

- February 7th minutes, Item 3.1 add: A member expressed concern for security of students living in the MBA House due to the multiple access routes to the elevator and upper floors.
- March 6th minutes, Item 4.3, add: The panel considers surface parking within the Thunderbird complex a major concern which should be revisited.

At the request of the Chair, Mr. McGeough described the proposed protocol for Panel Resolutions with the aim of providing more clarity:

The Panel should vote on one of the following three resolutions:

- Support with no conditions
- Support with conditions to be met to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning
- Non-support, with reasons elaborated

Further amendments to process:

- The chair summarises the comments and looks to other members to put forth a draft resolution
- The clerk (recorder) writes the resolution down and read it back for clarity and final revision(s)

The Panel supported this protocol.

3.1 Development applications DP 08011: SC lot 42 – Pacific

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Steve Forest and John Losee to present on the project of Lot 42. A proposed development is a four-story building with 98 market residential units at Wesbrook Mall and Birney Avenue in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Staff sought panel's guidance on the following variances:

- Height maximum of 14 m; whereas 16.7 m is proposed for taller living room volumes and rooftop lanais access proposed
- Maximum permitted site coverage is 50%; whereas, 53.5 % proposed

Summary of Panel Comments:

The combined height of the balcony wall and railing along Wesbrook is seven feet high in some areas;

Panel suggests applicants look at ways to refine the obtrusive appearance of the solid 'wall fronting' on Wesbrook, especially in the centre of the building, possibly by staggering the solid wall or stepping back the guardrail to accommodate for some landscaping.

Recommend entryway aligns perpendicular with the sidewalk.

Possibly add some reflective material to help add depth and balance to what appears to be overstated horizontality; In order to help mitigate the horizontality it may be effective to refine the edges of the roofs.

Make sure that views to the court yard are unobstructed by trees planted on the street boulevard.

It would be nice to see this building reach the level of REAP Gold, as it appears to have this potential.

Rather than treating the water feature at the entrance as two separate pieces which makes it feel disconnected, consider connecting the two water features – perhaps extending the stone wall as a guard and allowing the water to break through in one or two locations.

The Panel resolved following:

The Panel supports the project, including the two variances, subject to the following conditions:

- more attention is given to sustainability;
- there is variation in the material and softening of the edges of the roof; and
- attention be given to Wesbrook frontal treatment.

Decision carried unanimously

3.2 Development Application DP 08010: SC Lot 17 – Spirit Project

Steve Forest, Keith Hemphill and Jonathan Losee, introduced the project to develop Lot 17 in UBC's South Campus Neighbourhood. The applicant proposes a 66 market residential unit, four-storey building with total area of 56,630 sq ft.

Staff sought the Panel advice on the following issues:

- Liveability of the courtyard given its width of 9.9 M at the narrowest end
- The outcrop of the parking podium and the substantial wall it creates along the Gray Avenue pedestrian sidewalk

Land use variance:

- East Yard 2.5 setback required; 1.9 m setback proposed
- Height maximum of 14 m; whereas 16.7 m is proposed for taller living room volumes and rooftop lanais access
- Maximum permitted site coverage is 50%; whereas, 53.5 %proposed

Summary of Panel comments:

In general, the Panel finds the latest design to be successful, especially in the play of materials which adds depth to the facades and in the effective approach to the entry. However, the Panel members expressed strong concern over the narrowness of the courtyard and its impact on the liveability of the units. The condition of the courtyard is not appropriate for the level of liveability that should be expected. The dimensions appear much tighter than the original plan used to market the site. There is a problem with the lack of natural sunlight. It was suggested that every effort be made to improve the sun angles into this courtyard.

The Panel had mixed responses on how to deal with the narrow courtyard. Possibly step back the top two stories, or a combination of massing adjustments. Some members would like to see some of the mass from the upper floor relocated over the ramp. The applicant advised that they could explore this; however they noted that the easement over the ramp in favour of the neighbouring property owners may not permit this. They will investigate it further.

The panel suggested more direct access to the courtyard from the second floor.

There was a consensus to mitigate the high wall on Gray Avenue through layering of the landscape.

Support of the Variances

The Panel resolved:

That the Panel supports the project including the three variances, subject to the following conditions:

- There is a reduction of the impact of the landscape wall on Gray Avenue with the addition of stepped landscaping.
- The panel support any strategies to increase the natural day lighting to the courtyard; and
- That they are encouraged to pursue a higher level of REAP Gold.

Decision carried unanimously

3.3 Pre-application Enquiry - Curtis Law Building

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Rob Brown, William Locking and Kristen Reite, (working in joint venture with Diamond and Schmidt Architects). The applicants introduced the various options for the new Law Building and their preferred option.

Summary of Panel comments:

Given the key roles this building will play on campus, the Panel recommends that the current plan of the building be revisited and reconfigured to reflect the stature of this project and site.

The Panel requests that the applicants review their approach to the project, especially the current design being contingent upon the steam pipe; there are examples of other buildings on campus built over the steam pipe, those cases should be investigated further and options explored.

Concern was expressed regarding the general disposition of the building. Emphasis should be given to and exposure placed on student common spaces, classrooms and the library as opposed to office uses.

The Law Building should provide social and learning spaces that are open and inviting to both faculty students and the larger student community. The design should be of enduring prominence, recognized by those in the legal community and memorable in the minds of visitors. It should externalize the inside workings of the faculty, particularly at the south end.

The premise of the design form and layout should be developed from the point of view of its purpose as a law building, its position as an entry point to the campus and its role as a gateway with a statement which reflects the discipline of law.

Panel recommends using a 3D presentation and better site diagrams and context to advance this approach.

Panel's final recommendations:

- The expression of the law building as a gateway be a focus in this design;
- More attention be paid to the frontage on East Mall;
- There be a much stronger indoor-outdoor relationship consistent with other faculty complexes on campus; stronger and clearer connectivity be pursued throughout the building, especially between the student areas
- For a signature building, the plan and form of the project should be driven by a “bigger concept” – for example: emphasizing the idea of law as an open system encouraging dialogue and democracy; in addition, the design should honour UBC’s aspiration to enhance and give exposure to a vital campus life.
- Heritage references should also be taken into account in the design.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday May 1, 2008
Time: 4:00-7:00PM
Venue: Main Floor Boardroom # 149, Curtis Law Building

Members Present: Joost Bakker, Chair of meeting (in Joyce Drohan's absence)
Catherine Berris
Byron Braley
Norm Couttie
Joyce Drohan
Mark Thompson
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Members Absent: Joyce Drohan

Staff: Gerry McGeough, University Architect; Nena Vukojevic, Urban Planning Assistant, Rhonda Stevenson, Administrative Assistant.

Presenters/Guests: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects Inc.

Observers: Joe Stott, Director of Planning; David Grigg, Associate Director of Infrastructure; Cathy Pasion, Assistant Civil Engineer

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the agenda as circulated

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. The Panel approved the agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of minutes of April 3, 2008

Panel approved minutes with the following change:

April 3rd minutes item 3.1 and 3.2, add: Panel member Norm Couttie withdrew from participation.

3.0 UBC Public Realm

3.1 Best Practices (University Tours)

Joost Bakker, Chair, introduced Nancy Knight who in turn presented comparative review of university campuses by a slide show of images taken on a tour of a number of private and public universities across North America. The intention of the presentation is to stimulate discussion on public realm “Best Practices”. The themes were: gateways, pathways, architecture & public art, open spaces, social & study spaces, housing and mixed use (spaces). The campus tours revealed the following lessons:

- Great importance is placed upon university gateways
- Intimate spaces (on a human scale) mixed with open spaces complement the university’s grand spaces
- Buildings close together add to the intimacy of the experience. This is often achieved with infill development
- Architectural innovation helps to define a university’s character
- Design guidelines are key for making a positive change in university campuses.
- Landscapes provide unity on campuses when there is a wide range of architectural styles and building materials
- Mixed use campuses allows for a more vibrant campus life as well as new revenue streams for universities
- Public art enhances the public spaces and showcases the university’s commitment to the arts
- New ideas for funding public realm maintenance/improvements key to support university identity and campus experience

The key challenges for UBC:

- How to finance UBC’s large scale public realm
- How to integrate buildings into a cohesive design

3.2 Public Realm Capital Plan and Design Principles

Nancy Knight and Gerry McGeough asked the Panel to review and comment on the first draft of the “Campus Design Principles” circulated. A summary of Panel member comments are:

- Be more prescriptive, elaborate and direct in the objectives eg. “use noble materials”.

- Separate out principles and objectives, using headings and subheadings.
- The next step is to put the principles in a context/framework.
- Need an overall plan and set the design principles within this plan to inform and define specific objectives.
- Cover more areas ie. more emphasis on sustainability.
- With every investment, make a difference. Be more opportunistic ie. every building should contribute to the public realm.
- Target specific available or potential funds.

4.0 Pre-development application

4.1 Law Building

The Chair introduced the applicant team: Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust, and Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects. The applicants presented a revised design based on input provided by the Panel at its April 2008 meeting.

Panel comments:

North Elevation:

As an entryway to the campus, importance to be placed on landscaping improvements at the north yard. Create continuity between the indoor public spaces and the landscape.

The building needs to “say” gateway, with an increased presence and drama, more “gateway-ish”. The two large trees just in front of the building are not contributing to this goal and in balancing of public objectives, it might be best to remove them.

Recommend terracing the landscape on the north in a subtle way or possibly creating an outdoor amphitheatre and removing the grove of trees to improve the use of space.

Suggested building design changes include: raising the level of the moot court; adding faculty libraries; and re-examining the recession of the second floor due to bad lighting.

East Elevation:

The East Mall should not exclude the public, should be more engaging. The plinth separates the East Mall from the interior spaces. Direct connectivity is between the inside and outside is needed.

Good framing and reference to Buchanan Building.

South Elevation:

This courtyard should take advantage of its south orientation, as it is more likely to be occupied during the day.

The south courtyard needs to be inviting as this will be the entrance most commonly used to access the building. Increase opportunities for interactions in a pedestrian way. It is not activated in a pedestrian way, in the way courtyards between buildings should be. Needs the same care as the north courtyard with regards to being animated by activities from adjoining uses.

Don't know if classrooms in this location are a good idea, needs more penetration through the block.

What about flipping the plan around to take advantage of a south facing orientation and to animate the south courtyard? The library would face north to enjoy views and show visitors a full view of the library.

The courtyard to the south should anticipate and inform the future development to the south.

General:

Make sure that design takes into consideration enough funds for the surrounding public realm.

The layouts of the upper levels of the building are well resolved.

While mixed opinions were held about the choice of materials it was agreed that the brick should either be of a deeper palette or possibly match the "UBC brick" used at Brock Hall or the off-white brick used on the Sing Tao - School of Journalism.

Need to see services, garbage and loading zones integrated into the building.

For visual purposes, bicycle storage is best installed inside the building as opposed to outside.

Examine the atrium treatment to ensure solar access.

Chair summary of comments:

The Panel believes the scheme is much improved.

Important to have a statement of values, which informs the design of this building and its location.

Address the presence and entry into the building and increase its function as a gateway building.

Explore base-detail around the building.

Explore the material palette and colouration and its ability to have an impact on the surrounding landscape.

Carefully look at the landscaping around the building. Need to allocate appropriate amount of resources for landscaping. The design should take into consideration making available enough funds for the surrounding public realm.

The south courtyard needs to be enhanced.

In the context of a variety of competing public objectives remove the southernmost trees to create a strong public face, sense of entry and building presence.

Increase overall sustainability of the project.

Attention should be given to exit stairs, loading and bike storage facilities storage should be inside the building instead of in the lane.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, June 5th, 2008
Time: 4:00-6:30
Venue: TEF III

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

Members Absent: Catherine Berris

Staff: Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect;
Nena Vukojevic, Urban Planning Assistant and Laura Holvor,
Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Donald Schmitt and Jennifer Mallard, Diamond Schmitt Architects; and William Locking and Kirsten Reite, CEI Architecture; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg, Mary Anne Bobinski, Dean of Law; Shi-Ling Hsu, Associate Dean of Law.

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. The Panel approved the agenda with the addition of the Public Realm Report presentation.

Motion Carried

2.0 Approval of minutes of May 1st, 2008 meeting

Panel approved the minutes with the following changes in item 2.0:

Delete the phrase "due to a conflict of interest".

Motion Carried

3.0 Development Application DP 08017: Law Building

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Donald Schmitt and Jennifer Mallard, Diamond Schmitt Architects; William Locking and Kirsten Reite, CEI Architecture ;and new team member Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architect to present a development application for a new Law Building. The applicants put forward a revised design based on Panel's feedback at the May 1st meeting.

Summary of Panel Comments:

It was acknowledged that the design has been improved since last presented. The majority of the Panel expressed concern about the sense of sobriety, and the restrained, almost defensive character of the building in relation to the rest of Campus. To address this, the panel made several suggestions for relaxing the expression while maintaining the elegant composition. Strategies to explore include:

- More differentiation in materials to give relief. For example, introducing a secondary material such as zinc may be appropriate for this location given its use on the Chan Centre across the street. Having the two buildings share a common building material may strengthen the gateway expression.
- Several panel members made suggestions on the use of brick including:
 - 1) Introducing a second brick colour to help break down the building volumes
 - 2) Considering an alternative to the dark brick proposed that is less oppressive and more appropriate to the west coast context – ie: climate and materiality
 - 3) Considering a concrete brick that would provide a degree of texture, a subtle salute to the previous building and an appropriate complement to the Chan Centre
- Maintaining the increased height for the West (“gateway”) wing while lowering the library wing/volume to its earlier height or giving the West wing slightly more prominence which might include pushing it farther north.
- Introducing a finer grain aspect to the elevations, especially to give the building a more comfortable scale and acknowledge the west coast modernist context established by several north campus buildings such as the Lasserre Building, Frederic Wood Theatre Koerner House and International House.

West Elevation: The current access from East Mall suppresses the entry experience. Pursue making it more welcoming and inviting, and increasing the permeability. Explore increasing the canopy height, reducing the extent of plinth. Several members suggested investigating a more engaging edge for the building through increased activity at the ground floor spaces and a more pedestrian-friendly treatment to the plinth and associated landscape.

The subtlety of the approach to the Iona Tower axis is appreciated, but it would benefit from tying the entrance into that composition. One suggestion is a fuller extension of the canopy and/or perhaps wrapping it to capture this portion of the façade.

South Elevation: The alternate plan option presented by Diamond Schmitt that shifted the bank of classrooms east and re-enlarged the cafeteria is preferred by Panel, but the design still needs to find a way to introduce more daylight into the space. The west side of the elevation should be a more inviting, casual and friendly space and have an increased permeability and sense of entry.

General: The way the building is set in landscape is as important as the built form and the Panel must see a developed landscape plan before it can support the application. Due to Vancouver’s inclement weather, the rooftop patio should be covered or at least partially covered

to allow for use year-round and to add interest to the building. One Panel member expressed concern that the proposed siting of the building results in an extravagant commitment of land for this building. A detailed site plan is needed to understand how the servicing will function.

The Panel resolved:

Support of the project subject to conditions to be met to the satisfaction of the Panel:

- Design development to review the material palette, in particular the brick colour and potential introduction of a secondary material
- Design development to west and south elevations to increase permeability and sense of entry
- Design development to strengthen the expression of gateway
- Applicant committing to present to the Panel a fully developed landscape plan including principles for interface with surrounding landscape context at the next meeting.

Unanimous

4.0 Staff Presentation

Gerry McGeough introduced Nancy Knight of Campus and Community Planning to share the presentation she made to the Board of Governors on the Draft Public Realm Plan.

Panel Comment:

Panel in general, is very happy to see this plan become a reality, it is an enormous achievement. The consensus was that it is the right time to get this project moving. There was a consensus that the plan start with Main Mall and then University Boulevard, since those projects account for one third of the budget and more people would get on board with the success of those projects. It would be the inspiration for other projects. The large squares including the commons at the south end of Main Mall should also be implemented early. The issue of funding was discussed at length with several suggestions.

5.0 Announcements

Nancy Knight and Gerry McGeough took the opportunity to thank outgoing AUDP Panel members Joyce Drohan and Joost Bakker for their many years of service to the AUDP. Joyce in turn commended Nancy in turning around the process of planning on Campus. She then thanked Gerry for coming aboard, bringing some welcome rigour to panel proceedings and noted that future Panels will be well served. Joyce also thanked the Panel for their efforts over the years.

6.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, July 3rd, 2008
Time: 4:00-6:00
Venue: TEF III

Members Present: Norm Couttie (Chair)
Byron Braley
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe
Brian Wakelin

Members Absent: Richard Henriquez, Catherine Berris, Mark Thompson

Staff: Gerry McGeough, University Architect; and Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust; Martin Neilsen, Z Smith, Sébastien Garon, Imu Chan and Maginnis Cocivera, Busby Perkins and Will; and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership.

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.

Motion Carried

2.0 Election for a new Chair and Vice-Chair

Nominations were put forth for Mark Thompson as Chair (subject to his acceptance) and Norm Couttie as Vice-Chair.

Motion Carried

3.0 Approval of minutes of June 5th, 2008 meeting

Panel approved the minutes without any changes.

4.0 Development Proposals

4.1 Pre-Development Application – CIRS

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team UBC Properties Trust; Busby Perkins and Will and PWL Partnership to present a pre-development application proposal for the CIRS Building. Rob Brown provided a brief background on the history of the CIRS Project. Martin Neilsen and Z Smith described the project goals and the current conceptual design for the project.

Summary of Panel Comments:

Overall, the panel is very supportive of the conceptual approach to the project noting the following areas for exploration and/or development.

- Take into account the long term redevelopment potential of the adjacent buildings with regard to the proposed building. Can the new building be designed to allow future eastward expansion over the lane? What about the existing building to the north? It would be useful to prepare a site plan showing how this could be accommodated.
- Take measures to improve the pedestrian experience in the lane between CIRS and the Binning Building. For example, windows into the lecture hall, green roof carries down lane wall. Explore building a meaningful relationship between art practice (the Binning Building) and sustainability.
- The southwest corner can be viewed from a considerable distance along West Mall and this needs to be considered. It doesn't necessarily need to be a "landmark", but it currently doesn't seem to present anything. For the next meeting, provide an artist's conception of the view south down West Mall (north to south view).
- Consider the wish list vs. academic program with respect to all of the green initiatives such as multiple green walls. It is important to ensure that these components can be funded and maintained. Need to look at functionality, to make it "practical green", and a humane environment.
- There is concern about the choice of exterior material – wood, if done incorrectly can cheapen quickly. More important, since there is a lack of material continuity amongst the buildings on this part of campus, consider how it can best help unify this part of Campus. A sample material palette is desired for the next meeting.
- One building objective is to be a social condenser – take into account the research happening within the building and how to showcase it to students passing through. The current shape of the building is at odds with the ambitions of the project. Consider changing the shape of the convenience stair in the atrium to maximize the interface within the whole building and to explore a circular versus "U" shaped office/lab floor circulation.
- Make the lecture hall publically visible; capture the interest of those passing by in the lane. Orienting the lecture hall so it takes advantage of the slope is understood, but it raises the problem of late coming students disrupting the class. Is there a way to fix this?

5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 5:41 pm.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Tuesday, August 12, 2008
Time: 4:00-7:30
Venue: TEF III

Members Present: Catherine Berris
Norm Couattie *Vice-Chair*
Byron Braley
Richard Henriquez
Mark Thompson *Chair*
Brian Wakelin

Members Absent: Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

Staff: Gerry McGeough, University Architect; and Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Donald Schmitt, Diamond + Schmitt Architects; William Locking and Kristen Reite, CEI Architecture; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architect; Larry McFarland and Craig Duffield, Larry McFarland Architects; Adrienne Brown, Stantec

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:01 PM. The Panel approved the agenda with the addition of the Public Realm Report presentation.

Motion Carried

2.0 Approval of minutes of July 3rd, 2008 meeting

Panel approved the minutes without any changes.

Motion Carried

3.0 Staff Presentation and Discussion – Campus Cohesion and Character

Gerry McGeough gave a background slide presentation on campus character to prompt thinking and discussion in advance of the Panel deliberating on three new academic buildings in the design progress: Law, WWW Centre for Engineering Design, and CIRS. The goal was to engage the Panel and applicants in reflecting on and discussing the following four questions:

- How important is cohesion as a design objective for the academic core?
- What is the dominant campus character?
- What are appropriate means to achieve fit?
- What is the balance between individual expression versus strengthening the whole?

Summary of Panel Comments:

The landscape is the one thing that threads the campus together. It is more consistent than the built form and therefore has a more unifying and cohesive quality. The Public Realm is the glue that holds the Campus together and the University must prioritize investing in it. An analysis is needed of what works and what doesn't work with respect to the landscape. Most Panel members felt that guidelines and even restrictions should be put in place to give direction to the design teams in the building design process. Individual ideas included:

- There are currently two types of buildings on Campus – the background buildings and the highlight buildings. There needs to be a hierarchy in place and a plan of where the highlights go.
- We need to embrace the open space concept and build right up to Main Mall with additions or infill buildings that create a cohesion treatment fronting Main Mall. Create interior courtyards behind the buildings.
- Insist that all active public interior spaces of a building face on the streets to foster animation. Be as assertive as the City of Vancouver is on this objective.
- There should be no leftover landscape; the buildings should shape the surrounding landscape. Buchanan is a good example of this.
- That said, the Panel was reminded that the University, being outside a municipal jurisdiction, does not have a property tax revenue stream to address public realm infrastructure as would a typical municipality.

4.0 Development Proposals

4.1 Development Application DP 08017: Law Building

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Donald Schmitt, Diamond + Schmitt Architects; William Locking and Kristen Reite, CEI Architecture; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg Landscape Architect to present a development application for a new Law Building. The applicants put forward a revised design based on Panel's feedback at the June 5th meeting. The June 5th resolution is as follows:

Support of the project subject to conditions to be met to the satisfaction of the Panel:

- Design development to review the material palette, in particular the brick colour and potential introduction of a secondary material
- Design development to west and south elevations to increase permeability and sense of entry
- Design development to strengthen the expression of gateway
- Applicant committing to present to the Panel a fully developed landscape plan including principles for interface with surrounding landscape context at the next meeting.

Summary of Panel Comments:

Some panel members were disappointed with the applicant's overall design and felt that it was a step backwards in the design process. Some basic fundamental/technical issues remain unresolved, an example being the servicing issue. At the June meeting it was requested to see a detailed site plan to understand how the servicing will function and it was felt that that request was not met.

It was agreed that the light coloured brick was preferred over the dark colour. The dark colour does not fit in with the context of this area of Campus. The panel members liked the wood though some were unsure of the colour and suggested a darker colour be explored. It was also recommended that the wood fins be functional as a means of solar protection and thermal comfort within the building. Many members expressed concern over the addition of the zinc. They felt that it was too busy, appeared applied and didn't coordinate well with the overall design.

The permeability of the building is improved though more could be done. Animating functions should be pulled forward to front on East Mall. One member even suggested that the lounge and informal spaces be moved to East Mall in place of office space. Other members felt the cafeteria should be moved to front on both East Mall and the south courtyard. Rain protection should be increased along East Mall.

Panel members agreed that the proposed 57 foot setback from the existing residential building to the east is supportable and in keeping with downtown Vancouver residential standards. They felt that day light proximity sensors should be a requirement to mitigate light bleed towards Sterling House.

The gateway issue remains unsolved with panel members unsure of how to resolve the issue. One member supported the building expression, the majority did not. Many members expressed that the current gateway corner was weak and that the overall building composition and expression was too busy and unnecessarily complicated. Simplification and more emphasis on the north elevation should be pursued. Approaches might include:

- increase the size and presence of the west wing bay relative to the library bay;
- return to the previous design and develop it further
- north west 'lantern' is good, but is diminished by the library 'lantern' of equal height; therefore the building would be stronger if the element on East Mall is distinct from the library bay. Emphasize the west 'lantern' as a beacon that terminates East Mall, and explore linking it back to the East Mall entrance with rain protection;
- the building should be lighter, e.g. by reducing the frame thickness of the projecting bays.
- the round atrium is acceptable in isolation but needs to go with the rest of the building
- revisit or eliminate the north courtyard.

One member emphasized that the building is set too far back towards the south to be considered a gateway building and reiterated that the building siting is a poor use of the University's valuable land.

Panel appreciated the landscape plans as it gave a better sense of the building as a whole. The south courtyard is very positive and active. The north courtyard has limited use; reduce the concrete surfaces and increase the amount of green. Members were wary of the water feature on the north side of the building given the shadows on this side. Some felt it would be better situated as a reflecting pool in front of the west wing or in the south courtyard. The rest of the roof surfaces will need consideration.

The Panel deliberated on whether to have the project return to the Panel or have the unresolved issues addressed to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

The Panel resolved:

Support of the project subject to resolution of the gateway aspect of the project and those other specific issues raised by the Panel and summarized in the commentary above to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

Motion Carried; Richard Henriquez abstained, Norm Couttie and Catherine Berris were opposed.

4.2 Development Application Centre for Engineering Design

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Larry McFarland and Craig Duffield, Larry McFarland Architects and Adrienne Brown, Stantec to present a development application for the new building. This is the applicant's first appearance at the Panel.

Summary of Panel Comments:

The Panel was very pleased with the applicant's presentation and they should be congratulated. They felt that it was a very positive response to the site conditions, a good university building and a great project.

Some panel members felt that the current exterior design was a little busy and needs to be streamlined.

On the whole, the rain protection is adequate for the building; one member was wary of compromising the south façade for rain cover. It was suggested that a future bridge could somehow be configured to offer protection as well as a through way through the atrium.

A bolder approach to landscape would fit better with the scale of the building. The paving around the building needs to better relate to the building itself. The placement of recycling is supported; but consideration should be given to tying it into what is already existing.

Individual member recommendations included:

- For better long term flexibility, the location and configuration should of the core could be reconsidered and for clarity the washroom orientation should be changed.
- Consideration should be given to re-location of the cistern close to the one tree to be retained. It would be best to move the cistern away from that area.

- Consideration should be given to allowing the whole wall of the group space be able to open up to outside – double doors would help.

The Panel Resolved:

Support for the project with no conditions.

Unanimous

5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, September 4, 2008
Time: 4:00-6:35
Venue: TEF III

Members Present: Catherine Berris
Norm Couttie
Richard Henriquez
Mark Thompson
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe
Brian Wakelin

Members Absent: Byron Braley

Staff: Gerry McGeough, University Architect; Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder); Items 1-4: Joe Stott, Director of Planning; and Dan Sirois, Manager Development Services.

Presenters/Guests: Nick Maile, UBC Properties Trust; Martin Neilsen, Z Smith, Busby Perkins and Will; and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership; Cathy Pasion, C&CP Staff

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM.
Motion Carried

2.0 Approval of minutes of August 12, 2008 meeting

The Panel approved the minutes with the following changes noted in italics: Item 3.0, “what is the *dominant* campus character?” Item 4.1, “the round atrium is acceptable in isolation but needs to *go* with the rest of the building”; Item 4.2, “they felt that it was a very positive response *to the site conditions...*”
Motion Carried

3.0 In Camera Discussion

The Panel discussed procedure and protocol during meetings. The Panel resolved that the first 15 minutes of each AUDP meeting will be devoted to discussion of any housekeeping issues as well as any conflicts of interest that may arise for projects.

4.0 Development Proposals

4.1 Development Application DP 08022 CIRS

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team Nick Maile, UBC Properties Trust; Martin Neilsen, and Z Smith, Busby Perkins and Will; and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership. Martin Neilsen then provided background information on the CIRS project for the benefit of those panel members who were not present in July and presented the application.

Summary of Panel Comments:

Overall, the Panel was pleased with the application. There was support for the massing and circulation. The majority of the members supported the proposed floor to floor heights. Areas for further design development include:

- Rain coverage is needed on Sustainability Street.
- Re-examine increasing the rain protection on West Mall.
- Wood is not an appropriate material for the building exterior and a material that links with the campus context is needed. The white granite brick proposed by the design team was supported by several members noting that this site is a very legible corner on West Mall.
- The exterior is not reading as a test building. The experimental use and expression on the West and South facades should be furthered, including increasing the amount of facade area used for experiments. Introduction of an underlying structure, possibly using the structural bays of the building, as an organizing system for the experimental panels is suggested. Screening elements to the East and the West should also be included as experimental elements.
- Continue to seek improvements to the lecture theatre circulation to ensure that there is minimal class disruption by late comers entering.
- Apply the same experimental ideas used in the building to the landscape. Experiment with what plantings are to be tested for draught tolerance and what would be tested as part of the building's water management.
- Some street trees are merited along East Mall as long as they do not interfere with the clarity of the front entrance.
- Increase the connection with Sustainability Street. Suggestions included linking the proposed water swale with the existing one and breaking the cafe out from the building façade onto Sustainability Street.
- Illustrate the future expansion to the North on the site plan.

The Panel felt the lane upgrades should be included as an item in this capital project.

The Panel resolved: to support the Project.

Unanimous

5.0 Staff Presentation – Draft Public Realm Plan

Gerry McGeough gave a background on the project, saying that it had come to Panel on two prior occasions as a presentation but this is the first time it has come as a document. Cathy Pasion then presented the draft Public Realm Plan and asked for Panel comment.

Summary of Panel Comments:

Overall, Panel was very supportive of the Plan. They felt that it was a good start, but there is still more work to be done. Comments included:

- The definition of the Public Realm is very important and as written is inadequate. The Public Realm is the places framed by buildings and street, and animated by furniture, public art and student displays.
- Members felt that “Plan” was not necessarily the best name, but rather use a word such as “Program” and “Initiative.”
- Provide context as to what this document does and how it fits with other work such as the Vancouver Campus Plan (the “VCP”). It is not clear where this program “takes off” and how it relates to the VCP. It should dovetail with the Vancouver Campus Plan objectives and should promote interaction between landscape, buildings and sustainability.
- Create a map or a schedule of any likely construction/infrastructure programs to take place over the span of the Plan, to ensure that any public realm projects won’t be demolished because of such construction.
- Panel was adamant that a policy change is needed so new building projects are required to invest in public realm improvements surrounding them.
- It was noted that by the time the third phase is done, the first phase will need maintenance. Specific design guidelines and approaches are needed to make sure maintenance is properly addressed.
- One member expressed concern that East and West Mall were not addressed in the Plan. The Malls (East, West and Main) are the big armature and organizing spines of Campus. They need to be funded by this plan because they are not associated with any specific faculty or discipline and therefore don’t have another source of funds.
- The rationale for starting with Main Mall, University Boulevard and the two courtyards is supportable and should be stated in the document. However for Phase II and III the prioritizing criteria should establish the list and it should naturally evolve over time. It was also suggested that all required public realm projects be listed with how they will be funded.
- Be strategic with the funding. Target projects that won’t have easy access to funding and that can leverage funding as part of building projects. Have new buildings support

outdoor space. For example, by providing rain protection, food services, generous inviting stairs clearly visible from the public realm etc. The public realm design approaches should direct building designers.

- Main Mall should be connected across Chancellor.

6.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 6:35 pm.

Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, November 6th, 2008
Time: 4:00-7:15
Venue: TEF III

Members Present: Catherine Berris
Norm Couttie
Richard Henriquez
Mark Thompson
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe
Brian Wakelin

Members Absent: None

Staff: Gerry McGeough, University Architect; and Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust; Karen Marler, Hughes Condon Marler Architects; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Architects; Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust; Keith Hemphill, Rostitch Hemphill Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Joe Stott, Campus and Community Planning

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and approval of the agenda as circulated

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. The Panel approved the agenda
Motion Carried

2.0 Approval of minutes of September 4th, 2008 meeting

Panel approved the minutes with the following changes noted in italics. In item 4.1, add "*the roof landscape did not match the roof...*" Change "Experiment with what plantings are to be tested for draught tolerance and what would be tested as part of the building's water management" to "*provide ways to use plants to test drought tolerance and building water management.*"

Motion Carried

3.0 Development Proposals

3.1 Development Application – 07014 University Boulevard Underground Bus Terminal

Brian Wakelin declared a conflict of interest and abstained from participating in this item.

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team Jas Sahota, UBC Karen Marler, and Chris Phillips and introduced the project and its background. Karen Marler then introduced the project in detail.

Summary of Panel Comments:

Panel was supportive of the project in concept, however further analysis and development is needed to address the following issues:

- Substantive questions around how the design team proposed to build the station without design development of the building above. A substantial amount of design work is required to ensure that the two buildings will work together as a single structure, including issues of liability and phasing: who is liable should something be faulty in the construction.
- Seating at the lower level of the facility needs further consideration.
- Consider adding more landings to the exit stair. Thoroughly explore installing an escalator to help ease the congestion.
- Location of the bike storage and how bikes will get up to the surface. Bike users can't all use the handicap elevator which then raised another issue of the location of the handicap elevator since we don't yet know what will be above.
- Adequate day-lighting throughout the facility.
- Adequate ventilation as there will be a lot of fumes from the buses. Consider venting the bus fumes out the tunnel ramp to avoid having a fume stack.

Further development of the details is required for the following areas:

- The plaza – knowing that an interim design could be more permanent than expected.
- Material finishes as it is the details will make or break this project. The Panel also requested the reasoning behind the material choices they made and how they will make this into a world class facility,
- The green wall – in particular, its impact on circulation.
- The notion of gateway identity.

The Panel Resolved:

The panel supports the project in concept, but further review by the Panel upon submission of a complete development permit package including: responses to issues raised by the Panel and details of how the sub-structure and the super structure will work together from a design/structural/liability and phasing perspective.

Motion Carried unanimously (minus 1 abstention)

3.2 Pre-Development Application Mixed Use Building – South Campus

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust; and Keith Hemphill, Rostitch Hemphill Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates

Summary of Panel Comments:

The Panel was pleased the proponent had a well developed pre-application proposal. The Panel asked for design improvement in the following areas:

- Building massing and elevations:
 - Sympathetic with the proponent's desire to break up the façade though it appears to be done very arbitrarily. Current design is choppy, many different types of awnings and not quite together. Lacks the rhythm of a traditional city and street

- wall. Find an organizing principle and have a hierarchy of primary and secondary materials.
 - Take a more asymmetrical and simplified approach.
 - The building needs to speak to the rest of campus in some way
 - Line up the facades by removing the 1.6 foot façade set back. e.g. Simplify the massing and break up the block by keeping the asymmetry and having sections of different materials and different canopies.
 - The absence of balconies on the main façade lends a unique character to the project.
- Plaza:
 - The concept is formulaic and needs more thought. Needs to be more adventuresome, something special.
 - Consideration should also be given to how it could contribute to the public domain.
 - Consideration should be given to using the stormwater for irrigation purposes.
 - Panel agreed that raising the plaza is a good move. The grade change integration between the plaza and adjoining sidewalks will need resolution.

Other areas the Panel felt could use improvement included:

- The residential entryway needs to be different from the rest of the building and say “residential”.
- There is also an opportunity for a green roof and it should be explored.
- Integrate the weather protection strategies of the project with the surrounding context.
- Adaptability – what kind of future uses could one anticipate for the spaces. Explore providing greater flexibility and increasing the floor to ceiling heights on the upper floors to accommodate adaptability.
- Include a service elevator for garbage.
- The pedestrian realm is currently compromised by the loading bay. Improve integration of this area by grades and paving treatment on the ramp, loading and plaza along the west side.

3.3 Staff Presentation – Campus Plan

Joe Stott of Campus and Community Planning introduced the 4th phase of the Campus Plan. He encouraged Panel members to fill out the feedback form.

Some panel members were disappointed that the Farm was not retained in its entirety in the scenarios. Throughout their spring 2008 Campus Plan workshops, exercises and charrettes, the emerging idea was to densify the core and leave the outskirts as is. The current options don't fully respect that. It is important to look at the aggregate of uses from successful campuses.

4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.