



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2011

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, January 11, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-8.15pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**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:** Chris Phillips and Nicole Taddune – Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg  
Landscape Architects  
Dave English – UBC Properties Trust  
Joost Bakker, Bruce Haden and Jennifer Cutbill – Dialog Architecture  
Douglas Birkenshaw – BH Associated Architects  
Margot Long – PWL Partnership  
Rob Brown – UBC Properties Trust  
Peter Wregelsworth, Michael McColl and David Martin – Stantec  
Jennifer Stamp – Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects  
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 4:09PM. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the December 2nd minutes

A motion to approve the December minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 University Commons (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Dave English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Nicole Taddune from Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on: scale of the Knoll, desire for definition of the Square, number of transition elements from the SUB, possible simplification of Alumni Terrace, and east drop-off courtyard.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Appreciate the way things were laid out and articulated. Impressed by quality and thoughtfulness put into the design
- Simplification is supported
- Supportive of most of the gestures
- Amount of seating is supported
- Not in support of the movable seats chosen; too bulky and cold. Will look empty in the summer when there are not many people around. Explore other forms of movable seating
- Removing the trees in the middle of the Bosque is not supported as too arbitrary

##### Knoll:

- The ring paving and grading around the Knoll is supported
- Knoll could be more organic and more natural (a vestige of something special)
- Hardscaping around the Knoll is supportable, but some semblance of what was there would help, being too framed and manicured loses its organic quality
- Will the trees survive?

##### Definition of the Square:

- Extension over East Mall is supportable
- Unsure of the benches under the trees along East Mall
- Cannot accommodate large scale events in its current iteration unless the Knoll becomes the stage. Introduction of an event planner to lay out all that is needed for different sizes of events is required.
- Can you build a new Knoll elsewhere? Explore giving priority to one side of the square to create a major and minor space possibly by nudging the Knoll. Also consider removing a row or two of Bosque trees

##### Transition Elements from the SUB:

- Consolidating the smaller pieces is supportable
- The main stairs and porch extension north was a strong move from the earlier planning and it is slowly disappearing which is regrettable. Would like to see the porch reintroduced

##### Simplification of Alumni Terrace:

- There are less heavy and more connective ways the programmatic elements could be achieved
- Transitions in Achievement Corner are too subtle - think of adding more

#### East Drop-off Courtyard:

- Satisfied with resolution of east drop off courtyard
- East court feels like the backside as it lacks hierarchy. For a substantial amount of people it will be the main point of entry and therefore needs to be more ceremonial, including the paving treatment.

#### Chair Summary:

- Support the applicant's response to the Panel's earlier commentary
- Differing commentary regarding the Knoll; a slightly more organic approach would be supported
- Appreciation for the amount of seating.
- Support the revised grading for the overall space and the way it is unified
- Accommodate the needs of Alumni Terrace with less visual barriers.
- Detailed event planning for large events is needed to inform the design and where elements like the stage would go
- The Panel always felt the porch was a strong idea, but through the iterative process it seems to be weakening; would like to see it pursued
- There is an uneasiness to the main entrance from the east; needs to be amplified
- Have program opportunities for the covered area
- Keep unity of The Bosque by not removing the center trees

#### The Panel resolved:

Panel moved to support the development application subject to design development of the major event space and the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve outstanding issues noted in the minutes.

*Motion carried*

### 3.2 Student Union Building (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Rob Brown who then introduced Joost Bakker, Bruce Haden and Jennifer Cutbill from Dialog Architecture; Douglas Birkenshaw from BH Associated Architects and Margot Long from PWL Partnership as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on: hierarchy and unity of external expression, four sculptural elements, landscape geometry, clarity of the Knoll, circulation layouts within the inside of the building, and the juncture of the new and old SUB.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Pleased with way the project is developing and made a lot of progress
- Building has come a long way and a lot of hard work and thinking has been done to make the building work
- The parti is strong and workable, but the project requires refinement.
- A lot of the formal issues have been resolved, though the project would benefit from a degree of resolution that is not yet there.

##### Landscape

- The Knoll is quite prominent and bisects the public space

- Include the Knoll in the shape of the building to make it more organic
- Balance the amount of formal treatment of the Knoll; minimize the number of intrusions and reduce the amount of seating around it
- Some discrepancies with the two landscape designs and the space between the plaza and this building. Interested in seeing the landscape plan once all the details have been worked out amongst the buildings
- Mistake to have the bike parking as an afterthought, it should be more integral to the concept and attended to immediately
- The south entrance still feels like a secondary treatment; planters and benches are not appropriate as they narrow the entryway
- Make sure outdoor space works and flows well into the indoor space so it is welcoming to all
- East plaza is improved, but still needs more resolution regarding pedestrian paths and flow
- Recommend holding off on north pavilion element until the future of the existing SUB is known and one can be respectful of the options available to the building

#### Circulation within the building:

- Interior islands on the main floor imply built in inflexibility the might be regretted in the future. Consider a straight wall to pick up more usable space. Make the outlets similar to the theatre space
- Interior circulation from the Agora east works well and is very solid. Vertical circulation is improving; one issue is dimension, thicker/thinner would encourage meandering
- Levels four and five are poorly served by overall circulation system. Roof garden is overlooked by washrooms and club wall. Roof garden needs good adjacencies in order to work. Pendulum restaurant still a dead end, it feels abandoned.
- Feels like a bunch of dead ends in the project when it should be a bunch of connected pieces
- Spaces on the west side are very thin and not believably occupied; deserves dimensions and programming that make them strong and compelling
- The staircases need more elaboration, robustness and detailing
- The black box is better, warmer final treatment of material will really allow it to take shape. Interesting way to capture lightness in the interior and exterior

#### New/old SUB junction:

- East/west pedestrian connection through climbing wall area is an important one and would benefit from a straight connection to the Commons
- Option where penthouse is set back should be pursued
- New design is more respectful of Alumni Building and works well with existing SUB

#### Hierarchy and unity of external expression:

- Character, form and exterior have come a long way
- The parti is a strong one and certainly workable, but there are some refinements that the project would benefit from such as simplifying the envelope. One or two elements - not all
- Elevations are busy, have a smaller number of elements to tighten up then design
- A degree of resolution is still required; there is a trajectory in the right direction.
- Like the material palette; wood, concrete and zinc
- The concrete may be a stark material against the zinc

- A bit more colour or playfulness of material is needed. Can there be more articulation?
- Materials are supportable but there is a degree of richness that could be achieved. For example, in the east elevation that is negative institutional character, animate it by adding more colour
- Unfortunate proximity to perfect symmetry on \_\_\_ elevation

#### **Chair Summary:**

- General appreciation of the development of the scheme
- There is an increased simplification and clarity of external moves and general parti, but it could be taken further
- The palette of materials is supported and moving in the right direction
- Though big, the building is respectful of neighbours
- The public realm is still confused with the two different designs and the building's interface with it
- Knoll and its edges need to be resolved
- Still issues with the upper level circulation and integration in a public way. Essential to have public garden on level 5 and not 6 to maximize public engagement.
- South elevation and arrival as a major entry to the building. West is quite beautiful, but there is a disconnect between the two public faces of building
- Debate regarding ground floor and flexibility within those spaces
- Bikes are part of general public interface and it needs some serious thought, revision and integration
- Pavilion at north should wait for when the existing SUB is repurposed
- East west connection to the Square is essential; there is an opportunity to resolve this connection and reintroduce the porch at the same time

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

Panel moved to support the application in principle, subject to design development and a report back to the Panel on the exterior detailing, upper level circulation and interface with the public realm.

*Motion carried*

### **3.3 Centre for Brain Health (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Craig Knight who then introduced Peter Wregelsworth, Michael McColl and David Martin from Stantec Architects and Jennifer Stamp from Durante Kreuk as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on: the Wesbrook entrance, landscape plan and the general design.

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- Great project overall and organization is good
- Spectacular addition to Wesbrook
- Elegant in many ways
- Beautiful building and very pleased with the resolution
- The planning and improvements from the previous iteration are supported

- Preferred the stronger expression of the two boxes and in this current iteration it's not as strong
- Like the simplicity of boxes and their different expressions
- Appreciate the gutsy and successful interpretation of UBC's 60's modernism
- Varying depth of curtain wall is critical to the success of the aesthetic and must be carried through the quality of the detailing and not removed through value engineering

**Atrium:**

- Atrium is in the correct location and is better aligned
- Day-lighting in the back is supported

**Landscaping:**

- Landscape hasn't come as far – final detailing will need to be seen
- Detailing missing on the water canals
- Improvement to landscaped corner – think of how is it used and consider accessibility to the building
- Green roof is supported. Nice how light is introduced into spaces below. It would be important to know what is happening on the lower roof and as it will have a serious impact on 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and above
- Indoor/outdoor is a strong idea and would be nice to see it expressed a little stronger
- Walls along Wesbrook – that layering is fighting the message of being welcoming and open and inviting
- Make the central entrance area a road with wide sidewalks that are extensions of the Wesbrook sidewalks
- Minor entrance off Wesbrook seems forced

**Parking:**

- Put some angled parking where garden is on drop off to make it more usable
- Where is the courier, loading/unloading, recycling located?

**Chair Summary:**

- General strong support for direction, architectural expression, details, and materials
- Massing simplification has improved the building
- Bringing research to the streets creates an openness and clarity of message that is laudable
- One area which needs thought is public realm interface with the building and connection to Koerner
- Detailed landscape plan will need to be seen
- How vehicles will interact with public realm and around the building will be key

**The Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support the application subject to a detailed landscape plan being presented to the Panel.

*Motion carried*

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 8:15PM.



# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, February 3, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:00pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:**

Margot Long  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:**

Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Maged Senbel

**Staff:**

Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor- Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:**

Michelle Paquet and Michael Redmond - UBC Properties Trust  
Ray Letkeman - Letkeman Architects  
Mike Patterson - Perry and Associates  
Craig Knight - UBC Properties Trust  
Dirk Buttjes - Buttjes Architects  
Margot Long - PWL Partnership

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:17 pm  
A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.  
*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the January 11<sup>th</sup> minutes

A motion for approval of the January 11<sup>th</sup> minutes was made by the Chair with the following amendments and additions: page 2 *definition of the square unsure of the detailing*; page 5 *east elevation*  
*Motion Carried*

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

#### **3.1 Granite Terrace III (Application)**

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and sought comment on architectural treatment specifically with respect to the wood paneling. The team including Michelle Paquet, Michael Redmond, Ray Letkeman and Mike Perry presented the design.

#### **Panel comments:**

##### General

- This is an attractive building, nicely scaled and an inspired new addition to the neighbourhood
- Consider moving over the receiving area
- The challenge will be keeping the public realm intact throughout the building process
- Is it possible to have a large CRU with multiple levels to improve relationship to the street and improve flexibility for future tenants
- LEED gold or equivalent is what leasers are looking for. Push sustainability consultant to achieve this to increase leasing potential

##### Materiality

- The choice of form and material draws some attention without being overbearing
- Supportive of the wood cladding facade treatment. The vertical orientation described is supportable
- A more contemporary look is supported
- Supportive of the wood cladding with a warm colour as indicated in SK-2.01. The coreten steel in the top precedent image might work but generally inappropriate for the scale, use and location of the building. The grey wood cladding is too close to concrete and has the effect of a building from a different era

##### Elevations

- Disappointing that the east and west elevations are identical since there will be no other building to the west of this and therefore, there will be full solar gain on the western elevation. Differentiation to these facades would be beneficial to building
- Explore using trees to contribute shading of the West elevation. For example, retain and shift the tree being removed from the receiving area since it will have a significant impact in reducing solar gain
- Strong endorsement for the continuous canopy and an appeal to follow through with what is currently labelled as potential graphic panel on the West Elevation. The parking lot currently provides an experience that is almost pleasant and having a building facade that engages the pedestrian on the west side will make all the difference in whether that experience endures. It might also set a nice precedent for a new venue for public art

##### Roof

- Ensure that the green roof will work. The proposed 2.5 inch soil depth is a challenge and should be a minimum of 4 inches to ensure longevity
- Using the roof as a usable space is commendable and should be a model for all of campus

- VRF Mechanical system will help with the leasability of the building; Note that they tend to be lots of little pieces of equipment sitting on the roof and will be visible and not great to look at. Consider screening these elements on the roof

#### **Chair Summary:**

- Support for the direction, building architecture and its urban fit
- Support for green roof and for the sustainability goals reflected in the package
- Detail aspects to follow up on with Campus and Community Planning specifically: how the mechanical is incorporated into the roof design so that it is not an afterthought; differentiating the east and west elevations (trees will help with this); and the green roof needing to be a functioning green roof
- General support for wood cladding in a vertical contemporary style

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

Panel moved to support the project with the comments provided and working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve issues identified through the design development process.

*Motion carried*

#### **3.2 East Campus 4 (Pre-application)**

Gerry McGeough provided the project background and requested comment on the project's fit with the surrounding massing, character and public realm and sustainability measures.

#### **Panel comments:**

##### Project massing

- This project has a number of challenges that it must overcome before it meets the kinds of standards that the AUDP has come to expect
- This is a very challenging site for a tall tower in this neighbourhood and it doesn't seem to fit. It is not a gateway building, but of a gateway nature. It is a significant urban design challenge of how to respond to the context
- Breaking up the massing is essential to respond to the context
- There is no transitional massing elements – quite problematic
- More thought should go into whether the building is aligned with the neighbours
- Top heavy nature at 14<sup>th</sup> storey is reinforcing the heaviness and width
- The eyebrows on east and west elevations are unnecessary given their solar exposures
- The penthouse should contribute to the desired massing of the building and not be an afterthought
- The foursquare nature of the plan does not respond to buildings on either side
- This site will have to answer the question of how you make a tall building be logical on this context
- The potential to dwarf neighbouring buildings is real. This is particularly problematic when the proposed building is market rental and the buildings it overlooks are staff and faculty housing. It sends a message of profit over community that UBC is already struggling with in some circles
- The combination of a large footprint on a small crowded site and a tall mass in a cluster of low rise buildings requires much more attention as to how the massing works

- It would be important to see in greater detail how the ground plane interfaces with the surrounding landscape and public realm

#### Material palette

- Expensive materials are not required to solve the outstanding issues, they can be solved with massing and planning
- How to make this building part of a cohesive campus is a central question
- The architectural treatment seems ordinary on the one hand in its expression yet extraordinary on the other hand in terms of not relating to any of its neighbours. It would be good to see the tower juxtaposed against the Sitka project

#### Sustainability

- Review the energy performance of the building. So far the energy targets seem tentative and could be better
- It is losing a lot of energy with 65% glazing

#### Public realm

- How does the project benefit and engage the street and greenway in a real way
- Fencing in the pathway to the village will encourage disruption to the neighbours

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

Meeting concluded at 6:00pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, March 3, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:45pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:** Mark Thompson  
Margot Long

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Chris Phillips and Maureen Hetzler – Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg  
Landscape Architects  
Dave English – UBC Properties Trust  
Martin Nielsen – Busby Perkins and Will

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:23PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011 minutes

A motion to approve the December minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 University Trolley Bus Loop (Development Application Amendment)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Dave English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Maureen Hetzler from Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Landscape Architects as the applicant team. Panel comment was sought on the gateway wall as well as the median treatment down the centre of the boulevard.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- the street trees are good, especially when it's built out
- come up with a formal procedure for big events so that everyone knows how the drop-off and valet parking will work, before they schedule such events
- arrangement of driving surfaces and parking, with only a single moving lane, is really unforgiving if you end up with an incident

### Gateway sign/wall:

- there is a redundancy with the gateway wall and the gateway blade sign. The gateway wall is too much of a barrier and separates the street. Would prefer to see a space that spans both sides of the right-of-way
- the UBC piece at the front end adds competing signage and will conflict with everything currently there. It's not a unifying and clarifying piece
- at least perforate the wall in the front so that you can at least see through it - visual permeability through the campus is key

### Median:

- would like to see more flexibility within the space. For example, have one row of trees with reinforced grass on one or both sides, instead of two rows down the middle, so that one could use it for event parking, or pave or drive over the median in the future, if need be.
- hedges are a real challenge but can understand the reasoning behind them; perhaps ground cover and wire fence is a suitable alternative?

## **The Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support in principle the right-of-way subject to the applicant redesigning the median for visual continuity east/west and north/south, flexibility for traffic flow if the transportation consultant deems it necessary and redesign of gateway marking strategy

*Motion carried*

### **3.1.1 Lighting strategy**

Gerry McGeough briefly introduced the lighting consultant who provided an overview of the lighting plan proposed for the University Boulevard and Main Mall areas. He requested the Panel comment on whether the lighting poles should blend into the landscape or becomes a feature in itself.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- there is support for the poles more in line with the trees
- trees are the best asset in the Mall. Not only will light-standards in the trees allow for more flexibility, it is more cost effective and allows the trees to be the main feature
- light fixtures styles get dated, so there is a risk in making them a major design feature

### **3.2 Central Water Feature at Main Mall/University Blvd Intersection (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Dave English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Maureen Hetzler from Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on the concepts and the design direction.

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- consider a mechanical pulse with a water feature
- very interesting process but encourage you to not take feedback too literally
- have you considered an open art competition to design the feature? What this project needs is 20 concepts to choose from - use the work done to date as guidelines and a value set. There would be a lot of interest from the community. Get a really good professional jury to make the decision and include a modest prize.
- Would prefer to see alternative concepts all worked out rather than one concept that embodies all ideas
- A design competition is strongly recommended

### **3.3 Modern Green Wesbrook (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Martin Nielsen who introduced the project details. Panel comment was sought on the project in general and its fit with the surrounding neighbourhood.

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- very supportive of this building and a great move for South Campus. Would have been great to see it at the beginning of the development of this area as it would have been set a good precedent for the rest of the neighbourhood
- very refreshing approach and really impressed by all of the sustainability features
- innovating on the sustainability front, combining the academic and housing together – there is a great deal of leadership to show within this project

Retail placement:

- further thought is encouraged on the location of the retail space. From an accessibility to the street standpoint it makes sense, but the heart of the South Campus Neighbourhood is to the north – this is where all the pedestrian traffic is and therefore this should be the edge where community and retail space is. Furthermore, it would be more symbolic off greenway and not the street because it showcases the sustainability piece
- keep south side residential to maximize solar access to the units

Materiality and architecture:

- treatment of façade brick is too dark and creates an institutional feel. It should be warmer

- doesn't quite look residential yet. The facades need a lot of work
- with all the rain here, the metal isn't the right choice for sliding screens. Explore a new material - one that doesn't rust
- the fire exits are situated way too close together and should be separated for safety purposes
- the amenity area of building is buried below courtyard. It is up to the design team to establish a character and identity for this use that overcomes its location
- describe the building in greater relation to the context around it in the next iteration
- most of the residential buildings in this area have a sense of verticality to them. If this building had this, it would create a rhythm and give it a more residential feel
- could the townhouses have finwalls? This would create private space as well as rhythm and would also demarcate a unit
- Consider floating the top floor with a continuous window

#### **4.0 Other Business**

**4.1** Staff refrained from giving a presentation on the Vancouver Campus Plan Design Guidelines that were adopted by the BOG in June 2010, due to the length of the meeting.

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:45PM.



# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, April 7, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:00  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

### Members Present:

Norm Couttie  
Margot Long  
Brian Wakelin  
Maged Senbel (item 3.1 only)

### Members Absent:

Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson

### Staff:

Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor - Administrative Assistant (recorder)

### Presenters/Guests:

Martin Nielsen – Busby Perkins and Will Architects  
Jennifer Stamp – Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects  
Chris Phillips – Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects  
Dave English – UBC Properties Trust  
Curtis Neeser – Concert Properties  
Greg Voute – Raymond Letkeman Architects  
Bruce Hemstock – PWL Partnership

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:08 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011 minutes

A motion to approve the March minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Modern Green (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Martin Nielsen who introduced the project. Mr. McGeough sought Panel comment on the location of the commercial

space and the materiality and institutional character of the project.

### **Panel Comments:**

#### General:

- Like the project as it is exemplary in many ways
- Would like to see bike parking on the commercial side
- West elevation ground floor units could have windows facing west to improve “eyes on the walkway” to soften the character
- Very supportive of the elevator and roof decks; using the roof is very positive and would be a huge loss if removed
- The landscape works and is well thought out; however the plant list has a very small percentage of native plants. More native plant should be pursued.
- Avoid Mexican feather grass as it is not a good plant choice as it has become invasive, taking over a lot of projects
- Would be nice to see the street public realm design; but at least we know it is coming

#### Location of commercial space:

- Would still like to see the commercial space on the north east corner along the greenway to take advantage of that incredible amenity. As a commercial corner it would be better connected to the commercial heart of the neighbourhood and would avoid having residential units facing a commercial building across the greenway. The greenway is being presented as a quiet residential zone when in fact it is already abutted by commercial areas in three adjacent buildings.
- Can see the pros and cons of the location of the commercial area; project has strong merits and its current commercial location shouldn't hold it up

#### Materiality:

- Like the material palette; no issues with the colour
- Too bad metal screens have come off the project as it added an interesting dynamic.
- No problem with expression of the base of the townhouses, etc

#### Institutional feel:

- The institutional look of the facades has been mostly remedied and will continue to improve as the facades are detailed at the construction drawing stage
- The elevations drawings with the grid lines look more articulated than the SketchUp model. The grid lines themselves animate the facade. A simple brick line or variation in plane would be enough to achieve a similarly articulated effect. In summary this still needs additional development
- Still looks a little institutional – would like to see more development; brick colour still dark

### **The Panel resolved:**

The Panel moved to support the project subject to the comments provided, with particular attention to the materials choice and further development to ensure a less institutional feel.

*Motion carried*

### **3.2 University Trolley Bus Loop (Development Application Amendment)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Dave English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Maureen Hetzler from Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on the gateway wall as well as the median treatment down the centre.

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### General:

- Love the big trees, the big pavers, the narrowness of the road and the welcome sign
- Big trees are critical to the project and would really make the project – katsura trees are difficult street trees -- the ones in the median will do better than the ones on the side. Maples would do better on the whole

##### Gateway wall:

- Question of entry signage – will hopefully work with the other entries on campus. Concerned with the overall cohesiveness of the gateways and unfortunate that we don't have that knowledge for this project

##### Median treatment down the centre:

- Don't like the fencing off and hedges in the middle – does not speak to UBC or its culture. A huge missed opportunity
- No issues with the formality of the median -- the issue is with fencing off the students and does not symbolize the spirit of the campus. There must be another way to work with Translink to satisfy all parties
- The nature of the divider has improved over the last iteration but fundamentally is still a divider. The 30 inch green moat is better than the 48 inch green wall
- This should be an opportunity to do something special -- not necessarily more costly -- just something that says UBC

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

The Panel moved to approve the western 2/3<sup>rds</sup> (approximate) subject to hiding the fence element; the eastern 1/3 (approximate) should return for Panel review and be subject to further design development with respect to signage and landscape character. . The applicant should pursue means to achieve the desired safety needs while expressing the openness that is fundamental to campus life.

*Motion carried*

### **3.3 Central Water Feature at Main Mall/University Blvd Intersection (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background and introduced Dave English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Maureen Hetzler from Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg Landscape Architects as the applicant team. Panel comment is sought on the concepts and the design direction.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- Really great direction
- Really like it and think it is great and exciting. It has the genesis of something really nice
- It is an unusual thing to comment on as it is not a building - cautious about guiding this too much. Once the decision is made that this is an art piece, then give the artist full license to create their best work
- Not a lot to comment on; it suits the campus and has meaning behind it
- It is nice with the water because you will get more reflective qualities
- Unsure of how you have the water and interaction with the piece – do not know what the artists intentions were regarding this
- At the end of the day, it is the artist that will make or break the project
- It does not seem to tie into the campus beaux arts idea; a simple way to achieve this could be to have the rods come out of the ground in a formal pattern and randomize the pattern once they are in the air

### **3.4 St. Andrews** (Pre-development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Curtis Neeser of Concert Properties who introduced the project and the project team.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- Concerns regarding context. Would like to see the project embrace the massing of the surrounding area and possibly the footprint prescribed for this site
- Would like to see some speculation as to what is envisioned for the hub site next to it as it would be important to see how this project will relate to it
- Materiality is important. Painted brick is not enough
- Should be achieving REAP gold at least
- Support for parking reduction given the size of the units; use of co-op cars is encouraged; consider a Zip or Co-op Car partnership
- Top of the building is too simple; needs more character
- Playground might be in shadows because of the surrounding buildings; consider doing a shadow study
- Think it's a nice scheme and look forward to seeing the project at the next iteration.

### **4.0 Other Business**

### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:00PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, April 14, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-6:15pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

### Members Present:

Margot Long  
Mark Thompson  
Brian Wakelin

### Members Absent:

Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie  
Richard Henriquez  
Maged Senbel

### Staff:

Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor- Administrative Assistant (recorder)

### Presenters/Guests:

Craig Knight – UBC Properties Trust  
Dirk Buttjes – Buttjes Architects  
Margot Long – PWL Partnership  
Adrian Bell – AIG

---

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

## 2.0 Development Permit Applications:

### 2.1 East Campus 4 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough provided the project background and requested comment on the project's fit with the surrounding massing, materiality, public realm and sustainability measures.

### Panel comments:

#### General

- Made some great strides – a vast improvement from the first iteration
- Elegant building and no longer stands out as an un-harmonious neighbour
- Applaud applicant for keeping the significant amount of trees on the site.

## Massing

- Project has made many strides since it was last seen by the Panel. Issues have been addressed particularly with respect to scale as perceived to the street. Rotating the tower has improved the connection to the south side of the site, as well as the connection to the semi public pedestrian pathway to the west.
- West units on the tower have direct west sun exposure and will be over heated units. Look into a glazing or cladding treatment to address this issue.
- Massing parti seems to work quite well but it is not carried through consistently. I.e. the northside massing – there is a wide band that expresses the main piece, yet the canopy doesn't relate to the main mass and should perhaps be pulled back. The cruciform elevation on the south side has two solid pieces and on the other side you have curtain wall. Consider making the elevations more rigorous in the expression
- Missed opportunity to showcase this building in the context of the Sitka Tower especially how the two landmarks frame the park

## Materiality

- Brick base could be more thoughtfully integrated throughout the building
- Green glass and white concrete makes it feel like a tennis court. Appreciate the attempt to connect to the adjacent trees but it can be done in a more sophisticated way; there are ways to explore different options with respect to the glass facades and pushing it further would improve the project
- Material palette is extremely harsh and would like to see it scaled back. It is too bright and glaring and would benefit from less contrast
- The colour contrast could be justified if the brick surfaces were more articulate and defined
- The glass colour seems unresolved – what is seen in the renderings does not match with what we see. A bit more precision in the illustration of the materials would aid this decision
- Darker concrete would weather better over time. Current selection will stain.
- The white concrete will be the key to integrating the differential between brown and the green. If you were to re-examine the colour of the white concrete and then examine the brick and the green in relation to it, a more subtle differentiation could be achieved
- Do not throw out the idea of two green sides integrating with the forest as it is a good start

## Chair Summary:

- General support for the big moves made in response to February Panel comments which include the rotating of the elevation, simplifying the massing and introducing verticality.
- Scale issues have been addressed with the exception of some details; the new strategy around three cardinal points of the elevations is stronger and supported
- Provide something stronger than the current brick base in terms of the massing relationship to the tower. This would solve with one move some of the problems of the planar changes in material, the lack of robustness and the desire for simplification.
- General consensus that the material contrast is too great; the applicant should re-examine colour palette, starting with the painted concrete
- Applicant should look into the issues with the heat gain on the west elevation

### **Panel resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project subject to the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning on the design development to the colour palette to achieve a closer integration of the different materials and to refine the relationship between the podium and tower massing.

*Motion Carried*

## **2.2 Wayfinding**

Gerry McGeough introduced Adrian Bell and provided the project background and requested general comments on the project noting that it is not subject to a Development Permit.

### **Panel comments:**

#### General

- Building shadows on the map seem light. Test out different shadow intensities
- Think about the other wayfinding elements on campus to ensure cohesiveness ie: street name blades should coordinate with the pedestrian wayfinding blades
- Lettering on the blade signs seem small
- Consider barcodes for accessibility information
- One wayfinding voice that goes in and out of buildings to ensure consistency Large pylons – someone could hide behind them. Explore raising them off the ground so that one could still see under them, internally lighting them and/or orienting them in the line of travel
- The proposed proportions are fine – do not see it as being squat. If you go narrower it would be for safety issues
- There has to be some capacity to incorporate digital information in the future.
- Legibility of the map needs to be really simple; would like to see a layering of info so that one could zoom through layers to achieve detail while still maintaining a simple feel

## **4.0 Other Business**

## **5.0 Adjournment**

Meeting concluded at 6:15pm.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, May 5, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:00pm  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Brian Wakelin  
Maged Senbel  
Richard Henriquez  
Mark Thompson  
Margot Long (abstained from item 3.1 & 3.2)

**Members Absent:** Lisa Castle  
Norm Couttie

**Staff:** Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Deanne Geddes – Temporary Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Dave English, Rob Brown and Craig Knight – UBC Properties Trust  
Chris Phillips and Nicole Taddune – Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg  
Landscape Architects  
Bruce Haden and Jennifer Cutbill – Dialog Architects  
Douglas Birkenshaw – BH Associated Architects  
Karen Marler – Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Margot Long, Partnership

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. Item 3.3 was removed from the meeting agenda as the applicant withdrew their application. A motion to approve the agenda with this amendment was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the April 7<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup>, 2011 minutes

A motion to approve the both the April 7<sup>th</sup> and April 14<sup>th</sup> minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Permit Applications

#### 3.1 University Commons (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and issues previously identified by the



Panel, and introduced David English who then introduced Chris Phillips and Nicole Taddune of Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Landscape Architects. Key changes on which Panel comment and approval is sought are:

- Movement of vehicle and pedestrian traffic around the east courtyard.
- University Square expanded to the north.
- Event planning and spaces.
- Porch around the existing SUB building.
- Moveable seating.
- Characteristics of the knoll

**Panel Comments:**

- The issues raised previously seem to have been addressed in a creative way. Large improvement on the design from the initial proposal.
- Simplification of the knoll and Alumni terrace is supported.
- A complex element has been created with this project and the ongoing management needs to be looked at by the University.
- Proposed removal of trees in the Library Bosque fronting Irving K. Barber Learning Centre needs further discussion.
- There is still some concern about car and pedestrian traffic during high volume events.
- Unity of the Bosque is a strong move, and removal of the southern row of trees is a major improvement for the Square and arrival experience from the east.

**The Panel resolved:**

The Panel resolved to support the project as presented.

*Motion carried*

**3.2 Student Union Building (Development Application Amendment)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background on the project and previously identified Panel issues, Rob Brown introduced Bruce Haden and Jennifer Cutbill of Dialog Architects and Douglas Birkenshaw of BH Associated Architects. Key changes on which Panel comment and approval is sought are:

- Refinements to the exterior architecture
- Change to the stairway to make movement through the building cleaner.
- External exit stairway has been incorporated as a “sculpture”.
- Changes to external materials and colours.

**Panel Comments:**

- Great improvement on the scheme since last presentation.
- Stairway sculptural intent is supported, noting the design isn't quite resolved.
- Improved interior flow of stairs is supported. The exit stair could be of the same nature
- Roof over the pendulum restaurant is supported and at detailed stage seek a better connection from the stairs into the restaurant.
- Southern elevation relation to Alumni is the biggest change and makes the building feel like part of the suite of buildings.
- It's proximity to the existing SUB is not respectful. It is far too close and overbearing.

### **Glass fibre reinforce panel colour**

- Much discussion around the colours used in relation to other buildings and the purpose and uniqueness of this building. An interesting choice in materials and subtle tonal variation is supported. Relationship to existing student building isn't there. The darker panels for the outside makes the project look like an office building and too segregated from other buildings in the area. Overall, the option of the dark brown colour is not supported. Individual member comments include:
  - disappointed in lack of brightness, the original option of terracotta colour could be reconsidered.
  - consider terracotta, but only on the east site, or consider the green of the existing SUB roof
  - terracotta colour is not appropriate, the building should draw from the surrounding context
  - cladding should be lighter and more uniform
  - much lighter colour needed
  - don't like high contrast of the colour
  - determine what the role of the building is, to stand out or to be the glue that pulls the neighbourhood together
  - too much importance is being placed on the colour of the cladding, the building's identity is not so dependent on the colour
  - zinc is making the right connection to the context
  - this building needs to be the glue for the area.

### **Chair Summary:**

- General support for all of the moves made in terms of simplification, massing and materials.
- Material choice is great, however brown colour, relation to context and building purpose, is not ideal.
- Use of wood in building comes outside the building more than previously which is improved, and could be a clue to other colour decisions.
- Appreciation and support for all improvements to circulation. East/west connections are positive, providing a welcoming feeling.
- There is still a lack of comfort between this building and the existing SUB.

### **The Panel resolved:**

The Panel moved to support the project with consideration to the massing of the project relating to the existing SUB and the rationale on colour choice of the glass fibre reinforced panels

*Motion carried*

### **3.3 Ponderosa Housing Hub (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David English who introduced Karen Marler of Hughes Condon Marler Architects. Key consideration at this stage is the relationship to the University Boulevard public realm, particularly around the positioning of the building themselves and the towers.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- This has more of an urban development feel while the Boulevard is still a university feel. Is it possible to merge these concepts?
- Would expect a certain amount of clustering to define the area as a hub
- Bringing the buildings in line with the pavement with covered walkways and canopies would create a harmony and neighbourhood feel on entry
- Development appears a bit “slab like” in some positions, be sure to use the architectural treatment to break this down
- The area between the west mall and lower mall is a plaza, while east of this is more of a green space, therefore this would make it possible to have different facades on buildings to blend with the surroundings
- Further consideration is needed to the University Boulevard public realm as it extends further to the east

### Tower Positioning:

- Position of towers needs more thought around relations to the boulevard, use and definition
- The seven storeys podium is strong enough that tower positioning isn't needed to define the hub
- The east tower Option B (east west orientation and near Kenny) is preferred: it creates a more interesting and dynamic composite of Hub towers, allows the tower to go higher and increase sunlight on University Boulevard.
- Unity may be created by making heights of the towers identical. Discussion took place around this and the parameters in which this is to be done. The grade of the location and height restrictions make this challenging.

## **4.0 Other Business**

There was no other business to discuss

## **5.0 Adjournment**

Meeting Concluded at 7:35PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, June 9, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:**

Norm Couttie  
Margot Long (abstained for Item 4.1)  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin

**Members Absent:**

Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Michael Green

**Staff:**

Gerry McGeough - University Architect  
Dean Gregory - Landscape Architect  
Laura Holvor - Administrative Assistant (recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:**

Curtis Neeser – Concert Properties  
Ray Letkeman and Greg Voute – Raymond Letkeman Architects  
Bruce Hemstock – PWL Partnership  
Karen Kiest – Karen Kiest Landscape Architect  
Dianna Foldi – UBC Project Services  
Russell Chernoff and Tony Yip – Chernoff Thompson Architects  
Dylan Chernoff – Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects

---

### 1.0 Election of New Panel Chair

1.1 A motion was made to approve Brian Wakelin as Panel Chair for future meetings.

*Motion Carried*

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

After waiting to see if a quorum would be possible, the Chair called the meeting to order at 4:21 PM.

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

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Approval of the May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

A motion to approve the May minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

## 4.0 Development Proposals

### 4.1 St. St. Andrews (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Curtis Neeser who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment is sought on: the massing, the materiality [add other points from Gerry's memo]

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Very handsome scheme
- Captured features of Sterling House quite well
- Landscape has a sound concept
- Trees look too rigid in the landscape, explore other ways to create privacy at the ground level
- Appreciate the restrained use of glazing for energy conservation and affordability
- Review the landscape on the east side of the tower to maximize sun access and ensure choice of grass or plantings can survive with the limited sunlight

##### Massing:

- General aspects of the massing are quite handsome
- The massing itself is better now because it is compact. As you walk along, you have the sense of a smaller building which is appropriate for the site
- Massing in relation to precinct itself not addressed; the building needs shoulders and this could be achieved with a base condition.
- Tower is fine as it is, but there is an opportunity with the angles at the top of the building to introduce the deep overhangs that are characteristic of the buildings in the neighbourhood. In particular, the south side corner is under articulated
- Vertical emphasis is a logical choice
- Top was weak in previous iteration but quite nice now
- Feels like a tower that is floating in the landscape. Explore ways for tower to meet the ground. The base of the tower could be reworked to contribute to and strengthen the three storey "waterline" that exists with the other structures fronting the quadrangle.

##### Materiality:

- Granite on the base is fine appears to be a material change on the model could be better accentuated
- Granite needs more substantive appearance to it. Looks tacked on and is not engaging with the rest of the campus
- Current materiality unfortunate given Vancouver's inclement weather consider introducing a warmer material
- Consider using wood underside for the balconies on the first three floors. It would warm up the palette and add podium effect

##### Chair summary:

- Overall architecture is quite nice and the resolution of the top is much better
- Application of granite on bottom is fine; however revisit the detailing to ensure it doesn't look tacked on
- Vertical massing is supported with one member in disagreement over the lack of podium
- Look at providing an equal weight of treatment to the south side of the top of the building
- Playground issue is resolved

- Pursue revisions to the bottom three floors so this building can contribute to the 'waterline' established by existing buildings fronting the quadrangle.
- Explore measures such as wood soffits on the lower three floor to warming up the building during increment weather.
- Revise the landscaping on the east side of the tower to address the issues identified above.

*As one member required for the quorum could not be present at the meeting, the vote was done by email.*

**The Panel resolved:**

That the Panel supports the application subject to the applicant resolving the issues identified in the summary to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

**4.2 Medical Precinct Courtyards (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Anita Ryder and Karen Kiest who introduced the project. Panel comment is sought on the overall proposal and in particular: augmentation to the VCP Design Guidelines paving palette to include some of the local golden aggregate for the Health Science's precinct, as well as the accessibility to the courtyards.

**Panel Comments:**

General:

- This is not a full DP submission as the following information is missing and is required for the Panel to make a full evaluation:
  - plant list, project boundaries, material samples including samples of proposed aggregates and levels of sand blasting, detailed designs of the stair, ramps and bench areas, before and after plans including tree removal plan
- An overview of the project site and context would make it easier to understand the scope of the work
- Very supportive to changing existing lighting system to be more sustainable
- When you explore alternatives to IPE for bench seating, avoid plastic manufactured wood because it hasn't gotten to a level that is of good quality. Come back with information on seating types and wood choice.
- Appreciate the challenge to these projects and making the most of the budget to ensure programming is met
- Strategies and concepts are deep and rooted. They are moving in the right direction
- Would be nice to see how the special features work in the areas
- Accessibility to the courtyards is acceptable

Paving palette

- Supportive of intent as well as colour and pavers and geometry and general circulation
- Warmer paving is a good and appropriate move.
- Proposed colour augmentation to the paving palette in the VCP Design Guidelines is generally supported, however would like to look at samples of aggregate to ensure right amount of exposure is achieved
- Can appreciate trying to pick up on the historical paving expression but would have hoped that there would have been more from a landscape standpoint that would have been more reflective of the medical precinct.

- Like the reinforcement of medical precinct and how it has its own special character; however the idea is lost when every precinct has its own distinction. Maintaining Campus standards should be more important than creating precinct identity.
- Not sure the diagonal approach is this best approach to this precinct. Shouldn't take every open space and cut diagonals. Come back with rationale or alternatives
- Uneasy on the weight of the diagonal pathways and the way they are showing up currently. They are gaining overriding significance. The special pavers have a runway feel to them. Perhaps it's just a graphics issue, but further articulation and examination of how the path meets the rest of pavement as well as its character is needed.
- Bifurcation of lawn suggests that something different could be done. Probably translatable across the precinct.
- Details need to be more convincing

**Panel resolved:**

The Panel supports the overall concept and design principles but would like to see a full DP application package at the next meeting.

**4.3 TRIUMF ARIEL** (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Tony Yip who introduced the project and the project team.

**Panel Comments:**

General:

- Fascinating building
- Big moves all seem valid
- Location of the cooling tower is logical
- Appreciate the moves made to make badge building welcoming and easily penetrable
- More cohesion amongst the three buildings would be welcome
- Beautifully eclectic
- Quite impressed with the human touch to a very forbidding place
- Bike parking and end of trip facilities are a welcome addition
- Support for the project and look forward to next iteration. A very strong application
- Should relate to the purpose of the building as opposed to relating to the campus as a whole
- Finding some green or other spaces outside that will help build community and for respite is important and encouraged
- Existing administration building not welcoming. This building will be more so and will have a strong presence

**Chair summary**

The Project has the Panel's general support, but the proponent should explore and have a better description of green/relief space for the TRIUMF "campus".

**5.0 Other Business**

**6.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:45PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, July 13, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:55  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Michael Green  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin (abstained from 3.2)

**Members Absent:** Norm Couttie  
Margot Long

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

**Presenters/Guests:** David English – UBC Properties Trust  
Karen Marler – Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Bruno Weber – Kuwabara Payne Blumberg McKenna Architects  
Joseph Fry – Hapa Collaborative  
Karen Kiest – Karen Kiest Landscape Architect  
Dianna Foldi – UBC Project Services  
Crystal Roche – UBC Properties Trust  
Brian Wakelin – Public Consultation and Design  
Craig Knight – UBC Properties Trust  
Jennifer Stamp – Durante Kreuk Landscape Architecture

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:13 PM. A motion to amend the agenda and switch items 2.2 and 2.3 was made by the Panel.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

A motion to approve the June minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals



### 3.1 Ponderosa Housing Hub (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David English who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment is sought on: weather protection and accessibility, urban design and architecture of the East Tower, material palette and sustainability initiatives particularly with the energy performance.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Well executed design that will make a tremendous difference to the terminus of University Blvd
- Beautiful ideas and great direction. Excellent presentation
- Exciting project and design
- Very well designed given the many purposes the project needs to address

##### Relationship to Kenny:

- Current tower orientation is the best solution in terms of its relationship to the Kenny building, but something that is more respectful to neighbouring Kenny and its occupants is important
- Relationship with Kenny needs work
- Encourage having Psychology Department occupy some of the new east building fronting the courtyard adjacent to existing psychology space would give them partial ownership of the new courtyard
- Need to find some way to articulate the mass at the bottom; explore notching out 4<sup>th</sup> floor in the corner to allow building views into courtyard
- Massing at the courtyard level and the entrance could be improved by switching the funnel from a wider stair to a narrower stair and making it grander as you ascend into the courtyard

##### Rain Cover:

- Rain cover is important, encourage you to make it work. Will be hard given the character of building, but it should be done; horizontals that overlap might fit in elegantly with the building's strong geometry
- Rain protection should be provided as it is an important part of the social element of the Hub
- Rain cover is an issue are there ways the landscape could help provide a solution?
- Put something over studio doors to get weather protection
- Two metres wide of cover up high is not enough in our climate

##### Material Palette:

- White material palette makes more sense given its location. Campus core colours make more sense given its orientation to the core rather than to the forested edge
- Bringing the expression of University Boulevard to the Hub is a great idea
- Uncomfortable with the white precast concrete –reminiscent of an industrial park. Explore the use of a grey brick instead
- White a great colour choice given the abundance of grey in the climate. Cautious with the suggestion of grey as we have too much of it on campus
- Serious approach is taken with the materials. Buildings like this are really successful when there is no expense spared in the quality of materials that go into it. The last thing

you want to see is value engineering on the exterior envelope. Take care in protecting the material quality

- Creating transparency and views into the studios from the street is a great idea though right now there is a commercial storefront feel to these buildings. Blurring the lines of the ground plane to soften the edge could solve this
- Facade treatment is most successful on the east tower
- West tower and podium are problematic – feels like a long hallway or a filing cabinet; explore breaking it up with doors, or widening it with lounges.
- Façade not very convincing as a forest. Can do a lot better and merits a second look. The fact that the low building and the high building have the same treatment only exacerbates the issue. Explore adding some horizontality into the facade
- These are very serious buildings – relentlessness of corridors is a big issue and bringing the expression of University Boulevard to the foot is a great idea. The relentlessness of the straight facade is missing opportunity to lighten up to bring in or meet the forest edge. Create some relief and some retreats in the relentlessness of façade
- Difficult to make a call on the material palette due to lack of illustrative material

#### Massing:

- Building expression on the western tower feels extruded. Explore an expression on the top that gives it some variation
- Massing composition is good
- Treatment on the bridge could have more monumentality to make it seem more important
- Interior courtyard on the west podium/ tower is facing a big black wall; can there not be windows to fix the problem? Or at least introduce some landscape or graphics

#### Sustainability:

- Sustainability initiatives are key given its proximity to CIRS
- The proposal for less glass on the residential is good from an energy standpoint
- Support taking energy performance up a notch

#### Landscape:

- Landscape as a set of rooms seem great
- Landscape concept seems strong

#### Summary

- General support of project
- Support for tower position relative to Kenny
- Rain protection needs improvement
- Most in favour of the materiality presented
- General support of landscape concept
- General support for sustainability achievements so far, but would like to see more

#### Panel Resolved

Panel moved to support the project subject to the project coming back with a detailed landscape plan and improved rain protection and west building's façade

### **3.2 Rugby Pavilion (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Crystal Roche who introduced the project and the team. General Panel comment and support is sought for phase one of the project as phase two will return at a later date.

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- Very excited about this project. It's fantastic, elegant, simple and beautiful
- Brilliant in its simplicity; captures everything

Phase one:

- Phase one is fine and very much in support of it

Phase two:

- Very much like the form
- Work with the landscape team towards softening the hard edge by having more landscape, less hard edge material as well as introducing some colour and geometry
- Consider not expressing the columns given that it's an arch that tends to look like it's spanning on its own
- The only thing would be to not have the donor name splashed on the front as it's a visual blight
- One concern is the safety issue on the upper level and would suggest pulling the railings back

#### **Summary**

- Strong support for the project
- Not much support for the size of the sign
- Overall a beautiful project

#### **Panel resolved:**

Panel moved to support the project.

### **3.3 Medical Precinct Courtyards (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to this revised submission to the Panel and introduced Karen Kiest who introduced the project. General Panel comment is sought:

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- Very much improved from previous iteration
- It will be nice to see the area cleaned up but not overly done
- Quite like the development; it's come a long way from previous iteration

Lawn:

- Consider treating the Spanish firs to ensure health and aesthetics of the grass underneath

- Question the use of lawn – is it a large enough space to accommodate spontaneous games and question the sustainability of it given its maintenance issues
- Reality of the trees and buildings killing the lawn doesn't necessarily reflect images

#### Pathways:

- Not showcasing how runoff water reaches destination in catch basins is a missed opportunity
- Be careful of the path not following current desire line and consider what it will look like in the future
- Interested in how the pavers meet. The blackness of the basalt really stands out as a dominant material. Would prefer to see the diagonals be formalization of the informality of the path site lines as opposed to the structured 6x6 heavy stone.
- Would the character of the courtyard be improved without the two specimen trees taken out as they create compositional and technical issues of the ultimate usefulness of the space

#### Summary

- Design improved and resolved issues that were raised at last meeting
- Would like formal and technical resolution of centre courtyard and how it relates to the trees

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the project subject to working with staff to resolve the centre courtyard technical and formality issues raised by Panel.

### 3.4 Centre for Brain Health Landscape (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Craig Knight who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment is sought on: the central courtyard and how it relates to the rest of the precinct.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Like the plan evolution
- Project works well; really like the diagonal piece in phase one
- New revised plan (drawings introduced at the meeting) goes a long way from previous iteration. It is stronger, more cohesive and works better on the whole
- Diagonal on green roof is not necessary the geometry that would make sense at that level
- The drawings presented on the trace paper are a considerable improvement over the images that were presented in the materials; found them to be fussy and did not understand the core elements
- 3D view or study would help with the understanding of the overall context of the space as a whole

##### Central entrance area:

- This building is one with a few simple moves and is strong, clear and easily understood; so the landscape solution needs to operate on a much larger scale than it currently is

operating on; it needs to be on the scale of the precinct rather than the scale of the smaller pieces within it and would centre the building precinct. The plan is currently without hierarchy

- Protrusion of the entrance is not a huge problem, but it's hard to see without architectural context. It's odd that it doesn't have own rain protection at a human scale; could work in principle but could also work without the protrusion by using some other portal treatment
- The diagonal path towards Koerner is an interesting feature and adds a little juxtaposition to a building that has really strong clear lines
- Entrance courtyard is odd and underwhelming. Landscape has opportunity to make it better and enhance it. Make the diagonal gesture stronger
- Worry about the terrace as it will be a largely uninhabitable space throughout the year which is a missed opportunity architecturally so is left to the landscape to fix it. It could be difficult to fix with plant materials, but there might be an opportunity to drive something such as hardscape, attitude, walls, benches into the architecture to make it feel like it's part of the landscape and family

#### Detwiller Courtyard:

- Not many seating areas in the Detwiller courtyard. This area could benefit from that more furnishings and inviting for people to use and specifically benches that offer conversational opportunities

#### Relationship to the precinct:

- Connection to medical precinct courtyards is important and can appreciate the challenge with it. There is a lot of exposed concrete and its underwhelming

#### Synapse Garden:

- Synapse garden in the new design looks uninhabitable; would be nice if there was some sort of stone path that is inviting so that it doesn't become this big separation between the path and the building
- Synapse garden great idea there is huge opportunity to do something nice and is important to create something special where people can retreat and contemplate

#### Summary

- Supportive of moves made since last iteration
- More seating in Detwiller Courtyard is desired
- Project moving in a positive direction
- Central entrance area needs more development

#### Panel resolved:

Panel moves to supports the roof garden and the Detwiller Courtyard but would like to see full resolution of centre entrance area come back to the Panel.

#### 4.0 Other Business

#### 5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 7:55PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, September 7, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:15  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Margot Long  
Richard Henriquez  
Michael Green  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin (Chair)  
Norm Couttie (starting with second item)

**Members Absent:** Lisa Castle

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

**Presenters/Guests:** David English – UBC Properties Trust  
Karen Marler – Hughes Condon Marler Architects  
Shirley Blumberg – Kuwabara Payne Blumberg McKenna Architects  
Joseph Fry – Hapa Collaborative  
Craig Knight – UBC Properties Trust  
Jennifer Stamp – Durante Kreuk Landscape Architecture  
Adam Cooper – Transportation Office (CCP)  
Bruce Carscadden and Ian McDonald – Bruce Carscadden Architect

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:13 PM. A motion to revise the agenda was made by CCP

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

A motion to approve the July minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Centre for Brain Health Landscape (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Craig Knight who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment was sought on: the central courtyard and how it relates to the rest of the precinct.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- Appreciate the design development since last iteration especially with respect to the planting
- Synapse Garden works really well; the water is great addition. Like the angular treatment in the Synapse Garden. Terrace is fine

### Central entrance area:

- Looks suburban given the prominence and expanse of cars; would prefer to see larger and fewer trees
- Doesn't look like a courtyard at all; would like to see bigger moves and larger penetration into the space; more definition of the courtyards
- Scale relative to precinct is fine. There is a question of the relative significance to this artery – not a major thoroughfare but still a major traffic piece and this area defines whole Health Precinct. Would be supportive of it being treated with that distinction
- No sense of hierarchy in the space. All that asphalt in Phase I is unfortunate and adds to confusion from hierarchy standpoint  
Phase 2 will be hugely impactful and needs careful consideration in the future

### Design details:

- Water will lead to the white brick becoming black. Is there something else that will work better with the water.
- Building entry unresolved and still looks like an appendage. It's reasonable in plan but looks a bit odd and unresolved in 3D.
- Building entry doesn't relate to the street. Consider allowing people to step up diagonally with the water features as a way to make a more pleasant entry related to the street
- What is the acoustic impact with the water in the covered space? It could really be a cold echo-y place in the winter months
- There is a lot of concrete; loses wayfinding and hierarchy when it is all the same material. Would be supportive of a different material that would identify it as a special or important place
- In support of coloured concrete; it could also be used as wayfinding tool

### **Chair's summary:**

- Satisfactory resolution of Synapse Garden
- General consensus for the relationship to precinct as a whole
- Central entrance area still needs some improvement

### **Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve outstanding hierarchical issues with respect to the central entrance area.

## **3.2 Ponderosa Housing Hub Building (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David English who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment is sought on: the extent of canopy cover, relationship to Kenny, the west tower and podium design and the interior courtyards.

### **Panel Comments:**

#### General:

- Brilliant project, it's quite striking
- Very strong response to issues raised by Panel at last meeting
- Roofs are a huge issue – lost opportunity to use the space socially and to express sustainability

#### Relationship to Kenny:

- Resolving Kenny has been done brilliantly especially the strong exterior stair condition and how it relates to the interior stairwell
- Relationship to Kenny works well. It has come a long way since last iteration and is a wonderful improvement almost to a fault

#### Rain Cover:

- Would be in favour of continuous canopy in principle, but support non-continuous canopy as presented
- Canopy looks great I don't see the need to have continuous canopy
- Rain protection will function quite adequately with non continuous canopy

#### Material Palette:

- Lots of testing and back and forth will be required to get the final exterior material pallet right
- Mirror idea would be interesting; explore making the ground plane more interesting to animate the mirror above
- Applaud the use of Douglas firs on the soffits but lost opportunity to not use more natural materials on ground plane. It's an easy way to bring in warmth and a more campus like feel
- Grey as presented in boards seems a little dark explore a lighter colour
- Ensure that you don't see the relief on projection wall in south court (when using it as a projection wall)

#### West Tower:

- Good relationship between east and west towers; like the playfulness
- West tower still has an extruded quality – recognize that that is the intent but given that, more colour would help animate the tower to create more diversity in those continuous lines consider using more vibrant fall leaves instead of softer shades of green
- West tower still feels austere. Soften the heavy corners and explore something on the top corners
- The buildings are still austere and ask a lot of the landscape; it would make more sense to have buildings and landscapes fit into the terrain

#### Summary

- Unanimous support for relationship to Kenny
- Unanimous support for non-continuous canopy proposal
- General support for west tower with minor comments with respect to its austerity and colour
- Interior courtyard is acceptable

#### Panel Resolved



Panel moved to support the project subject to the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve minor issues raised.

### **3.2.1 Ponderosa Housing Hub Landscape (Development Application)**

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### General:

- Very well done; exceptional work with so many moves beautifully executed
- Great addition; well thought out and very much support the concept. Quality of building and landscape really complement each
- Would be great to have a big landscape to go with the scale of the buildings

##### Other:

- The idea of the diagonal lines is powerful and works well and like the geometry that you have set up, not fully convinced with alignment of the shapes. Don't feel like they've endured with the drawings. Would suggest different line system that work
- Wonder about the classroom and its geometry; it seems big and is hard to project and keep attention in that large of a space. Also concerned with the safety issues regarding the barrier especially late at night; could a diagonal line resolve safety issues and break up the classroom in to smaller rooms
- Find lower area fragmented; fewer moves would resolve this. The success of Cornell arts quad is that it's not so programmed. This is such a programmed space that editing some of the pieces will help find its scale and hit the programmatic requirements it needs; allow the students to set some of the program
- Lots of roof space that could be used for amenity space and green space; ensure the roofs will take the density loads of the future
- Really like the idea of the apple trees but they are so difficult (with yearly pruning etc) applaud the experimental aspect
- The cherry trees in the south west corner look weak

#### **Summary**

- Support for components of project
- Green roof would be desirable and would help supplement need for exterior programmatic space
- Concern with the geometry;
- Editing number of pieces within the space would be beneficial

#### **Panel Resolved**

Panel moved to support the project subject to applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to address comments provided

### **3.3 Bike Enclosure at Chemistry Building (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Adam Cooper who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment is sought

#### **Panel Comments:**

#### General:

- Architecture is great; clarity and restraint and simplicity of the project is great
- Needs to have some familiarity and pattern to it; so that it's not confused for a dumpster
- Encourage you to adopt a similar, cohesive look for future bike enclosures
- Would caution against using the same design throughout; uniqueness to the projects would be nice. Consider using like materials to keep the consistency
- Make sure that pedestrian experience is not a second class experience as you enter and leave through the landscape
- The door access is a huge issue from a safety standpoint it is worth considering a door swipe system. It would monitor who is entering and such oversight would enable more possibilities such as change room
- Cora bike racks have issues, but appreciate the reuse
- Nice opportunity to use the rooftop so that it becomes more than a garage
- Great opportunity for public art and celebrate more than just biking
- Only issue is the concrete end wall; it is the least engaging part of the project and could be subjected to graffiti. Consider re-orienting to the other end. Metal works best, it's smart and it flows

#### Summary

- Think about branding, bike rack type and concrete wall

#### Panel resolved:

Panel moves to support the project.

#### 4.0 Other Business

#### 5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 7:15PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, October 13, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:15  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Steve Jedreicich  
Richard Henriquez  
Michael Green  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin (Chair)

**Members Absent:** Lisa Castle  
Margot Long

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Steven Farris, Dean St. Andrews College  
Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects  
Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust  
Karen Kiest, Peter Nelson, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects  
Hugh Ker, Polygon Homes  
Nigel Baldwin, Nigel Baldwin Architects  
Joe Stott, Campus and Community Planning  
Bob Heaslip, Adera Group of Companies  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill 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 Approval of the September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

A motion to approve the September minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

### 3.1 St. Andrews Hall Expansion (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced who introduced Ray Letkeman who then introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment was sought on: Architecture on 2 storey pavilion and enhancing the outside space

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Number of positive moves – reclaimed wood is a great idea
- Idea of pavilion would work better if only the new piece be expressed as a pavilion
- Consider lightening up parts of the old building by adding some punched windows or setting back the kitchen window for better pavilion views
- Better relationship between old building and new building is desired
- Consider using the space on the flat roof? A green roof would be a perfect opportunity and also create visual attractiveness for the units above. Using a lighter colour would lower heat on upper floor
- Office views into the lounge would help as would sky lights for the interior offices

##### Pavilion expression

- 2 storey expression could be improved using other sunshade strategies - breaking the strong horizontal delineation would help
- Would be improved if there was more continuity and verticality
- Consider a parapet to better express a two storey space
- Top floor is top heavy – more transparency on the top level would be beneficial
- Stucco neutralizes the materials on the lower floor

##### Landscape

- Landscape is fine
- Enclosure and furniture is acceptable for hearth; geometry of space is not conducive to enclosures, but there are ways to work with it
- Hearth is a very nice idea – more enclosure would be good as well as more furniture

#### Chair's summary:

- Two storey needs more expression; more volume is desired
- Increase perceived separation between two buildings with deeper recess
- Provide more landscape seating around hearth to improve usability
- Use the roof - consider either a green roof or a pattern aggregate which would deal with heating issue.

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the application subject to the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve outstanding issues of the two story expression, separation from the existing building, better use of roof, solar shading strategy as well as landscape seating.

*Motion carried*

### 3.2 Memorial Road Public Realm Project (Pre-development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David Poettcker who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment is sought.

## **Panel Comments:**

### Hierarchy

- Bigger and bolder is preferred
- Design the east/west promenades as the 'street' and the dominant element, make the connections after; don't custom design the ramps for building entrances
- Flow into Tuning Fork Plaza lacks direction; look at massing scenarios of the future hub to understand the flow into tuning fork space; tighten up the landscape of the Plaza
- Double east/west walk preferred by most members as it fits with scale of the place
- Break up campus with street like blocks that are legible

### General:

- The terminus of Learner's Walk could be awkward; consider the notion of art
- Like the bridge across Learner's Walk
- Support removal of arcade as it is currently a barrier
- Introduce very few
- Extend steps through to full length of the road
- Consult surrounding neighbours
- Extending the trees into the plaza is a good thing

## **3.3 Academy Tower (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Hugh Ker who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment is sought.

## **Panel Comments:**

### General:

- Like the project a lot. It's a strong elegant building that will carry through to the details. Will be very beautiful. Lots of great moments in this project. Strong elegant building, well-articulated. Look forward to its completion
- Like the tower; there's no repetitiveness
- Vine wall would be fantastic if it could grow that tall however, the material underneath is interesting on its own
- Clear idea of orientation where entrance is. The logic is nice
- Make penthouse structures more visually interesting
- 

### Siting

- Articulation of condos are great, however the stand alone condos look orphaned
- Concern with stand alone town homes look orphaned and goes against the neighbourhood plan goals. Consider adding more units to increase density
- Consider softening the sharp end on south tip by pulling in town home and adding more green and open up the village lane
- Look at neighbouring towers– they share views a little bit better; explore moving the tower north a bit or making the narrow side facing Sage
- Lots of open area to the east beside the park area. Consider moving building to make the interior courtyard bigger

- Like the hard edge on north and west facades of the tower, though could be done more rigorously

#### Sustainability

- High REAP and stormwater management performance is commendable
- Given scale of glass on south side it will be interesting to see what the energy levels will be; south west shading needs to be re-examined

#### Expression and identity

- Strong physical response, but what else does it get from its UBC context? Consider what it means to live here at UBC
- Doesn't speak to its location – looks like it could be on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Importing downtown architecture into forest setting is not necessarily the right move
- Entryway is great. Liveliness of water brings in fun to the space
- Canopy is fun but could explain building more than it does. Glulam nice but does not feel integral

### 3.4 Wesbrook Village Amendments (Discussion)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Joe Stott who introduced the proposed amendments. General Panel comment is sought.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Support higher density in general
- Density is great
- Planning guidelines will allow you to shape the densities
- Consider more topography when looking at densities. Would assist in making it more dynamic for the public
- Height all along the back seems like you are turning your back on the forest
- Consider the life cycle of a 6 storey wood frame building and its economic repercussions; 4 storey probably provided more affordable housing
- Love the idea of taking this sub-campus and providing some parameters to really develop a character for this area
- Great parameter to have for all projects is to consider the roof conditions
- The liability of the units should take precedence over the economy of it
- Push for more towers
- More of a range in building heights would be preferable to the 4 storey, 6 storey and tower that we currently see in the area
- Built in massing flexibility would help

### 3.5 Lot 31 (Pre-development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Bryce Rositch who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment was sought with particular attention to the adjacent courtyard.

#### Panel Comments:

#### General:

- Commend the applicant team on their presentation
- Consider introducing pedestrian access to the roofscape
- Big worry about a six storey structure is its impact on surrounding buildings. Seems imposing on neighbouring sites and decreases pedestrian access
- Feels like building is caught in the middle between the water line at four storeys and the water line at six storeys
- Six storeys can work
- The difference between four and six storeys is not as significant – support six storey structure but managing the interface between four and six storeys is appreciated
- A mix of four, five and six storeys is preferred
- Courtyard addressed well and is made interesting. Impact on neighbouring building would be concern
- Courtyard concept is good as long as liveability issues are addressed
- Bigger challenge will be in courtyard treatment to neighbouring unit to the east. Looks like one of the tighter courtyards in neighbourhood. Re-examine a way to address fire truck access to achieve better courtyard relationship. Elevator cores and fire truck access will be biggest challenge
- Would like to see more vertical expression
- Really strong horizontals and really strong verticals are competing against one another – it's a hierarchy issue that will be resolved with design development

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:15PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

**DRAFT**

Last Updated:  
November 9, 2011

## MINUTES

**Date:** Tuesday, November 8, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:00  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Michael Green  
Richard Henriquez  
Margot Long  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin (Chair)

**Members Absent:** Steve Jedreicich

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust  
Chris Phillips, Nicole Taddune and Mike Derksen, Phillips Farevaag  
Smallenberg Landscape Architects  
David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Shelley Craig, Urban Arts Architecture  
Joe Fry, Hapa Collaborative  
Bob Heaslip and Norm Couttie, Adera Group of Companies  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:21 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the October 13<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

A motion to approve the October minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals



### 3.1 University Blvd (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David Poettcker who introduced the project team. Comment is sought on the central water feature element at the Main Mall University Boulevard intersection; and Achievement Square

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- really amazing and really exciting to see this happen and the amount of urban design gone into the campus – it's a welcome thing
- makes sense to structure a series of places along the Boulevard that relates to the terrain and conditions to the perimeter; appreciate the breaking down of University Boulevard into smaller elements
- on the whole, the project will elevate the public realm to a different magnitude

##### Achievement Square:

- Achievement Square very well done – like the flexibility of the space and opportunity to add to it over time; use of random lines and patterns is dynamic and looks great. Would caution you to maintain the flexibility as well as the ability to change over time
- would discourage the use of “I am” – explore the idea of “we are”
- like the sculpture – caution against giving management of pieces to artist community

##### Stormwater management feature

- stormwater terraces were better before expressed the full width between peripheral walkways – are the concrete steps really necessary? Water feature out of sand and membrane over the pools would be preferred or consider painting the concrete green or explore crushed gravel
- If they need to stay - treat side areas more like rooms rather than staircases (confine the east-west circulation to the peripheral walks); the formality is unnecessary. Turn middle bench around so it's perpendicular so as to slow movement down rather than facilitate it
- stormwater terraces – would be nice if they were rooms all slightly different and not fussy
- stormwater really important expression
- grass just above stormwater feature should be a native grass or meadow grass something taller
- terraces on east side unfortunate that they stop before the full diagonal. It is a bit stunted

##### Central Water feature:

- big problem with central feature – the round pool doesn't fit with the rest of the modern campus which is typically expressed in right angle geometries. Rings around it are a problem as they reinforce circularity. Should be reconsidered
- consider adding conceptual texture by making it round like a tree which has some jagged edges to it
- not as opposed to the central feature design, but don't like the fountain rising in such a traditional manner in the context of what is a more dynamic place. Not sure that it coincides with campus commitment to sustainability
- central feature is a neutral compromise, a non-design. It tries not to offend. Not spectacular or overwhelming - rather underwhelming

- would be nice to see more geometric play there – could be achieved with the way the jets work. Consider some asymmetry
- the mist seems odd in principle in our climate. It could work if it was fine tuned
- like the idea of a large seating space
- central feature should reflect moving forward rather than reflecting the history
- it's simple and elegant but such an expense and the wrong move
- needs contemporary expression
- the most interesting piece of the centre feature, whether its circular or not, is the water itself – whether it's gas, liquid or absent

East and west lawns:

- east lawn is not highly articulated – no problem
- suggest C&CP establish a Chemistry/Physics Building site build-to-line that is in line with the Henry Angus Building, so when this site redevelops it regularize the width of University Boulevard
- west lawn is fine, like the lawn terrace moving down
- lawn terrace is great, would like to use it

**Chair's summary:**

- positive support for Achievement Square
- consistent comments for stormwater feature/terrace - wider is better
- consistent support for west lawn design with handrails
- no support for centre feature as presented

**Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject with the comments above and subject to the applicant returning with a revised proposal for the central feature.

*Motion carried*

### **3.2 Engineering Student Centre (Pre-development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced David English who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment is sought.

**Panel Comments:**

General:

- everything presented is great and well thought out.
- building forms don't speak to structure right now and it will be interesting to see whether the building will speak to different engineering programs
- really doesn't tell an engineering story yet
- lovely, idiosyncratic building, but trying to figure out what it is
- project is working really hard to please everyone, however it needs its own voice and it's own drive. Needs to be edited down

Landscape:

- landscape concepts really great
- making the corridors along north side work will be a challenge

- understand what courtyard is trying to do, but feeling that programmatically, it will be quite dead. Northern and southern edges could have key pieces to help programming

#### Green Roof:

- lack of green roof is a lost opportunity on this project. Would make a big difference to neighbours that currently have views down on the courtyard and to expressing the values of today's engineering community
- recognize aversion to green roof operation standpoint, but this should be an opportunity for campus operations to test out green roof maintenance

#### Relationship to surrounding area

- have you considered depressed the building rather than building it up?
- feels foreign as a pavilion at the moment, there is an opportunity to further capture the pavilion expression
- ensure there are clear build to lines, it's a really tight space
- relationship to CEME is an important relationship to solve
- access issues are interesting, and therefore it will be interesting to see how that develops
- really like the tumbling staircase, perhaps lighten up some of that space
- very taken with previous iteration (with the ramp) shame that it hasn't been retained
- disappointed to see ramp go, ramp vocabulary a little unclear from drawing

### 3.3 Lot 31 (Pre-development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Bryce Rositch who introduced the project and the project team. General Panel comment is sought with particular attention to the adjacent courtyard.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- dramatic improvement from previous iteration; looks great!
- quite like the building improvements
- quite neighbourly
- pavilion open and exciting, but there is a nice opportunity to introduce the 'sail' theme in this feature
- patios are great
- interesting move to six floors in this neighbourhood, what are repercussions? Great opportunity for building to take on new form and break up monotony of this area

##### Massing:

- site plan much improved
- find this massing very positive like how you've extended the courtyard rather than stunting it
- like how the renderings are reading penthouse with some horizontality. Could use more articulation in the design process
- could edges on the west side be shifted to respond to the crescent and create continuity along the crescent?

- harness the crescent shape
- crescent form would help the building

#### Landscape:

- landscape is nice
- disconnect between imagery on landscape plan and the project name and theme of 'sail'. Consider making project sleeker and more aerodynamic or change name
- entrance landscape is a bit bitty, could made the entrance pathways wider to relate to both buildings. Simplify it
- ground plane patios should connect to the greenways
- it is important that the landscape be more usable
- not enough usable landscape in this neighbourhood; the space is good but can't be used. Think of how it could be programmed to maximize use?

#### Water feature

- excessive amount of water and it doesn't become special when it's part of the norm. Urge you to explore something else including increasing the ratio of vegetation to pool areas
- could be interesting if the water features took shape of sails
- revisit quantity of water

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 7:05PM.

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

**DRAFT**

Last Updated:  
December 1, 2011

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday December 1, 2011  
**Time:** 4:00pm-7:00  
**Venue:** 2<sup>nd</sup> floor Boardroom TEF III; 6190 Agronomy Road

**Members Present:** Lisa Castle  
Richard Henriquez  
Steve Jedreicich  
Margot Long (*abstained from item 3.3*)  
Maged Senbel  
Brian Wakelin (Chair)

**Members Absent:** Michael Green

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

**Presenters/Guests:** Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust  
Chris Phillips and Mike Derksen, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg  
Landscape Architects  
Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architect  
Hugh Ker and Rene Rose, Polygon Homes  
Nigel Baldwin, Nigel Baldwin Architects  
Colin Shrubbs, DYS Architecture  
Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership  
Bob Heaslip and Norm Couttie, Adera Group of Companies  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects  
Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the November 8th meeting minutes

A motion to approve the October minutes was made by the Chair.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

### 3.1 Memorial Road (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Craig Knight who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment was sought on the hierarchy of the space along the corridor.

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- Vast improvement since the last iteration. Responded really well to Panel comments
- Nice and simple design; it's wonderful
- Simplicity of design is great
- Fundamentally, shouldn't use cherry trees because they are diseased except for the one week they blossom. They cause more problems, but understand the use of them because they're memorable
- Aesthetically, cherries are great for the three days they are in bloom as they are celebratory trees and something the whole campus looks forward to every year
- It will be a nice compliment to Agricultural Road

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the project.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.2 University Blvd Central Feature (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Craig Knight who introduced the project team. Comment was sought on the Central Water feature element at the intersection of Main Mall and University Boulevard and the Stormwater Terraces feature

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- Generally, a huge improvement
- What has been done with design concept is admirable

Central Feature:

- Favourable concept
- Miss the mist; it would have been a great experience at night
- The fountain could be an opportunity to depart from the formality of the circle geometry
- There is a lack of interaction. Consider mirroring the lines of Achievement Plaza over top of the feature so that you could walk through it
- Concept of interaction and engagement is a big movement on campus and if there is some way to walk through the feature or over it, it builds on engagement and pulls everything together as opposed to just visual thing; it adds another layer
- More excitement than previous iteration yet still feels a bit dated. In the end, it will be all about the details
- Would like to see more dynamism, to loosen it up a bit more
- Like the idea of different stones

#### Stormwater Terraces:

- Really like the stormwater element; the way the terraces have been handled is great
- East lawn and stormwater terraces look absolutely effortless, appropriate and beautiful
- The crossway is a nice feature
- Like the viewing platform and the channels
- Definite improvement from last iteration

#### Chair's summary:

- East lawn stormwater terraces are very successful
- Central Feature has improved since last iteration

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus Planning to resolve physical engagement, interactivity, dynamism and the inner rings of the Central Feature.

*Motion Carried*

### 3.3 Academy Tower (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced applicant team. General Panel comment was sought on the location of the tower and how the project relates to the UBC context.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General:

- Beautiful building; very elegant pieces
- Quite a beautiful building; really like it
- Appreciate improvements to the overhangs and how the columns are set; nice way of laying them out
- Strong renderings; looking good
- North and west facades are really handsome
- The red colour might be too bold on the edge of a forest. Consider a different shade
- Consider strengthening the geometry in two areas: the axis to town homes and the axis from the park

##### Stand alone town homes:

- Aesthetically, the stand alone town homes are great
- Having detached homes is a serious political issue when Campus Planning is already dealing with density concerns in this neighbourhood.
- Trellis is a nice way to visually attach the stand alone town homes

##### Location of the tower:

- Can accept the explanation provided for not shifting the tower
- Willing to support location
- Privacy with Sage is good

#### Chair's summary:

- Support for project
- Majority supports for the design of the stand alone town homes

**Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project with Maged Senbel opposed.

*Motion Carried*

**3.4 Lot 31 (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Keith Hemphill who introduced the project and the project team. Panel comment was sought on the massing fronting the crescent, gateway off the crescent and the colour palette with particular regard to the level of contrast.

**Panel Comments:**

General:

- Really like the project; it's quite lively
- Very supportive of all the moves made especially the connection of the patios to the central courtyard
- Would be nice to have the connection of the courtyard all the way through; it would be a big move and speak to the community aspect
- Great improvement on landscape from previous iteration
- The project is still not rooted to the place and academic mission of the campus

Sail imagery:

- Don't care for sail treatments or anchors as it detracts from the elegance of the project
- Entrance canopy is a bit heavy and has more of a dock quality than a sail quality. Use more metal

Crescent resolution:

- No issues with the brick landscape wall
- The fence has a gateway feel rather than a gated feel. More of a welcoming arch which accentuates the crescent
- Explore softening the gated expression by removing the cover over the opening
- Like the straight edge of the architecture and the curve picked up through the landscape
- Gateway could be reinforced through the planting

White brick:

- Like the use of a lighter brick but consider a different brick colour; the white on other buildings in the area is stained.
- Lighter panelling is a bit stark when contrasting against the dark panel. Cut down the contrast in the cladding
- The contrast is too stark and could be more elegant
- Appreciate the change in the mullion colour on the ground floor

**Chair's summary:**

- Consensus of support for the revisions to the landscape
- Consensus on the recommendations for the cladding



- The gate is favoured provided it has a gateway feel and not a gated feel
- Landscape connectivity/access to Ultima is desired

**Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus Planning to finalizing the colour, the portal to the crescent and improving the connectivity to Ultima.

*Motion Carried*

**4.0 Other Business**

**5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:47PM.