



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2010

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:30pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Mark Thompson (chair)  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Brian Wakelin  
Rhodri Windsor –Liscombe

**Members Absent:**

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Doug Johnston and Kim Johnston, Johnston Davidson Architects  
David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Ron Loewen, Faculty of Applied Science UBC  
Larry McFarland and Leung Chow, McFarland Marceau Architects  
Aaron Mogerman, Project Services UBC  
Norm Hotson, Hotson Boniface Bakker Haden Architects  
Margot Long, PWL Partnership  
Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust  
Karen Marler and Aiden Callison, Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Shirley Blumberg, Kuwabara Payne McKenna Blumberg Architects  
Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Architects

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:06PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the December 3rd and December 14th, 2009 minutes

A motion to approve the December 3<sup>rd</sup> and December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Coal and Mineral Processing Laboratory Addition – Norman B. Keevil Institute of Mining (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough introduced David English who then introduced the design team: Doug Johnston and Kim Johnston from Johnston Davidson Architects and Bruce Hemstock from PWL Partnership. Margot Long abstained from comment due to a conflict. Panel comment is sought on the overall direction of the design in relation to the existing building as well as the response to grade changes and materiality.

##### Panel Comments:

##### Materiality

- rethinking materiality would be a good idea; the panel does not agree with zinc cladding as a contextual response and a stronger logic for use of zinc cladding and stronger position on materiality is required

##### Relation to existing building

- existing building is very uninviting and a difficult building to respond to
- the response is difficult to judge without a master plan - how does this building relate and is responding to the surrounding areas?

##### Design elements

- general positive commentary from panel regarding the big ideas
- big concern of how it will relate to the wider context
- consider where recycling is to go and how bike parking is handled
- good response – but looking forward to design development
- the program for the building is supported
- study spaces should be engaging and interesting
- the study spaces should come forward towards the exterior / entrance and the offices should recede

##### Entry way

- grade is a challenge - could be re-worked for next design panel
- appreciate announcing on West Mall but focus should be on actual entry
- bring strong idea of pedestrian access into building
- uncomfortable with vehicles crossing the plaza consult with pedestrian routes

#### 3.2 Bio-Energy Research and Demonstration Project – Development Permit Application DP10001

Gerry McGeough introduced Larry McFarland from McFarland Marceau Architects who gave a brief background on the proposal. Panel comment and vote is sought on the revised application specifically the urban design issues.

### **Panel Comments:**

- general support for the direction of the project and improvements from the previous presentation
- thoughtful response to panel comment
- the response respects the forest edge and mature trees
- simple design is the best approach for this area
- highly commendable design
- great project
- a more generous public domain would be a nice addition
- investigate insulation of the wall and ground area to protect the surrounding trees from the heat generated from the facility
- on its way to being an elegant shed

### **The Panel Resolved:**

Panel moves to support the project unanimously  
*Motion carried*

### **3.3 Totem Park Residence Infill Site – Development permit application DP09029**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project as well as Jas Sahota as the project manager for the project who then introduced the applicant team and user group: Norm Hotson, Sarah Bjornson and Don Chow, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architecture; Margot Long, PWL Partnership; Dan Roberts, Sustainability; Andrew Parr, UBC Housing and Conferences

Panel comment was sought on exterior architectural expression, the proposed courtyards, and the overall urban design

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### General

- excellent response to program; well worked out scheme and well integrated with context;
- confident proposal
- privacy zones are a nice touch
- treatment along West Mall is supported
- maximize opportunity for outdoor learning
- maximize integration of existing buildings
- a successful counter point to old buildings

##### Palette

- palette is supported
- investigate creating some warmth in the curtain wall
- explore a richer, more naturalistic response to the spandrel panels

##### Architectural Expression

- playfulness that is talked about is not reflected in the material presented; could benefit from some playfulness in the design; the panel finds it to be a bit sturdy and design

would benefit from more liveliness; more hospitable, less institutional; the more residential feel

- missing overlay of contemporary building aspirations – strategies include seeking opportunity for thin walls
- interior courtyard facing facades could have a more contemporary feel
- different treatment per elevations would add vocabulary to the contemporary design
- end elevation could be rethought – consider broadening the stairwell ends by 2 ft and creating lounges
- good detailing with exception of corner expression; the panel understands why corner element is different, but could still retain the same elements as the rest of the building
- penthouse / 7<sup>th</sup> floor not all the way there; treatment of the top of building could be more penthouse-like by removing some of the brick; an expression parapet would help it read elegantly; end elevation where there is a blank wall does not reinforce the penthouse
- use of brick piers and curtain wall should not continue where landings
- lounges should have overhangs / covered outside space
- a stack of balconies would break up monotony of the buildings

#### Landscape

- pavilions could also benefit from some playfulness into the design
- landscape is beautifully done; in favour of keeping landscape proposal as is

#### Other

- maximise the views from the penthouse and create an outdoor spaces
- direct connection from commons building lounge to main courtyard is essential

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

Panel moves to support design with integration of design panel commentary to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

*Motion Carried*

### **3.4 University Boulevard Design Guidelines**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and a brief background.

#### **Panel Comments:**

- the overall idea is strong
- porch/arcade will be well used
- accentuating the green 'u' is an interesting touch
- Brock Hall alignment is logical
- unsure of the location of the Alumni Centre - alumni mass on the commons should be brought in closer to the AMS mass - explore changing the massing of the alumni centre
- look at adding more height for the Alumni Centre
- powerful proposal – public realm is what knits the spaces together
- covered walkways to the bus loop would enhance connectivity
- bus loop location will have a big impact on the square and the team should be anticipating where it should be and how that would change the dynamics of the Square.

Start suggesting where you would like to see the bus loop to inform the rest of the planning of the Square

### **3.5 University Boulevard Gateway Sign with LED**

Staff presented this item at the December 14<sup>th</sup> AUDP meeting for panel comment. The proponents have come back with a revised proposal and are seeking a vote.

#### **Panel Comments:**

- make sure that the lighting doesn't impact current and future residents
- recommend that future signage coming onto campus work with this sign – should be part of a network of related gateway structure
- the large surface of metal is overpowering
- support the simplicity and cleanliness
- an improvement of what is already there
- relates well to neighbouring GSAB

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

Panel moves to support the project with panel commentary

### **4.0 Other Business**

Gerry McGeough introduced Margot Long as the newest member of the Panel. She will be filling the landscape architect position recently vacated by Catherine Berris. It was also noted that this was Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe's last meeting. Gerry thanked him for his insightful comments over his many years of service to the AUDP and noted that he will be greatly missed.

### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:56PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

**DRAFT**

Last Updated:  
February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, February 4, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8:00pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Mark Thompson (chair)  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Norm Couttie

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Andre Perrotte and Gilles Saucier, Saucier and Perrotte Architects;  
Roger Hughes and Bill Uhrich, Hughes Condon Marler Architects;  
Nick Maile, UBC Properties Trust  
Ron Hoffart, Graham Hoffart Mathiasen Architects;  
Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates Landscape Architects  
Doug Johnston and Kim Johnston, Johnston Davidson Architects  
David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Ron Loewen, Faculty of Applied Science UBC

---

### 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 the January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the January 14<sup>th</sup>, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

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

- Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team: Nick Maile from UBC Properties Trust; Gilles Saucier and Andre Perrotte, Saucier and Perrotte Architects; Roger Hughes and Bill Uhrich, Hughes Condon Marler Architects and Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates Landscape Architects. Panel comment was sought on the ground plane functionality and informal learning spaces, tying into the UBC campus context, landscape concept plan and gateway prominence. UBCPT clarified that the project includes all the landscape work as illustrated on the plan, with the exception of the green wall which will only be included if funding is available.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General

- general strong support for a rigorous, well researched project
- very strong addition to campus in this location, magnificent, beautifully articulated piece of architecture
- incredibly innovative
- responded well to comments and issues addressed at preliminary presentation

##### Materiality

- the project is taking the campus and pushing it forward
- building has a very strong interior, internally derived idea of itself and it's making it's way outside in a very confident and rigorous way
- no reservations with contextualism and materiality
- moving away from grey glass is supported
- white element through the glass is intriguing, it will be interesting to see how that works once the building is complete

##### Gateway nature

- Wesbrook alignment is really important, therefore push the building forward of the parkade to reinforce the gateway nature of this project

##### Ground plane and social learning space

- think of the building as a setting for ritual and not sculpture
- transparency is achieved at upper levels, but at pedestrian level doesn't appear to have same transparency – more sombre and dark
- more informal learning space on the ground level is extremely important; students will use the space in a way that works for them not necessarily in the way that is reflected in the model
- flow through building works really well but there is something odd about the atrium not connecting to the public plaza – explore moving cafe and the major space to front the plaza by switching the location of the large and small lecture theatres
- metaphor of tree is an interesting starting point; but circulation could be a problem for those unfamiliar with the building
- good moves on the programming inside and out, continue to progress it further



- too much reliance on elevators; explore reducing the amount of elevators and increasing stairs to be more sustainable

#### Landscape

- explore how the user group will use the exterior space; seating in the landscape will need to be addressed as the design moves forward; focus on inclusion of life sciences across the way for the landscape
- currently lacking sustainability in the design and need to think about it now and not at a later date; the large plaza is a good opportunity to manage storm water
- history of medicine and pharmacology not seen in landscape and is a missed opportunity; more balance of west coast plant ecology overlaid with the pharmaceutical program of the project
- notion of the exposed roots has a positive connotation in tropical climates, but in BC it is seen as an unhealthy tree, lacking soil
- more thought is needed at the technical level to get the smaller green element to survive and not have the utility of the plaza compromised
- try and relocate the trees, that are to be removed to other areas on the site or campus
- plant really significant trees to reinforce the forest metaphor
- if green wall not part of project, then it would be wise to rethink the whole landscape concept with regards to the idea of forest. This metaphor does not work in quite the same way with a parkade looming behind it.

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

Panel moves to support the project subject to the applicant addressing the issues identified to the satisfaction of C&CP.

*Motion carried*

### **3.2 Vancouver School Board**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and as well as the applicant Ron Hoffart, who introduced is design team. Panel comment was sought on the proposed architectural treatments, north entryway as well as the landscape.

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### General

- appreciate efforts made since first presentation
- planning well resolved linking to the outside context
- adaptive reuse is commendable
- the outdoor rooms are supported
- 100 bike stalls doesn't seem adequate in a UBC school context
- south wall of the gym needs to open to community to reinforce the openness and linkage

##### Architectural treatments

- the white cladding of the existing building is unfortunate - take the existing NRC building as the white monster that it is and accept that you are making an addition; the new addition should be considered a second building instead of the stealth approach of making it a bigger version of itself. This will also help inform colour palette choices

- the colours yellow and red are too primary and not reflective of a high school population – explore a softer, muted, more residential palette; more colour or less colour
- red entry colour accentuates the slick corporate look which is at odds with the steps taken to avoid this image
- generally the canopies as an idea are a good addition; but they should connect to a larger idea and engage in larger systems; for example: rain collectors, rain storm strategy, sun shelter strategies. This could become a strategy across the whole building to depower the corporate image
- architectural treatment – become more of an educational character in addition to the industrial character that it already possesses is required
- consider giving the other parts such as the canopies, granite pillars a larger role
- existing building was trying to hide itself
- the proponent is encouraging to explore further ways to open it up

#### North entryway

- appreciate north entry has confines and is programmatically driven; but larger connection or throat would allow it to have greater context
- northern entry needs a bigger exterior gesture

#### Landscape

- amount of flat roof is unfortunate for residents looking down – consider a green roof on the new addition or designing the structure to accept a green roof in the future
- protection of tree grove is supported

### Summary

The planning is well resolved, including a very strong internal plan. The adaptive reuse is well handled and laudable. The landscape is well received. The applicant should work with staff to resolve the architectural treatment of the building exterior giving particular regard to the colour.

#### The Panel Resolved:

Panel moves to support the project subject to the applicant addressing the issues identified to the satisfaction of C&CP giving particular attention to colour.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.3 Wayne and William White Centre for Engineering Design (landscape update)

Gerry McGeough stated that in order to keep the meeting on time, the Panel will be forwarded the landscape plans electronically for information.

### 3.4 Coal and Mineral Processing Laboratory Addition – Norman B. Keevil Institute of Mining (Application)

Gerry McGeough introduced David English who then introduced the design team: Doug Johnston and Kim Johnston from Johnston Davidson Architects and Bruce Hemstock from PWL

Partnership. Margot Long abstained from comment due to a conflict. Panel comment was sought on the issues of the proposed zinc cladding, entrance stairs and the landscape.

### **Panel Comments:**

#### General

- support for building and planning
- supports the open space; C&CP should plan a pedestrian mews system and no buildings should encroach on it
- naming the mews would reinforce this notion
- 3 punched windows at base should be slot windows to be more integrated with the other fenestration
- reinforcement of main pedestrian connection is encouraged and explore greater incorporating the wall will help reinforce it
- a site planning drawing to accompany the application to ensure that master plan ideas are not lost and continuity is maintained

#### Materiality

- building is too small to carry the zinc diamond pattern
- appreciate the rationale for zinc, but still agree with staff that its application on campus is for greater statement buildings or as an accent element; if zinc is essential, pursue other colours and patterns in zinc

#### Entryway

- new entry idea is strongly supported; entry stair has improved greatly from first iteration
- for accessibility, extend the pathway to the plaza

#### Study spaces

- ensure that the building is maximising the potential for faculty and grad students, and we defer to the facility on what works best

### **The Panel Resolved:**

Panel moves to support the project subject to the applicant addressing the issues identified to the satisfaction of C&CP

*Motion carried*

## **4.0 Other Business**

Gerry McGeough introduced Maged Senbel as the newest member of the Panel. He will be filling the Faculty and Staff position recently vacated by Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe.

## **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:50PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

**DRAFT**

Last Updated:  
May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, May 13, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8:00pm  
**Venue:** TEF III 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Norm Couttie(chair)  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Brian Wakelin  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Lisa Castle  
Mark Thompson

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Steve Forrest, Adera;  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects;  
Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architect  
Cynthia Melosky, Polygon;  
James Hancock and Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Group;  
Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative  
Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust;  
Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects;  
Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates  
Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust;  
Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill and Associates;  
Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:11PM. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 South Campus Lot 30

Norm Couttie stepped down because of a conflict. Brian Wakelin chaired this item. Gerry McGeough noted that this item is coming to the Panel as a Development Permit because the applicant team has previously presented two projects on adjacent development sites to the AUDP and has a good understanding of issues in the vicinity of the project site. He then introduced Steve Forrest from Adera who then introduced Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects; and Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Landscape Architect as the applicant team.

Panel comment is sought on the following items: the request for relaxation with respect to height, side yard variances and site coverage; simplifying the material palette and landscape

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### Architecture

- general consensus that the project is quite handsome and nicely done
- explore changing the brick colour to add some variance to the neighbourhood
- concrete retaining wall – should be brick or more textural from a pedestrian view, if necessary remove brick off building and put it at ground level
- would have liked to see differentiation between main street facade and rest of the building
- looking at proposals in context of the past projects, they look very similar. This is nearing the build-out of the Wesbrook neighbourhood. Could be too institutional given the very similar qualities with respect to palette materials. (*comment submitted by a non-attending Panel member*)

##### Requests for Relaxation

- support for the requested relaxations

##### Landscape

- landscape is well done
- really like the liveability of the large terraces and roof decks – great additions and
- entry really well done
- appreciate glimpse of interior green space
- not a lot of usability in the courtyard; explore adding more uses and enhance the liveability and usability of landscape in courtyard areas
- not a lot of native plants on the list; explore the addition of more native plant materials from sustainable standpoint
- maintenance an issue for the water feature

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

Panel moves to support the project subject to the applicant addressing the issues identified to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

*Motion carried*

### 3.2 Lot 1

Gerry McGeough introduced Cynthia Melosky from Polygon who then introduced the project team: James Hancock and Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Group; and Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative. Panel comment is sought on the following: appropriate materiality given its location in the forest district, landscape, and soften the ground level

#### Panel Comments:

##### General Panel Comments

- the Panel was unanimous in requesting the applicant study locating some building mass and activity along Wesbrook due to the high volume of pedestrians that would take this route. This would then connect the residential areas to the north and south of the site ,, animate and provide over look in this dead zone of Wesbrook created by the park and the parkade on the west side of Wesbrook. Bringing 2-3 storeys forward might solve this.
- The Panel acknowledged that there is a lack of current urban planning guidelines for this area, as compared to most residential enclaves on campus.
- concern was raised whether the white concrete is the appropriate choice for the building cladding given that the residential neighbourhood has a more earth tone palette

##### Additional Comments

- quite handsome – just not in the right siting
- quite like the simplicity of building and landscape
- need to relate the development more to the neighbourhood and the surrounding context
- south lawn could be more park like instead of lawn like
- tower seems rather abrupt – might it be better to sit lightly off the ground, or have a transition device
- top needs a little more interest
- the planning decision to bring the forest to Wesbrook is not appropriate – makes it inhospitable. University should consider developing greenway with street frontage etc. but realize that can't be addressed here

### 3.3 Lot 22

Gerry McGeough introduced the Michelle Paquet from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects and Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates as the applicant team.

##### General Panel Comments

- the Panel supported the concept of deleting the underground parkade if the building is changed to a rental building. However, cautioned that there would have to be a stronger representation of other alternatives with respect to transportation and storage if there is to be no parking.
- the Panel, with the exception of one member, was in favour of fewer balconies however advised the proponents to address lifestyle impacts of this such as providing larger storage rooms, a communal bbq etc...

##### Individual Panel Comments

- quite like the building, great project

- very generous unit sizes
- the options are really positive (choosing from ground level and corner units)
- need to see ground floor treatment in next iteration
- explore different materials on the street edge
- have a connection to the park through landscape plan
- could use more density near the park but realize that can't be addressed here
- strong symmetry is setting up a bit of a challenge for adjacent site and park.
- make landscape more organic in relation to adjacent park
- provide direct ground floor access from units fronting the park
- would like to see playfulness in the masonry in next iteration
- smart solar treatment

### 3.4 Lot 28

Gerry McGeough introduced Michelle Paquet from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects and Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates

#### Common Panel Comments

- the Panel was unanimous in its call for a flat roof – if it cost more (which differs from some of the Panel's experience) consider reducing the amount of brick to offset the cost. Other roof comments included:
  - Pitched roof a problem. The proportions aren't good and don't contribute positively to the area
  - Stronger rationale for roof in this location for next time
  - Roof appears top heavy and bulky – seems out of context with what's there and doesn't fit with rest of building
  - show the downspouts – will affect the look of the roof option
- several members recommended that the westerly portion of the building B massing that fronts the central courtyard would be better located on Birney Road so it meets the urban design role of framing and animating the street. This would also create a larger interior courtyard. Another thought would be to combine 3 green spaces into one large one.

#### Individual Panel Comments

- liveability is great
- floor layouts work
- wide windows nice touch to accommodate lack of balcony
- long building might be the answer
- consider having a different character for each building
- create more enclosure in block
- very high retaining walls – pull building back now in anticipation
- respond to the lack of green street. Find a connection to closest green street
- makes more sense to step up to a courtyard – would like more rationale behind proposed design
- central courtyard sets up a strong urban design gesture but does not lead anywhere. Will need to be followed up – has potential to be the green street currently missing. Need to see how it will relate to lots 27 and 29

#### **4.0 Other Business**

AUDP summer tour was suggested for July or August. It was received quite well but it was decided that a tour in September would be easier in order to accommodate everyone's schedules

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:30PM.



# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

**DRAFT**

Last Updated:  
August 13, 2010

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, August 5, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8:00pm  
**Venue:** BC Gas Room, Koerner Library

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Mark Thompson

**Members Absent:** Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Brian Wakelin

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects  
Peter Turje, Communities and Architecture Inc

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:32 PM. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the July 8, 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the July 8, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Public Realm Plan – Pathways: Agricultural and Memorial Roads

Gerry McGeough introduced Dean Gregory who presented the planning history and design principles and conceptual ideas for revitalizing Library Commons. Karen Kiest then presented pre-application schematic designs for Agricultural and Memorial Roads.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General Panel Comments (background):

- Public realm has been forgotten for so long – stay away from architectural and structural elements which will eat away at your budget.

- Strengthening the formality of this quadrangle is important. The redesign should find a way to respect that integrity.
- Need to address the zero activity edges which make courtyards dead zones.
- Sculpture garden would be one solution but still might not be enough animation.
- This space is not currently regarded as a people space.
- Topography is major challenge.
- The option of meeting grades at the lower commons plaza is the option that will meet the budgetary constraints more readily.
- Treating the lower commons plaza more like a light well could be effective.
- The landscape design has to be really strong in itself because there are no strong edges to help define it.
- How does Main Mall inform the space and where does Main Mall fit in the whole context?
- Southern Japanese garden is a gem on campus that you just happen upon. A lesson to be learned here is the sense of being able to combine the sense of activity with spaces of quiet reflection and learning. This space should be retained as the experience and not so much the heritage value behind it.
- From a sustainability standpoint it makes more sense to maintain instead of starting fresh – will help to send a campus wide message that landscape is important.
- It will be very difficult to function as one space given the multitude of design moves currently made.
- Acknowledge the urban design move with Sedgewick as the edge of the space and not Koerner; spend the \$2 M from Main Mall to Barber. It will be very difficult with the grade change and amount of work needed to connect from Koerner to Barber.
- Enhancing the crosspaths through the courtyard will enhance the usability of the courtyard. If there is a way to do this without fiddling too much with the grade change.
- Make use of the Ladner clock tower as an important monument.

#### **General Panel comments (Agricultural Road and Memorial Road)**

- Lots of pedestrian traffic in these areas – anything that can introduce more green and less asphalt is supported.
- Connecting the Long House to the bosque in the Commons is a positive move.
- Ensure that connections to East Mall and Main Mall are strengthened.
- Treatments made for pedestrians are supported.
- Scope is appropriate for this location and is not overly ambitious.
- Responding to movement as we currently observe it is the correct strategy.
- A major aspect of this area is how it connects to Main Mall and currently this remains unresolved – should be the next area of focus.
- At a conceptual level the moves initially work with the Campus Plan. Breaking down the pavement is supported. We don't want to set a precedent that is not achievable. A mock up would be helpful.
- Like the idea of taking the storm water into the landscape, but storm water management currently is not resolved.
- Benches built into the landscape is suggested.
- Having the ramp (at the LSK building) at less than 5% is more inviting.
- Cherry trees are not a strong tree from an urban design perspective.
- Retaining significant trees is preferred from a sustainability standpoint; maybe it becomes a transitional thing - catalpas stay – infill with cherries over time.

- There is a symbolic message to be aware of with the removal of the catalpa trees - we memorialize the healthy trees that we just took down, this could be an area where we can show leadership and stewardship.
- This is an opportunity to give direction to future plans for the rest of the area.

**Chair Summary:**

- These projects are more important than the scope defines.
- Importance of this project cannot be overstated. This is the precedent that we're going to set – getting to the details is important as this is how we will implement it for the next 15 years.
- Start reflecting the importance in the scope. Need to build that section of Main Mall at the same time as it will link both segments of Agricultural Road together.
- Need to zoom out in order to get the details correct.
- Paving choice is really important because it has big budget implications with the Public Realm Plan and Main Mall. Need to figure out what will be on Main Mall before figuring out what will be the secondary material.

**3.2 UBC Childcare – University Services Building**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Peter Turje, the project architect.

**General Panel Comments:**

- This is very positive as there is such a desperate need for childcare services on this campus.
- Great improvement on a fairly dead corner. The canopy and the landscaping are supported. Ensure that the children feel that it is a safe haven considering the area it is locating in
- Design is neat and playful
- Resolution of the details will improve the project further.
- Putting children behind a chain link fence is strongly not supported.
- Chain link fence is not appropriate on west mall.
- Use of the space in this location is quite ingenious.
- Suggest incorporating rainwater somehow so that the children have the opportunity to use it.
- Some kind of bicycle storage facility is essential for this area.

**4.0 Other Business**

**5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:45PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, September 9, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8:00pm  
**Venue:** Gardenia Room, Campus and Community Planning

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Maged Senbel  
Mark Thompson

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Karen Marler and Kurt MacLaren; Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects  
David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Mark Mawhinney, UBC Alumni Affairs  
Joost Bakker and Bruce Haden; HBBH Architects

---

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

Following a site visit of Main Mall paving sample, the chair called the meeting to order at 4:49 PM. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the August 12, 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the August 12, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Public Realm Plan – paving pattern for Main Mall/U Boulevard and Agricultural and Memorial Roads

Gerry McGeough introduced Chris Phillips who presented the four paving pattern samples that varied in patterns and frequency of darker grey 'speckle' pavers.

#### Panel Comments:

The Panel had the following sample preferences:

- The more random paver pattern (southern sample)

- Medium frequency (density) of dark pavers (i.e. mid-range between the centre and south samples)

Other panel comments included:

- Emphasize the hierarchy of the route. Main Mall should be at the top of the hierarchy and continuous; Agricultural Road should not go through – rather it should abut and stop at Main Mall. Consider notching its width where it contacts Main Mall.
- Locate seating, lighting and other infrastructure outside of Main Mall paving path (preferably in a single strip or alignment). Perhaps allow seating, etc within paving path of secondary pathways.
- Details need to be carefully thought out. Where secondary paths cross Main Mall on an angle, cutting pavers on an angle is problematic. Take care in devising a well thought out detail. Pursue other options such as just treating with uncut dark pavers and living with a jagged edge.

### 3.2 UBC Alumni Centre (Pre-application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David English from UBC Properties Trust who then introduced Karen Marler, and Chris Phillips, the project architect and landscape architect and Mark Mawhinney, UBC Alumni Affairs. Staff sought the Panel's general comment along with issues of 3rd floor projection into the University Blvd alignment as well as the design expression.

#### Panel Comments:

##### Material Palette

- Material palette, including the mirror frit, is an interesting one and would be a welcome addition to campus
- The lightness and transparency on the ground floor is good
- Not sure of the mirrored concept – too much of a downtown feel for this social heart of the campus
- Cloud image is very powerful and mirrored glass not necessarily the best choice - white frit would fit better into the campus.

##### Building Alignment and Concept

- Lovely building that fits well into the location (from an aesthetic point of view) and nice addition to the square
- Very nice end to the Square
- One panel member felt the siting should be reconsidered and moved to the other side of University Commons, closer to the North Parkade and the Student Union Boulevard major drop-off
- Like the massing and two storey projection into University Boulevard, anything to help the scale.
- Supports the proposed alignment of the building with Brock Hall and the playful misalignment of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is good. Pull back the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor – it should line up with rest of University Boulevard. This would also help express the importance of the second floor celebration space.
- The mis-proportioned corner creates interest and is a good addition
- Like the cloud idea but it could be more deeply imbedded into the project and would help in the presence of the building
- Like the concept for the building because it stands on its own and makes its own space

- Beacon idea is a big commitment and needs to be carefully thought through particularly at night and with events that may want privacy.
- Need to ensure that the building doesn't encroach too much into the crescent idea and that the programming works with the beacon concept and not against it. Explore setting back the top floor on the west facade to soften its intrusion into the crescent.
- Bridging to AMS would make the building more interesting and make for more compatible massing and visible connection.

#### Drop-off courts

- Clarity and legibility of vehicular circulation would be a higher priority than the convenience of a secondary drop-off loop on University Boulevard.
- Second drop-off not supportable – should try to pull the entrance back 90 degrees to the north-south wall and get people to be dropped off at the main drop-off plaza.
- Real issue is the drop-off and needs to be clear. If you introduce a second drop-off to the south, it changes the whole building and will be a difficult issue to resolve.
- Elm tree too tight on the site and next to the building. Doesn't help that corner of the building. The building should work more around and together with the elm. Particular care should be taken to protect the roots.
- Challenge will be making the drop-off plaza into a European plaza that doesn't look like a parking lot loading bay, but rather the front door of the Student Union Building and Alumni Centre.

## 4.0 Other Business

### 4.1 AUDP Campus Tour (discussion)

A date was set for the Campus tour. It will be held prior to the start of the October 7<sup>th</sup> AUDP meeting. The meeting will start at 3:30pm to accommodate this.

## 5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 5:45PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 7, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8:00pm  
**Venue:** Gardenia Room, Campus and Community Planning

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:**

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor, Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Peter Nelson, Karen Kiest 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 4:43 PM, after completion of a Campus Tour. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the September 9, 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the September 9, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Public Realm Plan – Pathways: Agricultural and Memorial Roads

Gerry McGeough introduced Dean Gregory who presented the planning history and design principles and conceptual ideas for revitalizing Library Commons. Peter Nelson then presented schematic designs for Agricultural Road.

#### Panel Comments:

The Panel was unanimous in its desire to see how the project would relate to the greater context of the campus. They agreed that since this is the first project that it would set a precedent for the rest of campus and therefore had to be done right. Specific comments included:

#### Precedent Project:

- need to set the right precedent. Would be nice to see the details
- needs work – feels a few steps away from being a complete cohesive plan
- no strength to it – not sure that the design is fully formed yet and ready
- not sure how all the pieces fit together
- too custom designed to suit adjacent site conditions
- if this is to be a precedent, then we need a larger scale diagram of what this will be a precedent for ie) is this the same for Memorial road so we understand what the treatments will be for each intersection

#### Main Mall Hierarchy

- Main Mall needs to take precedence
- exactly how will we transition these east west streets to Main Mall.
- Doesn't seem to defer to the stature that is Main Mall. Currently a subtle switch and the hierarchy not at all clear
- need to have more of an intensity of transition at Main Mall

#### Consistency

- overall big picture is there but need the overall resolution of the minor details to show that the details have been completely thought out – a few scales need deeper analysis
- have a system that deals with the entrances to buildings; have a structure that is used consistently
- would like to see a consistent landscape treatment
- does it continue to Lower Mall because that's a different animal?
- having more constraints is something UBC needs and could benefit from
- create some sort of step and make it consistent across campus

#### Chair Summary:

- The design should be strong on its own – right now the scheme is reacting to what's happening along the pathway and beside it
- There is a need for an overall vision for the Road
- There should be a framework that deals with the connections and site furnishings so that the bulk of it has a familiarity to it
- more constraints will free you up to make a better project
- this will be a precedent so make it right. whatever you do here will still inform elsewhere
- get the big picture to work and then look at the detailing
- establish precedents for each district (forest edge, campus core)
- put trees all along and try and get some bigger landscape elements to enhance the pathway

#### The Panel resolved:

Panel voted to see the project again at the next meeting



#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:45PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 7, 2010  
**Time:** 4:30 pm-7 30 pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Richard Henriquez

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough, University Architect  
Dean Gregory, Landscape Architect  
Nena Vukojevic, Urban Design Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Dave English: UBC Properties Trust  
Joost Bakker, Jennifer Cutbill & Bruce Haden: Dialog Architects  
Chris Phillips & Nicole Taddune: Phillips, Farevaag Smallemberg  
Landscape Architects  
Karen Marler & Kurt McLaren: Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Shirley Blumberg & Andrew Dyke: Kuwabara Payne Mc Kenna Blumberg  
Architects

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:43 PM. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the October 7 , 2010 minutes

A motion to approve the October 7, 2010 minutes was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### Student Union Building (Pre-application)

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and sought comment on five Design Guideline issues along with general comment on the proposal. The design team including Dave English, Joost Bakker, Jennifer Cutbill & Bruce Haden then presented their proposal.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General concept

- Very challenging and playful project and exciting client to work with; the dynamics reflect this.
- Turn the programming off and provide a bigger organizing device about the circulation; i.e. a strong generative vertical circulation idea instead of assembly of programmatic spaces; north-south axis to provide connection to the existing SUB; bring rigor to circulation.
- Commendable aspiration in keeping the bulk of the building down but concerned about the squishing the project down which triggers the north/south axis misalignment. The scale of the building is not a concern. For example the long continuous west frontage is comparable to the east side of I.K Barber Library. Being pretty flat, you are on the right track to mitigate it in plan and section. You could go to multi-storeys like Seattle Public Library and stitch it all through physically visually and spatially.
- There is a tension between the outdoor space and bringing the traffic indoors; the concept has people moving inside as oppose to having people stay outdoors.
- Exciting building, architects scheme is very dynamic and rich. Like the idea of embracing the natural light.
- You have a baker's dozen; need to narrow down to one or two key ideas to bring clarity.
- West edge seems long and tenuous. Looks like a no man's land.
- Next submission to the Panel you need to show in clear graphics of how the design fits into Design Guidelines objectives.

##### Building aspects

- There is a lot programmed space but not enough social space and not enough clarity of where it is all located. Provide more informal social spaces where students can kick back.
- Need more respectful eastern edge; i.e. the misalignment with the existing SUB corridor needs to be more thought through.
- Transform club spaces to be terraced, connective.
- Never use the word 'roof'; the roof should be connected and totally programmed like Le Corbusier's roofscapes. The roofscape is a project. Explore connecting to the existing SUB roof terrace.
- Lower floor is reminiscence of the old SUB with the long corridor and the rooms on both sides; bring the excitement down into this level.
- How does the transparency of materials play in achieving LEED Platinum; bridge elements on the west facade can be treated as double-facades with circulation between, as an environmental response.
- The outdoor covered space needs more riggor. It should be differential to the knoll, yet a part of the knoll; sunny enough and a part of what is happening with Alumni Centre. A

shadow and sectional studies and needed. The issue of aligning with the courtyard can be done through architectural elements which can pick up on some of the linear geometry.

- There are some uneasy relationships that need resolution: the cantilevered bookable rooms eclipse and dwarfs the Alumni Centre; uneasy relationship with the Aquatic Centre.

#### Knoll

- The Knoll is a passive player and missed opportunity. Find ways to make it a more dynamic element. Carve into it symbolically or functionally; integrate it ecologically; make it a more lifelike, dynamic piece and part of the landscape, something visionary, a leap forward versus a hard division between architecture and landscape. Resolving the Knoll can help resolve issues around circulation, e.g. seeing it as dynamic piece.
- Use the knoll as a potential organizing device by transforming it to have more urban qualities, such as steps. Not necessary to treat it as sacred, but it provides a point of departure. As presented the knoll still feels like an obstacle; it needs to engage more.
- Resolve relationship between the knoll, the Pit Pub and the upper levels.

#### Chair Summary:

- If you are using the building as city metaphor and if it is a great city, it needs a Champs Elise. Maybe it is a circulation or a knoll; it is that one thing that makes it a great city, instead of collection of the buildings
- The team has listened to many voices, what is needed now is to listen to their own and to distil it.
- This Panel needs to see how this project knits into to the larger context in five years from now and also where the project boundary lines are.

### 3.1 University Boulevard Drop-off Court (pre application)

Gerry McGeough provided the project background including the drop-off courts integral relationship the Alumni Centre and new SUB. David English, Nicole Taddune and Chris Phillips presented design options.

#### Panel Comments:

##### Concept and legibility

- The big plan needs to be legible. Think about providing a different identity to each of the plazas e.g. formal versus less formal. It can be achieved through different paving pattern e.g. U. Blvd and East Mall with one kind of paving and plazas being different. Maybe this plaza should contrast with an ecological theme for University Square.
- Highlight in the landscaping the arrival plaza as the grand access place: provide clearer hierarchy of arrival points for legibility and wayfinding, show that event entry is a pedestrian zone and arrival plaza is a vehicular zone. Paving being the same throughout gives the appearance of spaces bleeding into each other.
- Need to see intermediate scaled drawings to better understand the design.
- Keep a strong working relationship with the SUB.

##### Technical performance

- Support the use of an elevator to provide service access from the courtyard to the basement with the understanding that dangerous chemicals safety needs to be addressed. Explore alternative ways of bringing the chlorine to the Aquatic Centre such as piping it or diluting its concentration. Ramp going down from the courtyard is a non-starter and all the buildings should work to avoiding this.
- Undertake comprehensive analysis of how this space will serve the different uses: day-to-day, large events drop-off, food staging, etc.
- How will the plaza be lite?
- Think about how to bring in a semi truck, if necessary, for a servicing a large outdoor concert in University Square.
- Address and demonstrate storm water management in a sustainability way.
- Like the expression of the elm tree being saved, but be thoughtful about the technical details such as its irrigation.
- Explore how to deal with potential pavers failing due to heavy vehicles turning.

### 3.2 Alumni Centre (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and the applicant team: Dave English, Karen Marler, Kurt McLaren, Shirley Blumberg and Andrew Dyke, who in turn introduced the project design. The Panel was asked to review, comment and a vote on the proposal.

#### Panel Comments:

##### Building concept

- The building design is a fascinating blend of strength and grace. It resolves a very important intersection on campus and provides a positive edge to University Square. Speaks of independence rather than interdependence and it hold its own against the new SUB building. Team has responded well to past AUDP comments; the white brick and frit helps.
- Build in the storytelling layer such as recognizing alumni recognition into the corridors, circulation and 'living room' space. Looking for layers of occupation, it should show occupational history of day-to-day campus.
- The building is handsome but has some aloofness about engaging with the students, which is fine to certain extent. There is a bit of turning its back to the SUB. Who is it welcoming for? Suggest providing a physical connection at the conference level with the SUB building to maximize opportunities for larger conferences.
- The majority of the members felt the proposed third floor projection into University Boulevard is strong and it gives the building more presence. Since it is at the ground floor that pedestrians will experience the University Boulevard alignment, the applicants should pursue setting the ground floor south facade parallel to the University Boulevard alignment.
- The roof should be green as part of the storytelling, the big picture and the environment as this building sits in the middle of the public realm.

##### Design development

- Extending the rain protection along the south facade is important.
- Carrying the masonry skin inside is important for the inside/outside continuity of materials and the 'cloud' concept.

- The ground floor on the south-west corner is understated and not as dynamic as it should be.
- The curtain wall and the canopy support define the building and therefore their appearance needs careful resolution. The exterior should be simple and clean, 'God is in the details'.
- Less frit on the elm tree side of the building will allow a view to the wood clad staircase and bring warmth to the building.

#### Public Realm

- The animating ground floor piece should front University Boulevard. Ground floor corner with business center is uneventful for this prime location. It should be more porous and animated along University Boulevard. Pursue opening the library to the south to help animate University Boulevard.
- Unfortunate sequencing of the two very important campus buildings and public realm, resulting in a lack of resolution at the ground plane. Make sure we get alignment of the schedules to get the wholeness.
- Building should be cut back on the lower level to give more room to the canopy of the Elm tree.
- Public realm in and around this projects need to be resolved.

#### Chair Summary:

- Strong support for building in general; elegant and very appropriate.
- Support for third floor massing following the lower floors massing, extending the rain protection to the west.
- Bridging to the AMS is important.
- More externalized expression of sustainability, especially the green roof to signify that the building is located in the middle of the public realm.
- Exterior masonry to be carried though to the inside.
- This is one of the most important buildings sites and it needs to be resolved in detail in all aspects, as it becomes the model building.

#### The Panel resolved:

The Panel voted to support the project, subject to the applicant returning with the landscape and public realm design to the satisfaction of the Panel and the curtain wall and other detailing being resolved to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

#### 4.0 Other Business

#### 5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 7 :30 PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, December 2, 2010  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:45pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Lisa Castle

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Nena Vukojevic - Architectural Planning Assistant  
Sarah Joyce- Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Chris Phillips and Nicole Tadune, Phillips, Farevaag Smallemberg  
Landscape Architects  
Joost Bakker, Bruce Haden and Jennifer Cutbill, Dialog Architects  
Douglas Birkenshaw, BH Associated Architects  
Margot Long, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects  
Bryce Rositch and Smiljka Stankovic, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Dr. David Hardwick, UBC Faculty of Medicine  
Jonathan Losee , Jonathan Losee Landscape Architect Ltd.

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4.05pm  
A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the November 16<sup>th</sup> minutes

A motion for approval of the November 16th minutes was made by the Chair.  
*Motion Carried*

### **3.0 Development Permit Applications:**

#### **3.1 University Commons (Pre-application)**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and sought comment on two options proposed along with general comments on design. The team including Dave English, Chris Phillips, and Margot Long presented the design.

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### Layout, Grading and the Framing of the Square

- Critical to enter the SUB at grade as opposed to ascending to the building and a move to bring the square up to the elevation of East Mall is sound. The question is how do you make that transition to the SUB - maybe one location or no transition (e.g. tilt the ground plane)
- Recommend not having too many small elements of ramps and stairs for transition, try to find something in the scale of the space from the precedents. It should be a significantly scaled space with one large element in it, which either can trigger a number of smaller connections to solve the grade change or preferably, have a simpler larger transition at the scale of the space.
- There is very little opportunity to experience the space as a whole as it is always divided by The Knoll, it's almost unfair to compare it with the large spaces provided as example that have big contiguous surfaces.
- The open space of the square should expand out as far as possible to East Mall for big events, especially if something were to happen to McInnis Field, which is a big part of orientation week.
- The location of East Mall vis a vis the new SUB and the square is quite wonderful and extending it into the building is a very strong move. If the knoll was less central it would form a major and a minor space instead of two equal spaces. To overcome this, consider reshaping the mass of the building by moving some of the mass to form the north edge of the square and use the building as the edge to the square, with no stairs at this point at all.

##### Knoll

- Support the move to reduce the scale of the knoll by raising up the elevation of the square. Not a supporter of the knoll, but it has become sacred.
- Good move to diminish the scale of the knoll and make it less disruptive by taking a meter from its height. It helps unify the space and make it more usable.
- The knoll can be a great opportunity and it's shaping up nicely. The way the whole outdoor room is being defined is working well.

##### Materiality

- Definition of the square is required. Use materiality to provide definition. Buildings at the two edges and the other edges require definition.



### 3.2 Student Union Building (Pre-application)

Gerry McGeough provided the project background and asked the Panel to comment on issues outlined in the previous AUDP minutes. Mr. McGeough introduced the project team including Dave English, Joost Bakker, Bruce Haden, Douglas Birkenshaw, and Margot Long, who presented the project.

#### Panel comments:

##### General

- It has come a long way and is going in a good direction, but still have reservations.
- Bring a building working model the size of the table next time to facilitate discussion.
- Show project boundary as built.

##### Vertical Circulation

- Vertical circulation is not strong enough. The route to the Pendulum Café is under performing.
- Pendulum Café feels lost. Have the stair up the back to get to it, it feels like a lost café at the top of Eaton's Department store. Vertical circulation should reinforce the energy.
- Hierarchy and flow from the south to main and lower levels works fine. However, the flow up from the main level can be improved by adding a major stair and elevator that take you to the biggest room in the building at the south west corner, without engaging the entire building. Floor to floor circulation would engage the major access points.

##### Hierarchy

- There are lot of bits that are interesting, but they feel kind of orphaned. Too important of a building to lose pieces of it.
- Looking for hierarchy in the many pieces that are expressed. For example, roof elements and structural elements can be many things, but they can be organised in a more compelling way. Collage is good, but still can have hierarchy.
- Regarding architectural treatment, it seems that you have lots of different pieces e.g. one set of different detailing for skylight roof, west wall and then curved wooden armature wall. Maybe the curved armature informs the detailing of the other two pieces and creates a more cohesive whole.
- Better hierarchy in the ideas is needed. They are all interesting on their own, but not convinced that they are assembling in an interesting way.
- As we look at the building from different sides, the building still feels fragmented and is in search of an element of unity.
- The curving east wall is very good, don't interrupt it at the north

## Knoll

- It is getting more exciting. The direction that the knoll has taken helps integrate it into the public realm, being a more dynamic piece that changes from end to end.
- The series of functional transitions of the knoll as you move towards and into the building is supportable.
- There is a need for more intensity there, perhaps with the climbing wall which is part green function, vertical leap right at the knoll. There might be an opportunity to almost terrace up to the roof.
- A connection between the rain garden and the knoll should be investigated.
- The way terrace seating on two sides and the narrow element between can be broken. Connect the two in a more cultivated way that is a green connection that can be passed over. This would communicate better the ecological function of the two.
- Constructing the pub underneath the knoll is going to compromise the roots of the existing trees.

## North/ South Concourse

- The proposed north/south connection to the existing SUB should be more organic rather than linear. Maybe when the existing SUB gets redesigned it can be more organic as well.
- A little interruption of the linear concourse passage as it continues through the new SUB is supportable. However, there is something questionable about the symmetry of the bulbous shapes and their sequence.

## Agora, Birds Nest and Slow Circulation

- The Agora is rising as a major organizing element.
- Major weakness is this “black box” in the Agora. It appears opaque, a gem that is untouchable inside, doesn’t have transparency or fluidity and celebration that the rest of the space has. Needs to be useable – can be used daily for something.
- Is this repeating the error of putting a ‘mound’ in the middle of the space (Agora).
- If we’re talking about 100 year building, the birds nest is not adaptable. Needs to be perfect if it is going to be permanent or make it flexible so that it can be changed.
- Maybe it should be a suspended theatre that is deliberately open, another version of the internal knoll.
- The “glass box” theatre is strange and should be moved to the side to allow more overlook from the upper floors down into the Agora.
- There is only circulation around the upper floors of the Agora, suggest everyone inhabits circulation spaces. Some of the residual places like the Pendulum can be part of this organizing place. Have more program right around the Agora.

## Massing

- The interface with the existing SUB is very awkward. Back off from it and if necessary go towards the west, notwithstanding the guidelines. The north side of the plaza is dead and it will be ghastly in the winter. If you think of East Mall with the public square being punctuated by an element that comes out on the north side, it would animate and alleviate the pressure building up in front and at the top of the current SUB. The little café in the woods, recognize that something is missing.

## Space Layout

- Public space in conjunction with big events function is too small and doesn't engage the square.
- The Pendulum seems out of the way, it should be more central and celebrated more.
- Sprouts feels like it is in the wrong place. It wants to be on the level four and five connected to urban agriculture, not below grade visual. Alternatively, if it remains in the basement close to bike kitchen, add some of the excitement that is elsewhere in the building so it doesn't read as the basement.
- The crush space for the three part room is insufficient.
- Find another home for the fire escape, its floating in the air.
- Have the lower floor in the existing building echo or be more reminiscent of the relaxed nature of the lower floor under the new building. Want it to feel a part of their project.
- Suggest detailed planning for the bookable rooms so they are more flexible.
- Like the curved wall, but it needs to be peeled away at the upper floor for better space distribution.
- Question of whether the vestibules are needed on the ground floor. The guiding principles talk about connecting with the outside. If possible use automatic doors, as on Convention Centre. You want strong indoor outdoor flow but sustainability is an issue, this conflict needs resolution.

## Other

- Regarding sustainability, support the idea of not installing everything in now, e.g. photovoltaic not making economical sense now, but it will in the future. Future proofing is supported.
- Roofscapes are still flat decks with stuff on them. These need development.
- Are you considering black water treatment?

### **3.3 St. John Hospice (Development Permit Application)**

Gerry McGeough introduced the development application and the project team: Bryce Rositch, Smiljka Stankovic, Dr. David Hardwick, and Jonathan Losee. General comments and vote was sought from the panel.

## Panel Comments:

### General

- Like the building and a great location for hospice with the teaching part. It is a grand house that ties into the land. It is not flashy but sedate.
- Building reminiscent of F.L Wright, but wonder if you can make more use of corner windows.
- Great location for this use with the adjacent residential. The siting is far superior to previous site.
- Quite underutilized in comparison with the adjacent sites.

### Porch

- Porch location could be more asymmetrical and more relaxed. Relax the porch to be in line with general softness of the house and help it integrate with landscape more fully.
- The porch does appear to be tight and too close to the roundabout. Could move towards the south.
- Suggest the porch shift or angle to be orientated better to the Stadium Road and roundabout centre point and could be significantly larger.
- It seems out of scale with the house itself. Consider thinking of it as the two towers and the canopy. The two towers would be pushed back and higher to break horizontality; the canopy would come out and allow diagonal views to the fountain.

### Finishes:

- Building materials are quite appropriate.
- Stone work is very nice looking, but don't have to take it all the way to the soffit on the front. Like many F.L Wright buildings suggest it stops short with siding above. Probably want to extend the stone up a little further from the base line and otherwise use it elsewhere. The prominence of the stone could be lessened so it doesn't compete with the gateway wall.

### Space Layout and Views

- Very few rooms receive the view. Rework some of the rooms so residents can capitalize on the landscape spaces. Only 3 of 20 units can see the views.
- Would be pleasant to have views from the courtyard out to the south.
- Make greater use of corner windows as it gives a diagonal view and opens up the rooms.
- Discrepancy between some of the sketches, plans and elevations with regards to the corner windows.

### Landscaping

- Planting material rich, positive and will provide great variety.
- Looks like a lot of it is landscaped but not necessarily a place to go out to.

- Supportive of more vertical landscaping with a softer touch behind.
- Water feature – is there an opportunity for one in the garden to provide sound animation.
- Perhaps have the path more on the edge to put the patients at the top of the hierarchy.

#### Gateway

- It's a competitive relationship with the gateway wall; is odd. Not sure why it plays a role in gateway expression. Supportive of vertical landscape and a bit softer touch behind. A bit odd reading of the building
- Like the use of the hedge to break between the existing wall and the new building but it might be not enough.

#### Indoor Outdoor Relationship

- Well thought out as a residence but needs a stronger connection with the outdoors.
- Critical to have more interplay with indoors and outdoors. Ideal to almost treat the rooms as though they are part of lush surroundings –is there is a way to maximize this more by views and great apertures to the courtyard?
- The ability to go outside is encouraged. Resident should capitalize on landscape.

#### Chair Summary:

- Great relief regarding the site of the building. Much more appropriate, seems to fit and give opportunities for the surrounding landscape.
- General support, not quite unanimous, for the style and materiality of the building. I.e. relaxed style of residential architecture with a Frank Lloyd Wright prairie house style.
- Quite a bit comments about room placement – nice landscape and courtyard but only three rooms have access to the courtyard. Worthwhile to have one more attempt to get more access or visual access to the landscape.
- Stronger landscape solution in front of the porch seen as a positive move. Support for even more landscape to mitigate the relationship with the gateway.
- General support for materiality and for the landscape concept.
- Make the porch less formal, less symmetrical and larger.

The Panel moved,

*To support the development application subject to design development of some architectural details and layout issue to the satisfaction of the University Architect.*

Motion passed with Margot Long voting against it.

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

Meeting concluded at 7.35pm.