



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2009

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, January 15, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00-7:00  
**Venue:** TEF III

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

**Members Absent:** Brian Wakelin

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust; Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Donald Schmitt, Diamond + Schmitt Architects; William Locking and Kristen Reite, CEI Architecture; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architect; Keith Ross, 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 4:10 PM.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of November 6<sup>th</sup>, 2008 meeting

Panel unanimously approved the minutes

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Development Application – DP08030 SC Mixed Use Building

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

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

The Panel was very pleased with the dramatic improvement to the design. The issues raised from the previous submission have been addressed to its satisfaction. The Panel supports the commercial unit size and guest and commercial parking relaxations described in the University Architect's report. The Panel asked that the completion of the construction of the square be coordinated with the introduction of pedestrians into this area.

Areas for further develop include:

- Provide a more generous parapet height on the north massing block
- Consider pre-cast window sills in place of small brick sills
- Delete the roof eave brackets that are visible in some drawings

One member suggested introducing a second, different building material – such as a second brick colour.

### **The Panel Resolved:**

Panel moved to support the project with the design improvements suggested by Panel  
*Motion carried unanimously*

### **3.2 Development Application – Fairview Square**

Gerry McGeough and Chris Phillips presented the planning process and conceptual design for Fairview Square and siting for Earth Systems Science Building (ESSB). The Panel established that Catherine Berris was not in conflict due to her consultant work for the new proposed ESSB Building.

### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

Panel felt staff needed to step back and rethink their approach to Fairview Square:

- We have to decide if this new Square is part of the bigger idea that is reflected in the Campus Plan from 1992 or something more responsive to buildings around individually. Is there a clear idea of Main Mall in a holistic sense. Is that idea the big idea from the 1992 Plan? Answering these questions will give you the underlying philosophy for development of this precinct.
- There should be a clear and consistent approach to Main Mall. This is a major opportunity to get cohesiveness along Main Mall – current design does not do that.
- Must decide if this plan is part of the structure of the 1992 Campus Plan or in response to the surrounding buildings
- ESSB pushes too far south into the square– consider pushing ESSB further north so it aligns with the south edge of Beatty Biodiversity Museum to create a better connection with Fairview Grove
- It is currently unclear what the Square is – a crossing or a node. As a crossing, it's really good, but as a node it needs a lot more work.
- No longer a Square, but an 'L' shape
- The Square should not cross two spaces

Other detailed comments:

- Locations for a biodiversity garden is important to site
- Include the art students in your design process as the art studios surround the space
- Sustainability Street is not a street – it is a walk and should probably be renamed accordingly
- Need to reaffirm your first principles “what are you trying to do” and show how you respond to it

### **3.3 Development Application – DP08017 Law Building**

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant Rob Brown, UBC Properties; Donald Schmitt, Diamond + Schmitt Architects; William Locking and Kristen Reite, CEI Architecture; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Landscape Architect

#### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

Overall, Panel is very pleased with the submission and felt it had moved forward substantially since the previous presentation.

At the request of staff, the Panel commented on the following specific issues:

- Brick colour - The Panel strongly supported the applicant's proposed pallet of materials and felt it is a very good fit with the surrounding context. The light coloured brick is strongly preferred as it has more of an academic nature and is important for binding this building with the surround context – the dark seen in earlier schemes is a more commercial response. The building should have an academic nature first and a law nature second.
- The ground floor atrium space is good, with one member requesting increased visual penetration if possible.
- Oak trees – the landscape response to East Mall should match the rest of East Mall. That being said, one member felt there should be a double row of trees along East Mall

Areas for further development include:

- Increase the pedestrian animation and link the building to the rest of Campus along the south west corner of the building through one or a combination of strategies: flip the main entrance to the corner; flip the food services to the corner; or pull the offices back and flip the circulation to the outside wall.
- Bring continuous rain protection from the south west corner to the two entrances
- Reintegrate the higher two storey base from the previous submission. Lift the brick panel along East Mall to make the building feel more welcoming. Also, look at the landscape to create a welcoming feel.
- Have more seating in the North courtyard.

#### **The Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support the project subject to their recommendations.

*Motion carried unanimously*

### **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:00pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, February 5, 2008  
**Time:** 4:00-6:00  
**Venue:** TEF III

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

**Members Absent:**

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Landscape Architects; Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust; John Wall and Brian Wakelin, Public Architecture +Communication;

---

### 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 January 15, 2009 meeting

Panel unanimously approved the minutes

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Development Application – Fairview Square

Gerry McGeough and Chris Phillips presented an urban design analysis and siting assessment of seven options for Fairview Square based on the Panel's recommendations from the last meeting.

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

Option 7 was favoured by Panel members and the following design improvements were suggested:

- The connectivity of the pedestrian passage through ESSB should be further developed and strengthened
- Natural alignments of walking routes should inform the building edges and landscape design

- Curved lines should not be used for paths on Main Mall

**The Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support option 7 for the siting of Fairview Square/ESSB with the design improvements suggested by Panel.

*Motion carried unanimously – Catherine Berris abstained.*

**3.2 Pre-Development Application – Centre for Comparative Medicine**

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust; John Wall and Brian Wakelin, Public Architecture +Communication and Cohos Evamy. Craig Knight noted that this is the first phase of a two phase project and that the applicant is seeking feedback on the generalized siting of the buildings and the design of the outbuilding.

**Summary of Panel Comments:**

Overall, Panel was very impressed with the applicant's submission and had the following comments:

- Consider adding some colour to the outbuilding façade treatment and steel structure
- Consider providing only one vehicular entrance from Wesbrook and extending the landscaped berm along the entire frontage
- Address issue of stormwater management regarding runoff from animal holding pens

**The Panel Resolved:**

Panel resolved to support the outbuilding and site concept.

*Motion carried unanimously*

**4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:47 pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, March 5, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00-6:30  
**Venue:** TEF III

**Members Present:** Catherine Berris  
Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe

**Members Absent:** Brian Wakelin

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect; Keith Ross, Landscape Architect and Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Toni Gill, Project Architect; Anita Leonoff, Project Architect; Ed Cepka, Project Manager, Land & Building Services

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10PM. Gerry McGeough introduced new Panel member Lisa Castle to the rest of Panel. The Panel approved the agenda unanimously.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of February 5, 2009 meeting

Panel approved the minutes unanimously

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Development Application UBC Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Centre for Drug Research and Development

Gerry McGeough introduced the development application and gave some background information with respect to the type of project (public private partnership) and the application process involved. Ed Cepka brought the fairness component of the process to the attention of Panel. A discussion ensued and a call was placed to the Fairness Advisor who then established that at this stage, participation by Panel members in this meeting would not in any way affect their ability to participate in the future RFP for this project.

## Summary of Panel Comments:

### Security

- The current animal holding facility location (facing Wesbrook) is not desirable – consideration should be given to moving the animal facility to a more secure location.
- Significant security issues exist because of the close proximity of loading, in particular for animals, to the parkade.

### Character and Massing

- The project should define the University's identity at the Wesbrook edge – through scale, character, fenestration, etc. The Wesbrook façade should state that you are entering the academic part of Campus. The corner treatment should be more grand.
- Wesbrook is a public view and should be visually interesting and advantageous to the project.
- There is no consensus on using the Life Sciences Building as height standard. Making the new building taller would give it a sense of grandeur and reinforce its gateway nature. It may also be more cost effective and allow for green space to surround the project. Consideration should also be given to the shadow impact on the future building site north of Agronomy Road
- Consider softening the Agronomy Road street façade through transparency, active uses and landscaping
- Seek a compatible design character with the campus eg. Building and landscape relationships, horizontal patterns, light materials.
- Alignment with TEF III Building is not seen as essential.

### Pedestrian Routing

- Ensure there is adequate rain protection on three sides. Make sure that the rain protection is part of the sidewalk route.
- Clarity is needed on project boundaries so that functional outdoor space is provided and circulation routes are improved
- Address the pedestrian traffic flows coming from the Acadia Complex.
- Address the treatment of space between the building and parkade.

### Open Space

- There should be a strong, positive open space next to the knoll – prescribe in the RFP a minimum area requirement for this plaza. This campus is lacking high quality, usable open space and this is a great opportunity to address this.
- Make efforts to mask the parkade from the open space.
- The western edge of the building should form one edge of the future open space around the knoll
- Panel supports a well defined level of amenity provided in the open space at the west side of the building.

### Other Comments

- Is future expansion a program requirement – it should be fully planned for if it is.
- Consider a green roof or accessible space on the roof deck to enhance useability.
- Panel supports the proposed finalized streetscape improvements on Agronomy and Wesbrook.

## 4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 6:10 pm.



# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00-5:30  
**Venue:** Gardenia Room – Campus and Community Planning

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Catherine Berris  
Norm Couttie

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Director of Planning; Gerry McGeough, University Architect;  
Nena Vukojevic, Urban Planning Assistant and Laura Holvor,  
Administrative Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters/Guests:** Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust; John Wall and Brian Wakelin, Public Design Ken Johnson Cohos Evamy; Gerry Eckford, [\*]; Corey Day, Aplin Martin

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:17 PM.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of March 5, 2009 meeting

Panel approved the minutes with the following changes in item 3.1 (other comments) Consider a green roof or useable space on the roof deck to make it usable. Change to *Consider a green rood or accessible space on the roof deck to enhance usability*  
*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 In Camera Item

#### 3.1 Development Application

Gerry McGeough noted that due to the sensitive nature of the building that it is to be an In Camera item. He then introduced the project, staff issues and the applicant team Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust; John Wall and Brian Wakelin, Public Design Ken Johnson Cohos Evamy; Gerry Eckford, [\*]; Corey Day, Aplin Martin

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

Overall, the proponents had general support from the Panel. The questions of stormwater management raised at the last meeting were addressed and it was felt that the colour and

material palette was appropriate for the building given its function. Other comments given included:

- Well designed facility.
- Resolved with good use of site and the issues of security addressed appropriately.
- Question raised about front facade: is it correct to welcome or push away? In truth you want to welcome some people, not all.
- Approval subject to cost estimate so that architectural intent is upheld and detail preserved.
- Consider a row of trees along the front façade or other action to soften the entrance treatment
- Continue to strive for a balance between the needs of the building, animal needs and sense of belonging on Campus

**The Panel resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project as proposed with comment offered and subject to cost estimation.

*Motion Carried*

**4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:14pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, May 7, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00-6:00  
**Venue:** Gardenia Room – Campus and Community Planning

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe  
Brian Wakelin  
Catherine Berris

**Members Absent:** Norm Couttie

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Lisa Colby; 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 4:30 PM.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of April 14, 2009 meeting

Panel approved the minutes.  
*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Staff Presentation – Vancouver Campus Plan Update

#### 3.1 Vancouver Campus Plan Update

Lisa Colby introduced the Project. She noted that they are in the preliminary stages of the Plan and that she is here at this time to give an update and to get feedback.

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

- Focus on housing; bring more activities into each hub.
- This is an activator for the exterior public realm.
- Would be nice to see everything on an aerial drawing to better situate one's self
- Use hubs to make campus more legible. Current situation so confusing – it must be clarified and more defined.
- More legible pedestrian routes needed.

- Student Union Building and University Boulevard east of East Mall are the biggest hubs even though they not within the Campus Plan study area. They should be areas of biggest focus.
- Connect South Campus to University Boulevard and create a spine.
- Hang on to the primary blocks and secondary blocks from the Main Campus Plan (1992)
- Nodes could liven the dead areas of campus. Great opportunity.
- Building up instead of out is ok.
- One member would like to see separate housing and academic zones.

#### **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 6:00pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday July 14, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00-6:00  
**Venue:** Gardenia Room – Campus and Community Planning

**Members Present:** Mark Thompson  
Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe  
Brian Wakelin  
Norm Couttie

**Members Absent:** Catherine Berris, Lisa Castle, Richard Henriquez

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Mike Champion, Project Services UBC; Mark Ostry, Susan Otwell, Acton Ostry Architects; Chris Mraymar, Landscape Architect; Jeff Cutler Space to Place Landscape Architects

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of May 7, 2009 meeting

Panel approved the minutes.  
*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Staff Presentation – Buchanan Courtyard Draft Concept

#### 3.1 Buchanan Courtyard and Draft Concept

Gerry McGeough and Jeff Cutler introduced the project and gave some background information on the Public Realm Plan community co-design process for these informal social/learning spaces. Panel comment was sought on both the process and concept plan.

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

##### General

- Very interesting and thought provoking. Buchanan occupies a significant place in the cultural landscape of the campus
- Active programming of the outdoor place is critical
- Problems can be created by trying to force use into a place – people become focussed on making it work, but forget that the space does work now

- Keep the rainy weather in mind when planning the programming of the courtyard
- Consider how people move through the courtyards – they have a tendency to make their own paths
- Seems ambitious from a budget and ongoing maintenance perspective

### **West Courtyard**

- Needs to work with and without programming
- This space is crying out for a piece of art or treat the ribbon edge as the art. When the courtyard is empty it is still occupied.
- Consider making the stage the art piece and shift it to the east so it is more central and not in conflict with the cafe seating
- The design is driven by public interaction and might not work without it
- Design space with flexibility in mind – so that it can accommodate large events as well as feel good when there is no one there
- Infrastructure is needed for bigger events and if you don't have that, the space will not meet its potential
- Moving tables and chairs will make a positive contribution
- Courtyard design should be more rectilinear
- Ensure new paving surfaces can accommodate heavy truckload
- Explore making the piece surrounding them smaller
- Cafe management is important
- Entry circulation currently blocked by existing trees – reduce the size of the tree box at the Buchanan A entrance and reconfiguring in a rectilinear geometry
- Look into high design, interesting umbrellas for the café to replace the canopy

### **East Courtyard**

- Open up the courtyard more
- Night time safety and security issues should inform the design: e.g. scale back the plantings and the secluded spaces
- Design in anti-skateboarding measures

## **3.2 UBC Renew: Biological Sciences Building**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and noted that it is being presented to the Panel as a pre-development application, and won't be returning as a full application as the exterior changes are not extensive on this Renew project. Mark Ostry introduced the details of the proposed changes to this existing building as part of the Renew Program.

### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

Strong support for the proposed direction noting the following comments:

- Buttress are good and strong
- A facade with several layers is positive and sets up a nice rhythm with AERL
- Creation of differential night and day atmospheres is suggested
- Sustainability aspects and the storm water strategies proposed are supported given budgetary constraints
- Vertical elements are of the necessary strength to work with the existing building's scale
- Sallal swale a positive tie-in with the bio garden inside the building
- Mission to communicate the academic mission and interior work on the exterior is supported
- Bridge across 1 or 2 junctions might be a solution since bringing building up to Main Mall grade is not possible with this project given budget and time constraints

The project team was encouraged to pursue additional opportunities to reinforce their main concept, including:

- Using the spandrel panels and landscaping more
- Making the trellises/plant screens a stronger and more connected part of the overall composition, possibly making them of perforated metal, and connecting them to the ground
- Raising the landscape grade in some places, bridging it to the building or some form of connectivity with Main Mall to integrate the two more directly
- Bringing colour to the roof : e.g., painting the mechanical equipment a green colour as it will be one of the most visible building elements, and introducing a linking colour or material to the building cornice
- Exploring asymmetry as means to further break-up the currently monotonous facade. I.e. More composed or asymmetry introduced into some of the elements instead of the current regular approach.
- Adding a sitting area or bench or mini plaza at the fin locations

**The Panel resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project with the commentary attached.

*Motion Carried*

**4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, September 3, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:30pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Catherine Berris  
Rhodri Windsor -Liscombe

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Director of Planning  
Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Alec Smith and Nick Sully, Shape Architecture  
Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Johnathan Losee, Landscape Architects  
Dr. David Hardwick, Faculty of Medicine UBC  
Eric Stedman, Busby Perkins Will  
Darrell Hammond, Eckford and Associates  
Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of July 14, 2009 meeting

A motion to approve the July 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009 minutes was made by Panel.

*Motion Carried*



### **3.0 Development Proposals**

#### **3.1 Tennis Facility – Pre Application**

Gerry McGeough introduced Craig Knight from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Alec Smith and Nick Sully from Shape Architecture as the applicant team for the Tennis Facility project. Panel comment was sought on the site planning and design framework as well as on architectural materials before they come back with their final development application.

#### **Panel Comments:**

Overall, the Panel was pleased with the applicant's presentation and felt it was a thoughtful proposal. The following specific comments were made:

#### **Siting**

- Siting strategy as presented is logical
- It is prudent to keep the corner of East Mall and Thunderbird Boulevard open for a more permanent building
- Interior vehicle drop off unnecessary given proximity to parkade
- Pedestrian connections very important
- Explore leaving a footprint that allows for future expansion and maximise land use efficiency over the long term

#### **Materiality and Architectural Detailing**

- Universal access an issue for competition courts and provision of disabled access to the seats could be difficult – look into the cost of excavating courts down to reduce building envelope as well as alleviate heat load and cooling load
- Interested in cladding choices at next stage
- Like off-setting of courts – gives interesting appearance
- Natural lighting a nice touch
- Interface between the three competition courts and the north end very important as it is the main pedestrian entrance
- Make pedestrian access active and open to engage the outside
- Ensure adequate rain protection

#### **Chair Summary:**

General support for the design parti and the siting of the buildings. Support for external visual pedestrian connection. Interested in seeing how this building will become part of the UBC aesthetic design. Questions of universal access to be addressed in the revised application as well as how to modularize and “future” proof the building. Panel is looking forward to seeing the revised design at the next meeting with particular attention to how the proposed landscape connects with its surroundings.

### **3.2 St. John's Hospice – Development Application**

Gerry McGeough introduced Bryce Rositch from Rositch Hemphill Architects as the applicant team for the St. John's Hospice Project. He then introduced Dr. Hardwick who described the need for a hospice facility on the campus.

Panel comment was sought on the approach to architectural character, parking and the building position in the landscape.

#### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

##### **Architectural Character**

- Looks like a ranch-style house – steepen the roof to reflect St. John's College across the street; flat roofs on the 2<sup>nd</sup> story should be explored; asphalt shingles acceptable given that St. John's has them as well; consider textured asphalt shingles
- Material palette is good; colour will tie into neighbourhood and context
- Consider tan brick to match surrounding buildings
- If cost is an issue, look at reducing masonry on west elevation since it is hidden by berm
- Make the building part of direct the context. Suburban bungalow nature has no direct relationship to surroundings. The building can still have the required "homey" feel without being overtly suburban and take into account direct contextual cues; consider wood instead of stone

##### **Parking**

- Proposal is supportable for those accessing the facility, but must be limited in amount and location
- One stall per bed adequate parking ratio

##### **Landscape**

- Landscape design must be more in tune with the surrounding area ie wreck beach, student residences
- Landscape must help reinforce the need for a quiet setting and separate itself from surrounding buildings – explore signage
- Drive through the woods feeling could be pursued along this section of Marine Drive
- The break from openness of Marine is supportable

##### **General**

- General support for planning parti and the way it solved problems and challenges
- A hospice on campus is a good fit with UBC's holistic goals
- Sustainability and its documentation is lacking
- Questions to consider: what is the daylight quality; what is the quality of materials; what is the bigger connection to the world outside; strive to go deeper and stronger in next iteration
- One member not fully convinced on current site – lots of traffic and not a quiet setting
- Position of building is not most appropriate location given its proximity to campus gateways

#### **The Panel Resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project subject to a report back to the AUDP with design development of the roof and general character to strengthen its relationship to the surrounding context.

*Motion carried*

### **3.3 Earth Systems Science Building – Pre-Application**

Gerry McGeough introduced Craig Knight from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Eric Stedman from Busby Perkins Will as the applicant team for the Earth Systems Science Building project. Panel comment was sought on the urban design as well as the architectural and landscape contexts.

#### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

- Well thought out and exciting building; like the direction its going; magnificent addition to campus
- Very appealing to students, brings what is inside outside
- Effective response to the site relating to the surrounding buildings as well as Fairview Square
- Move building closer to Main Mall in alignment with the Scarfe Building
- Really important urbanistically to align with Beaty Biodiversity Building grid and opening space across Main Mall
- Reconsider programming on upper floors of the south elevation more carefully as they will be seen from Fairview Square; bring the stairwell to corner (south end) or explore an external stairwell – same as Beaty Biodiversity building
- North wing has lots of dark space – reconfigure to get better performance
- Atrium could be improved; south side could be stronger from a programming point of view; make more use of the spaces surrounding the stairs in atrium
- Space on level 5 seems lost – explore putting into atrium or other area
- Relationship to the Scarfe building could be strengthened
- Interested in seeing how the building and landscape interfaces with wider campus context
- Material palette is missing a larger idea; needs to have conviction

#### **Chair Summary:**

General support for the planning parti and all the big moves made. Some questions on the programming internally in particular animating the south of the building. Tighten up urban character on Main Mall. Panel is looking forward to seeing the revised application.

### **4.0 Announcements**

Gerry McGeough introduced Dean Gregory, the new landscape architect for UBC.

### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:20 pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 1, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00pm-5:20 PM  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:**

Lisa Castle  
Rhodri Windsor -Liscombe  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:**

Catherine Berris  
Norm Couttie  
Brian Wakelin

**Staff:**

Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Nena Vukojevic, Urban Planning Assistant

**Presenters/Guests:**

Eric Stedman, Busby Perkins Will  
Gerry Eckford, Eckford and Associates  
Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust

---

### 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. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of September 3, 2009 meeting

A motion to approve the September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Earth Systems Science Building –Application

Gerry McGeough introduced Craig Knight from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Eric Stedman from Busby Perkins Will and Gerry Eckford, Eckford and Associates, as the applicant team for the Earth Systems Science Building project. The team advised that the setback from Scarfe will be reduced by 1.2 m to allow for the structural grid to be aligned with the Beaty

Biodiversity Centre structural grid. This will help improve ramp loading area and main entrances alignment between Oak trees. Panel comment was sought on:

- Alignment with Scarfe Building.
- Alignment with Beaty Biodiversity Centre.
- Programming on south elevation.
- Material palette, Main Mall entrance and landscaping.

### **Panel Comments:**

#### **Building:**

- Fabulous building for students who it is really intended for that is successful in balancing Panel's comments with the users group desires; mixture of utility and elegance; very interesting visual and compositional object on Main Mall. The building picked up on all the best in the spirit of the previous, very simple, post-war, modern, modular buildings. Frozen music – has a real sense of variation and development. Look into alternative treatment for the doors to provide more articulation and presence.

#### **Landscape:**

- Pedestrian pathway along the east facade should allow one to walk along the side of the Mall with moments of pause rather than walls. The landscape layout should allow being able to walk across to the next building rather than being blocked from this movement.
- Landscaping up Main Mall to be simpler so the atrium becomes a special place.
- Alignment of the two set of doors in the atrium are not as important as having the correct Main Mall alignment

### **Summary:**

Strong support for overall architectural expression and use of materials, the spirit, utility and elegance.

Some of the details of the landscaping especially on Main Mall should be simplified. An overall simplification of the landscaping to the north is recommended. Use every strategy to improve east-west alignment to integrate two building across the Mall. The introduction of the bike storage to the north should be reconsidered as it presents as too utilitarian. Look into organizing some of these elements in a different way rather than placing them at the edge of the building. The Panel is recommending that the applicant goes as far out from the building edge and grabs hold of all the connections to the campus context.

**The Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support the project

*Motion carried unanimously*

**4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting concluded at 5:20 pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 7, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:20 PM  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Brian Wakelin  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:** Catherine Berris  
Richard Henriquez  
Rhodri Windsor -Liscombe

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Lisa Colby, Associate Director, Policy Planning  
Nena Vukojevic, Urban Planning Assistant

**Presenters/Guests:** Ron Hoffart, Graham Hoffart Mathiasen Architects  
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates  
Henry Ahking, Vancouver School Board  
Marta Farevaag, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg  
Chris Philips, 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 4:15 pm. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Development Proposal

#### 2.1 University Hill Secondary School – Pre-application

Gerry McGeough introduced Ron Hoffart, Graham Hoffart Mathiasen Architects who then introduced Michael Patterson from Perry + Associates, as the applicant team for the South Campus University Hill School. The team advised that this is a replacement school for the current University Hill Secondary located on Acadia Road. It is designed to accommodate 800 students with potential growth to 1000. This VSB project proposes a retrofit of the existing 60 000 SF NRC building with the addition of 40000 SF of space.

## **Summary of Panel Comments:**

### ***Connection to the larger campus context***

Resolution of the access to the north is not strong enough as it is a strong organizing device to link this site to the campus. Move to connect to the larger campus context and circulation patterns by emphasizing the north-south connection as an organizing element of the site. Link the athletics field's commons pedestrian access with the green street south of the site. To achieve this, explore:

- Aligning the N/S connection and plaza so they all work together
- Reorganizing the interior space to better align the entrances and integrate the north-south pedestrian connection
- Locate the school plaza, building entrances on both side and the future community centre plaza together to form part of the N/S pedestrian route
- Creating the N/S link and associated plaza through a separation at the junction of the new and existing buildings
- Utilize the plaza at the NE corner as an important visual element in providing continuation of the north-south pedestrian route to the south campus
- Strengthen the connection of the SE corner of the project to the public realm created by the commercial node and community centre.
- The corner between the gym and the back of the food store needs to be more inviting and contribute to overall urban feel of the area.
- Consider alternative locations or a different architectural treatment for the gymnasium to minimize the feel of "the back of gymnasium "and to recognize its participation in the urban realm
- Consider relocating drop-off area to the west and give it more consideration as a whole

### ***Sustainability***

- Look at non-technological solutions rather than technology applied to the building to make it sustainable. For example landscape elements might be used to achieve sustainability verses more expensive green roof and walls
- Consider a water element or introduction of indigenous plant species to the north
- When converting lab space into classroom space consider minimizing capacity of the existing HVAC air handling units to be more suitable to less demanding classroom environment

### ***Architectural Character***

- Interesting elements in proposed architectural treatment that softens the building design, moving away from the boxy proportions is positive.
- Encouraged by the window treatment that breaks up the building.
- Minimize large blank wall areas by carrying through the idea of linear bands introduced on other elevations.
- Look at more significant utilization of wood as a building material to fulfill the Provincial mandate to use wood as a primary construction material for Provincially-funded buildings
- Examine the wider campus context in relation to building character and materials to move the external treatment in a right direction.



**Additional Comments:**

- Creation of the areas for students to spill out to the south side of the site is a positive direction
- There is a logic to the interior layout that takes advantage of the part of the existing NCC building
- A simple storey or vision for the project would give the design and the presentation direction
- Explore in section linking the rotunda and multipurpose room to create a larger public space for the building
- More consideration to the drop-off and traffic flow is needed, as it is already somewhat congested in this area
- Consider reviewing general location of the Community Centre to the north to allow for better integration of the school site and how it affects larger context
- Would like sectional information to understand the relationship between the building and the fields

**3.0 Policy****3.1 Staff Presentation – draft Vancouver Campus Plan (VCP) and Design Guidelines**

VCP and Design Guidelines were presented by Lisa Colby, Marta Farevaag and Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg for info and panel's comment. Panels comment will be sought at the November meeting with a particular focus on the Design Guidelines.

**4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting concluded at 6:30 pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, December 3, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:30pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Catherine Berris  
Lisa Castle (*late*)  
Norm Couttie  
Mark Thompson (chair)  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Rhodri Windsor –Liscombe  
Richard Henriquez

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Alec Smith and Nick Sully, Shape Architecture  
Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust  
Roger Hughes, Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Andre Perrotte and Gilles Saucier, Saucier and Perrotte Architects  
Nick Maile, UBC Properties Trust  
Ron Hoffart, Grant Hoffart Mathiasen Architects  
Darrell Hammond, Eckford and Associates  
Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:04 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of minutes of October 1 and 7, 2009 meetings

A motion to approve the October 1<sup>st</sup> and October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009 minutes was made by Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Tennis Facility – Application

Gerry McGeough introduced Craig Knight from UBC Properties; Alec Smith and Nick Sully from Shape Architecture and Amy Tsang from Perry and Associates as the applicant team for the Tennis Facility project. Panel comment was sought on vehicular drop off, pedestrian engagement as well as landscape and colour palette.

## **Panel Comments:**

Overall, the Panel was pleased with the applicant's presentation and felt it was a thoughtful proposal. The following specific comments were made:

### **Vehicular Drop-off**

- proposed vehicle drop off not desired in this location
- strong support for drop off at East Mall as there are more options
- reconsider how disabled people get into building if energy is now on East Mall

### **Public engagement**

- public engagement is good
- good balance between users not being distracted and passers by being able to view inside
- responds well to people being able to view inside the facility
- glazing between courts give more eyes into lane
- allow views from the lobby to East Mall by shifting the lobby and east shed north of the west shed

### **Landscape character and extent**

- needs to be well landscaped – take away foundation planting along back of courts and spend more money on front entrance
- foundation planting will not make a big impact; trees would be a good idea and get rid of ground covering shrubs
- equalize fire lane; engage both edges
- higher end landscape paving in high traffic areas
- run off will be hard to deal with given the size of the building. Consider using the roof side with the canopy as it's an easier amount of water to deal with
- do something interesting with rain water; maybe run part of rain water at the end; explore having run off on the back or into landscape
- avoid piping all stormwater

### **Building alignment**

- proposed informal alignment of lobby with corridor between the two Osborne buildings is appropriate
- if it's easy to align great but if not, not fundamental

### **Colour palette**

- explore building colours and signage
- consider taking metal cladding down to grade
- all about the details and taking the building from a shed to an elegant shed

## **Chair Summary:**

- strong support for drop-off away from parking lot and onto East Mall
- support for public engagement and the way it is introduced into the scheme
- bolder landscape moves needed, concentrate moves to fire lane or pedestrian thoroughfare

- simple bolder linear seating in landscape needed, explore double sided seating for dual use
- the competition courts may need to meet American Disability Association Standards, if so, design accordingly
- building alignment and loading should not drive project, should be governed by other factors
- palette – panel understands challenges of these buildings, but must respond to campus character within constraints

### **The Panel Resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project subject to the applicant working with staff to resolve issues identified.

### **3.2 UBC Pharmaceutical Sciences and Centre for Drug Research and Development – Pre-Development Application**

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Nick Maile from UBC PT; Gilles Saucier and Andre Perrotte from Saucier and Perrotte Architects; Roger Hughes and Bill Uhrich from Hughes Condon Marler Architects.

Panel comment was sought on architectural design, materiality and gateway expression

### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

#### Architectural design

- reach beyond limitation of labs
- split stair solution a great element and really engaging
- like the vision for the project and it will help when it comes to design issues, but caution that functionality doesn't get lost in vision
- lighting strategy – how does it work will need to be resolved through design process
- light wells how will they work given our climate
- some areas seem starved for light ie) dean's office
- start thinking about an interstitial floor
- starved for a program at grade – explore a cafe to populate lobby
- agronomy facade – explore a detail to eliminate a sheet of rain landing on pedestrian route
- consider mechanical on top – right dimensions and ability to respond in the future

#### Materiality

- very bold – like the glazing and the wood
- space between the building and the parkade - what is the materiality?
- would like more detail for the south side in next iteration
- would like to see green wall all along gateway to hide the parkade, but realize it might not be possible
- details will come into question at next meeting

#### Gateway expression

- show gateway views

- doesn't tie into UBC context though it is striking
- bold and striking
- look at where building is sited with respect of Wesbrook edge don't defer to parkade
- gateway vs. context this is achieving gateway status by not challenging the UBC context

#### General comments

- connections to campus very important to pursue
- would like to see a well used community space in the atrium
- captured balance of structure and organic with knoll
- landscape will be a challenge
- explore shifting lecture hall in a bit so that you can see the food outlet from the outside
- not enough indoor/outdoor food space; explore a more usable space
- loading not helping with visual penetration into building at Wesbrook end and produces a blank block; explore a different solution

### 3.3 Vancouver School Board – Pre-Application

Gerry McGeough introduced Ron Hoffart from Grant Hoffart Mathiasen Architects; Michael Patterson from Perry and Associates and Henry Ahking from the Vancouver School Board as the applicant team for the Vancouver School Board project. Panel comment was sought on the connection to pedestrian spines and future building sites; how do the old and new relate as well as how does it relate to UBC context.

#### Summary of Panel Comments:

Panel felt that the proposal had improved a lot from the fundamental issues that were raised the first time this project came. The following comments were made:

#### Connection to pedestrian spines and future building sites

- opening up gym is a great idea and great for community
- like the alignment with future community centre
- is there an opportunity to open up at north side?
- like the flow through space and continuity makes more sense
- adding new addition helps remove industrial feel
- lose the random window panels as it doesn't work with the new addition
- need north canopy at entry
- connections to urban spaces need to be addressed as well as current elevations

#### Parking and fire lane access

- minimum intrusion for fire access is ideal
- parking lot will be difficult - plan for drop offs at all sides
- resolve parking issues and have drop offs on east and west sides

#### General comments

- open up/widen the entrance hall on north side
- using storm water at the north side as well as reducing berm makes sense
- look forward to seeing resolution of the architecture at the next stage

- grove of trees at corner should be retained
- courtyard not very inspiring explore ways to enhance the courtyard

### **3.4 Nexterra Biomass Project**

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Aaron Mogerman from UBC Project Services; Larry McFarland and Leung Chow, Larry McFarland Architects for the Biomass gasification project. Panel comment was sought on the design direction of the project before it comes back as an application.

#### **Summary of Panel Comments:**

Panel was very interested in this project and how the process worked. The following comments were made:

- questions were raised regarding noise and emissions management
- interesting project would like panels to do more; consider using them as the structure or other purposes
- challenge to take the form of CLT
- nice looking building – simple and clean
- really like how open it is and how it fits with the demonstration mandate

Campus and Community Planning advised that the project would need to meet GVRD emission control standards and make an application accordingly

### **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:50pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Monday December 14, 2009  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:30pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:**

Mark Thompson (chair)  
Brian Wakelin (late)  
Rhodri Windsor -Liscombe

**Members Absent:**

Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Catherine Berris

**Staff:**

Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:**

Marta Farevaag, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg Landscape Architects  
Dianna Colnett, Campus and Community Planning  
Alan Endall, Endall Elliott Architects  
Dianna Foldi, Project Services UBC  
Andrew Robertson and Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg  
Landscape Architects

---

### 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. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Policy

#### 2.1 Draft Vancouver Campus Plan and Design Guidelines

The VCP and Design Guidelines were presented and distributed at the October 7th AUDP meeting. The Panel is now asked to provide comments to the planning team: Dianna Colnett, Campus and Community Planning; Marta Farevaag, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg and Alan Endall, Endall Elliot.

## Panel Comments:

- the challenge will be how the residential character meets the historic and the hubs character
- make Main Mall a really interesting place to be – don't plant too many trees as a way of defining of the old campus
- it would be nice to have one map that illustrates the vision for the whole campus
- have a major building at the University Boulevard and Main Mall intersection – as in original plan
- open up the axis on campus - don't be afraid of open space
- don't keep closing up grander spaces and avenues
- avoid covering everything in greenery – it is about the architecture
- good to have a strong vision before the overlay of details
- the real challenge will be how to get from a great plan to implementation
- are there rules or tools given to a designer for implementing the guidelines
- submission requirements should be addressed and maybe moved to a different part of the Campus Plan ie Part II
- codification around 3D modelling for submissions will help everyone especially designers
- a project is not about building footprint, but rather the context that surrounds it. Needs to be an implicit to the designer to think outside the project to make connections to other projects
- stronger expression for the hubs is the right approach – concerned about residential areas
- building height maps are currently confusing – it would be better to refer to absolute height instead of storeys
- think about pedestrian weather protection – talk about where it is essential and where it's not needed; perhaps a map would be useful
- sustainability section is the most living portion and will likely change the most. Have a way in which it can change and be adaptable rather than having a specific standard
- don't worry about homogeneity for historical reasons we shouldn't be afraid of some change
- academic and sustainability needs should be paramount
- a good piece of architecture should be able to achieve both sustainable and aesthetic goals wonderful piece of work and will give Campus and Community Planning the tools and strength to make it happen
- wonderful piece of work and will give Campus and Community Planning the tools and strength to make it happen

## 3.0 Development Permits

### 3.1 Buchanan Courtyards – Streets and Landscape Permit 09026

A concept plan was presented to the Panel at its July 14th meeting. The applicant team has now submitted a Streets and Landscapes Permit. Panel comment and vote is sought on the design. Gerry McGeough introduced Andrew Robertson from Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Architects who described the project.



### **Panel Comments:**

- Terrific design
- the pavilion in the west courtyard would be more successful if its members were quite a bit thicker with a member at grade complete with shadow line more like the precedent photo on the same page. This would need of course a small ramp on one side, which could be accommodated.
- review the extent of the water in east courtyard to allow better access to the pavilion
- will be a very nice space and will survive over time
- simplification since the last design is very positive – concentration on specific elements a nice move particularly in east courtyard
- is there another planting type for the lawn berm in the east courtyard? Grass is not very sustainable
- design the stage for the two directions: both from courtyard and grassy knoll to the north

### **The Panel Resolved:**

Panel moves to support the Buchanan courtyards.

#### 3.2 University Boulevard gateway sign with LED

UBC seeks to construct a gateway sign with an LED component at the intersection of Wesbrook Mall and University Boulevard. The sign is to replace the current LED sign in time for the Olympics. Staff will present the proposal for Panel comment.

### **Panel Comments:**

- difficult to comment on the design without the context behind it
- explore masking the back of the LED system in a way that allows for ventilation
- does it need to be the scale that it is?
- if it is to become a monument on the corner it is important to know what it is made of needs further development
- demonstrate views from University Boulevard – what competes with it ie) trolley wires and surrounding buildings
- will need to see what it will look like at all four cardinal points
- needs refinement as a design
- hard to review in isolation of both wider policy context (gateways) and this sign element
- sympathetic to time pressures but hard to steward the task
- not opposed to sign or strong statement – panel is having difficulty to review given info provided
- it requires a lot more explanation in order to determine its validity
- explore the temporary cost over the real cost of this element

### 3.3 Earth Systems Science Building (ESSB) Update for information

At its October 1st meeting, the Panel voted in support of the Development Permit Application for the new ESSB. Staff are presenting for information an updated ground floor plan which achieves a better alignment with the Beaty Biodiversity Museum and the East West pedestrian corridor.

#### **Panel Comments:**

- alignments really positive
- gallery/museum feels tenuous though looking down into high base could be interesting
- losing activity at grade level on Main Mall is not a good idea

#### **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:45 pm.