



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes  
2012

# Advisory Urban Design Panel Meeting

## MINUTES

**Date:** Thursday, January 12, 2012  
**Time:** 5:00pm-6:30  
**Venue:** Policy Labs A/B CIRS Building – 2260 West Mall

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

**Members Absent:** Michael Green  
Steve Jedreicich

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

**Presenters/Guests:** David English, UBC Properties Trust  
Shelley Craig, Urban Arts Architecture  
Joe Fry, Hapa Collaborative

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 5:21 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting minutes

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

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development Proposals

#### 3.1 Engineering Student Centre (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 was sought on the west elevation, energy performance and the south-west pathway.

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- Appreciate the integration of comments from previous meeting while staying true to user group

- Strongly support the project. It's attractive and playful but not overly presumptuous. Nice features. Really applaud the applicant for the programming options for the spaces
- More respectful of neighbours especially CEME
- The red ribbon is a nice touch and speaks to the user group
- Has more of a pavilion feel than previous iteration
- Like the grass and the porch effect
- Really like the asphalt idea and how it's a little rough. It can be painted (experimental paints could be a fun thing). It will invite use and it creates something dynamic such as a 2D version of the "E" on Man Mall
- Biggest move is making the green roof though it should only be accessed by Operations staff
- Should recess the tree planter on the rooftop deck
- Not enough space for recycling
- Washroom capacity requirements need to be checked out for big events

#### Outer stair:

- Exterior stair leading up to second level is too slight. Consider a gesture at the bottom to make it more significant and inviting as well as to improve the relationship with the terrace that was there in previous iterations
- Consider a platform 2-3 ft high so that the stairs become the staging area over big plaza

#### South-west pathway:

- Like the meandering path but caution against it given the tendency of people to pick the fastest route. Seek opportunity to keep path but as a secondary offshoot
- The overall space is so small it would be nice to get as much lawn as possible. A strictly diagonal path would cut into the open space

#### Energy performance:

- Less concern over fishbowl effect of glazing on the west elevation; only an issue if the energy performance is an issue

#### Rain protection:

- Rain protection is important. Fill in the cut out areas in the west landscape along side the building so the overhang provides rain protection
- Overhang is needed at back door

#### Chair's summary:

- General support for project
- Support for acknowledgement of the natural desire lines of pedestrians through the courtyard without creating a strictly diagonal line
- Glazing considered adequate but modify if energy performance is compromised
- Design development of back stair dimension and its relationship to stage

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the project subject to applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve outstanding issues relating to the dimension of the south stair, the stair relationship to the stage, continuous rain protection and to greater integration into the architecture of the tree proposed on the second level.

*Motion carried*

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:30PM.



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Date:</b>       | February 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2012   |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00-5:15   |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Room 402, Allard Hall, 1822 East Mall   |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Lisa Castle, Michael Green (Chair), Steve Jedreicich, Maged Senbel,                     |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Richard Henriquez, Margot Long, Brian Wakelin   |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Dean Gregory, Karen Russell, Laura Holvor (Recorder)                    |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Dave Poettcker (UBC Properties Trust), John Wall and Chris Skylar (Public Architecture) |

---

### 1.0 Ponderosa Hub Update (Information only)

Gerry McGeough introduced the proposed updates to the Ponderosa Hub façade: revised pre-cast panel design for Phase I West and new highlight colour scheme focused on the lower level curtain wall.

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- The building has a brutalist character to it
- Consider introducing more than one board-form for the pre-cast panels to maintain the imperfection qualities of board form concrete
- Colour panels could work if the interior walls were a neutral colour
- Consider further animation at night with painted interior lobby walls instead of the exterior colours
- The lack of colour works in the residential areas, but there could be opportunities to introduce colour in the common spaces above the main floor level

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel

*Motion Carried*

### **3.0 Approval of the January 13th meeting minutes**

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

*Motion Carried*

### **4.0 Development Proposals**

#### **4.1 Transit shelter** (Development Application Amendment)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief background to the project and introduced Dave Poettcker who introduced the project team. General comment was sought in addition to comment on maintenance issues and the whether the design would have timeless quality appropriate for its location.

#### **Panel Comments:**

General:

- Interesting looking shelter. Really like the canopy idea, the wood works really well
- Thoughtful design and really well done
- The design is lively

Vertical Protection:

- Vertical protection would be well founded given the weather. Consider portions of verticality instead a complete enclosure
- Something's got to be done to protect people from rain and wind. Consider enclosing one corner

Lighting Strategy:

- Lighting doesn't seem bright enough for CPTED levels and safety should be a priority
- Would be nice to see how the light goes through the structure throughout the year

Aesthetic Concept

- Like how the wood replicates the trees as opposed to the buildings
- It will be a timely design and will last a number of years and also has an artfulness to it
- Underside needs careful thinking but is a risk worth taking
- Concern with the glass detailing. Removing the glass edge and charcoaling it would create a more artful structure and make the edge more organic.
- Doing away with the wrapping glass supports more of a canopy idea and makes it more whimsical and less boxy
- Big cost issues with joint connections. Ensure they are designed so that you can get competitive pricing
- Consider pushing the envelope with wood connections as opposed to metal ones

Maintenance Issues:

- Glass enclosure makes sense from a maintenance point of view, but there is concern with what it will look like two years down the line when birds and dusty debris mar the underside. Think of strategies to mitigate bird problems including not having risers.

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

- General support for project
- Some level vertical protection is a good idea
- Consideration of light levels and public safety would be welcome
- Timelessness quality has been achieved

- Consider bird issues

**Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject to applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve outstanding issues relating to the vertical protection, maintenance specifically bird considerations light levels and public safety issues and a degree of simplification.

*Motion carried*

**4.2 Modern Green - Yu DP11010**

Gerry McGeough introduced an alternate brick the applicant team has requested using for the exterior cladding of the Yu residential building in Wesbrook Neighbourhood.

**Panel Comments:**

General:

- New brick is really flat and monolithic compared to the original. The original brick is wire-cut and really varied and has more life to it.
- The building relies on texture and the movement of the original brick to give the building elegance
- Is there a possibility to play with the relief of the new brick to create some character?
- Not a suitable alternative

**Panel resolved:**

Non-support for the proposed alternate brick material, support for the original DP brick material.

*Motion carried*

**5.0 Other Business**

**6.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 5:15 PM.



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Date:</b>       | March 8, 2012  |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00-4:45  |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Lisa Castle, Michael Green, Margot Long (abstained), Brian Wakelin (Chair)               |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Maged Senbel, Richard Henriquez, Steve Jedreicich  |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Dean Gregory, Karen Russell, Laura Holvor (Recorder)                                     |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Dave Poettcker (UBC Properties Trust), Margot Long and Miriam Plishka<br>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 4:07 PM. A motion to approve the agenda was made by the Panel

*Motion Carried*

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

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

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development applications

#### 3.1 East Campus Park (Pre-development application)

Dean Gregory introduced the proposed East Campus park located south of the Sitka building on Wesbrook Mall and Thunderbird Crescent. General Panel comment is sought with specific attention to programming and geometries of the space.

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- Project is well thought out with a lot of great ideas
- Nice scheme; it will come along nicely
- Like the bird idea
- Like how the project takes the bones of the space and makes it stronger
- Quite usable for residents and students on campus which is welcome



- Not sure of the large circular community amenity area – seems forced on the landscape your working with
- I love the planning - the logic - the layering of the schemes. Lots of compelling moves
- Opportunities to create hierarchy with materials used in the rings and pathways
- Nice that you have left some of the existing structures. Just heavy enough

#### Geometry of the space:

- Geometries seem to work in the space
- Geometry is curious and interesting
- Would like to see how use and program develops geometric composition
- 
- Show how existing tree pattern informs geometry of circular spaces
- Show how the intersections of the circles is resolved at next iteration

#### **4.0 Other Business**

#### **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 4:45pm



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Date:</b>       | April 5, 2012  |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00- 4:45   |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Lisa Castle, Maged Senbel, Richard Henriquez, Steve Jedreicich, Margot Long (abstained), Brian Wakelin (Chair) |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Michael Green  |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Dean Gregory, Joe Stott, Laura Holvor (Recorder)   |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Dave Poettcker (UBC Properties Trust), Margot Long and Miriam Plishka<br>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 4:05 PM. A motion to amend the agenda was made.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes

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

*Motion Carried*

### 3.0 Development applications

#### 3.1 East Campus Park (Development application)

Gerry McGeough introduced the proposed Development Application for the East Campus Park located south of the Sitka building on Wesbrook Mall and Thunderbird Crescent. General Panel comment is sought with specific attention to programming and geometries of the space.

#### Panel Comments:

General:

- Applicant has been quite responsive to Panel comments which is appreciated
- Lovely park well done; like it a lot
- Love the design; great work of art and blends in well with the surrounding area
- Consider planting trees beside the TRIUMF building

Program:

- Ensure thought goes into selecting the equipment for the fitness circuit and consider consulting with fitness people on campus to ensure proper design
- Consider something other than metal for the birdhouses
- Consider another picnic table around the BBQ pit as it would get used
- Pursue greater design consistency and harmony within the park to ensure that all the pieces are cohesive and work together
- Consider moving the boardwalk so that it is beside the wetland instead of over top of it
- Like the boardwalk; it has a fun adventurous feel to it which is welcome

Geometry of the space:

- Like the circular geometry that creates a sense of place and allows for a pause in the space

**Chair Summary**

- Support for the project and recognition of team's response to Panel comments
- Get street trees in front of TRIUMF if possible (east side)
- Take care with fitness equipment choice
- No metal birdhouses
- Cohesion of the design details desired
- Consider another picnic table
- Relocation of one segment of the boardwalk to the side of the wetland instead of over top of it

**Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus and Community Planning to resolve the six elements mentioned above.

*Motion Carried*

**4.0 Other Business**

**5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 4:45 pm



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Date:</b>       | May 3, 2012   |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00- 6:30  |
| <b>Place:</b>      | <u>həm'ləsəm'</u> House Study Lounge, Totem Park Residence, 2525 West Mall  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Maged Senbel, Mark Ostry, Martin Nielsen, Margot Long (abstained from item 3.1), Michael Green  |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Steve Jedreicich, Lisa Castle,  |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Dean Gregory  |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Mike Redmond (UBC Properties Trust), David Kiloh, Jason Wegman (PWL Partnership), Adam Cooper (C+CP), Mark van der Zalm (van der Zalm and Associates) |

---

### 1.0 Election of a new Chair and Vice-chair

The term of the previous Chair ended at the last meeting necessitating the election of a new Chair and vice-chair. The AUDP Terms of Reference require the chair to be a registered Architect. Michael Green, MAIBC, was nominated. A motion to elect Michael Green was made.

*Motion Carried*

A motion to nominate and elect Mark Ostry, MAIBC, as the Vice-chair was made.

*Motion Carried*

### 2.0 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 amend the agenda was made.

*Motion Carried*

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

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

*Motion Carried*

## **4.0 Development applications**

### **4.1 Totem Park Landscape** (Development application Phase I; Pre-application Phase II)

Gerry McGeough introduced the applicant team. Jason Wegman then presented the overall design concept for the Totem Park precinct, noting that the current Development Application is only for the area defined in the plans as Phase I. The remainder of the project will be submitted for application as future phases at a later date.

#### **Panel Comments:**

##### **General:**

- The heritage space is quite incredible and it is a delicate balance to intervene.
- Recommend squaring off the service route to the loading area as it turns to the west.
- Lots of detail is missing in the plan and therefore ask that staff ensures it gets the level of detail necessary.
- Subtlety of the moves is important and yet hard to fully understand and judge, particularly the views created or lost. It is unfortunate that the application is not more complete.
- Signage idea is good noting it is distinguished from the UBC standards.
- Make better bike storage a priority in Phase II.
- Interested in planting – heritage approach is important.

##### **Family Room:**

- Family room is interesting, but it is not detailed to reveal how it is to be used. This detailing could be developed more.
- Generally fine with the location, but the trick is to break it down by reducing the amount of brick paving. Bricks in the original design are treated as an island within the concrete.
- Like the room.
- Keep the existing wall, but reduce its height. Retain delineation of space.
- Keeping the wall where it is good from a wayfinding perspective. From a heritage perspective I could take or leave the wall.
- Lowering the wall would work well, though removing it completely would result in making a secondary path.

##### **Seating:**

- Nice to see the heritage benches as important. Old benches are stronger than the new benches.
- When you have something new it should be distinct and therefore fine with contemporary bench design.

##### **North entry and turnaround:**

- Like the notion of the proposed square geometry to slow cars down and it is consistent with the geometry of the place.
- Sense of arrival from the north is not fully resolved. Could a short wall be introduced? Where is the gateway? Is having a well paved drive around enough or should an early "gateway" be considered? A larger scale exploration of the north arrival is warranted.
- Consider keeping the north gate to Nootka Residence open and improving the entrance area in front.

- Additional CPTED thinking is needed for the lane leading to Marine Drive.

### **Chair Summary**

- Lots of detail missing and therefore we need to trust the applicant and staff's detailed review.
- Bike storage is a major issue.
- A marker for the north entry is lacking for wayfinding clarity.
- Further design development of the 'family room' area is needed.
- Restore any existing benches where possible and introduce the new style where needed.

### **Panel resolved:**

The Panel supports the proposed Phase I work with the conditions that the loading lane corner is squared and that the quality of the project details are resolved to staff's satisfaction. And further, that the following issues be fully dealt with in the Phase II proposal: better quality bike storage facilities, improved entrance experience from the north, improved north entrance to the Nootka Residence, a CPTED response for the lane flanking Totem Park Forest, larger concept of wayfinding, and details of the 'family room' including the retention approach for the existing wall.

### *Motion Carried*

## **4.2 UBC Skate park (Pre-development application)**

Gerry McGeough introduced Adam Cooper who then introduced the rest of the applicant team. General comment is sought.

### **Panel Comments:**

#### **General:**

- Like the project direction. Thrilled UBC is doing this. Very good location.
- **Lighting is important and worry how well it will work. Need to work it out carefully for safety.**
- There is an intimidation factor in skate parks, therefore pursue ways to make it safer and inviting for the novice to be allowed in.
- Keep at least a pedestrian path along the north edge of the basketball court.
- From a design perspective reconsider eliminating the eastern section of the proposal. There is already circulation to the north of the electrical sub-station.
- The trellis is not needed.
- If you are losing the trellis for budget reasons, replace it with a couple of trees to achieve gateway effect.
- The north-south access across this part of campus is an important movement and therefore the diagonal from the south-east to the north-west corners of the park should be strengthened for pedestrian movement. Consider flipping the park features so the stairs are on the south to address this.
- Regret the loss of the beautiful trees.....could you save another tree and integrate it into the project?
- Lack of seating is an issue. It is a huge lost opportunity to allow the community to watch and participate. Concrete bleachers are a good approach that could double for basketball court viewing.

- Glass is good because it allows visibility through the required barrier.
- Glass seems like the wrong material for a skate board park - suggest designing the guard rail with the same language as the rest of the skate park such as a steel rail.
- Think about how or if you manage graffiti.
- Great presentation and good level of material.
- An east-west section through the project will be important for the next presentation.

## **5.0 Other Business**

## **6.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:30 pm



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Date:</b>       | June 7, 2012   |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00- 5:00   |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Lisa Castle, Margot Long, Martin Nielsen, Michael Green (Chair)  |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Maged Senbel, Mark Ostry and Steve Jedreicich  |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Laura Holvor (Recorder)  |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Dave English (UBC Properties Trust), Brian Wakelin (Public Architecture + Communication Design), Joe Fry (Hapa Collaborative) Kavie Toor (UBC Athletics) |

---

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM. *Motion Carried*

### 2.0 Approval of the May 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting minutes

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

### 3.0 Development applications

#### 3.1 Rugby Pavilion (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough provided a background to the project. General Panel comment was sought with specific attention to the second story and knitting the landscape to the facility.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General

- Very cool project
- I love the simplicity, purity and sculptural elements in the back
- Very compelling project and presentation

##### Material

- The alignment of all the second floor south facing materials seems a little off and doesn't speak to the desire for a floating pavilion
- Really love how the way the bleachers spill out into the landscape. Concrete is a good material choice for these
- The wood cladding is good as well
- The main glazing really needs to float by moving it into the plane of the main exterior wall



- Consider a splash of colour on the inside wall
- Charred wood would be a big issue because people would pick at it or rub up against it. Put it in an area where no one can touch it
- Don't need to pull the glass out necessarily

#### Roof

- Hesitancy lies with the roof. I like how it looks solid and stable. The roof just seems to disappear to the arena behind it
- Really like it but the roof seems disconnected
- Would be nice to incorporate where the water would come off the roof and connect it to a rain garden
- Fatness of the roof is a serious problem. It should be expressed a lot thinner
- Spend some energy on the roof and everything will fall into place

#### Relation to the landscape

- Really nice expression in the landscape.
- Strong grades but might pose a challenge for grass cutting and maintenance
- The way it meets the ground is beautiful
- Accessibility would be an issue. Consider how people access the lift and where the viewing platform would be. You will want to an accessible route up to the club room

#### Chair Summary

Further consideration is needed for

- There is an opportunity to celebrate the way the rain water is expressed as it leaves the roof and drops into the landscape. It would be worth considering a rain garden expression. expression in the landscape
- The building is modest against its large neighbor. Lighting and colour might be considered to help the building hold a presence in its context.
- The roof structure could be expressed in a more delicate and interesting way. The roof is currently the most noticeably undeveloped area of the design and yet one of the most important.
- Accessibility concerns, A ramp to the second floor in the landscape or highly accessible means of using the elevator is recommended. The nature of the sport results in a wide range of temporary and permanent disability within the regular viewing constituency.
- The plane of the glazing facing the pitch should be developed to help the clarity and simplicity of the overall building forms.
- Revisit the charcoal as the cladding material

#### Panel resolved:

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus & Community Planning to resolve the elements mentioned in the summary above.

*Motion Carried*

#### 4.0 Other Business

#### 5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 5:02 pm



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Date:</b>       | July 26, 2012  |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00 - 6:48 PM   |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Maged Senbel, Mark Ostry, Lisa Castle, Margot Long, Martin Nielsen, Michael Green (Chair)  |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Steve Jedreicich   |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Clare Smith (Recorder)   |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Craig Knight (UBC Properties Trust), John Wall (Public Architecture + Communication Design), Walter Francl (Walter Francl Architecture), Karen Kiest (Karen Kiest Landscape Architecture), Mark van der Zalm (van der Zalm + Associates), Adam Cooper (C&CP), Anita Ryder (Project Services) |

---

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

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

### 2.0 Approval of the June 7th meeting minutes

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

### 3.0 Development applications

#### 3.1 Wesbrook Community Centre (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough provided a background to the project. General Panel comment was sought with specific attention to the connecting space, the east elevation, the space between the high school and the community centre.

#### Panel Comments:

##### General

- This will be an amazing hub of activity so needs to be studied in detail to make sure get everything right – there'll be a lot of people seeing it.
- A simple design complicated by the relationships and moving parts within it.
- Start to look for places to place signage –consider it in relation to where the day care is to be placed.

- Like the three sections, how they read independently.
- For the teen room, the opening doors seems like a good idea; allows to spill out into the car park for events/farmers markets.
- Doesn't think there's a logical flow through the site.
- Biggest issue is the front door – the gymnastics of the different volumes are competing to the point where not sure what you're supposed to be looking at.
- Like the massing– 3 forms are a good decision – simplify to add clarity.
- The south side is a little domestic compared to other sides.
- The form facing east looks like it is still being developed.
- Questioned geometry of the cranked portion – it pushes the building further south.

#### Stage/North facade

- Maybe some redistribution of program space around the gym and stage – consider putting stage on end to increase stage use and give breathing room to school.
- Short of that, maybe think about planting up wall – seems a bit stark – will get tagged if not occupied in some way.

#### Materials

- Like the choice of materials.
- Love use of CLT but it is a visually busy material – could maybe break it up even with just a painted plane – seems very relentless at the minute.
- For the use of CLT in the gym, consider vibration –eg bouncing balls off the walls in the gym – laminations could minimise this.
- Feel that there is too much concrete, both in this building and on campus generally. Pursue more variety in the concrete other than just different colours.
- Stone column doesn't seem resolved – needs more development.

#### Daycare

- Worries that the daycare will block off access from the gymnasium to the playing field.
- Also questions regarding the crush space; where is it, will it accommodate the number of people who will use it?

#### Sustainability

- Very strong sustainability.
- Suggested that the roof is made into a green roof – would make this a great visible representation of the building's sustainability.
- No problem with not applying for LEED – makes more sense for the money to be put into actually increasing the building's sustainability.

#### The landscape

- People are going to want to come from south patio into lawn area, so would be nice to have the ability to move through there.
- Bring tree boulevard down the new street so that its separating lawn from road and move the drop off nearer to the community centre.
- The trees are small compared to forest pocket – campus has too many small trees and this is a site that could afford to have fewer trees but bigger, more majestic trees.
- Trees in lawn area suggested.

#### Siting

- Disappointed that UNA is not living up to their goal of honouring the forest.
- Maybe consider moving building little to west to create a slightly larger public space on the east side and separating the building from the parking lot

## **Chair Summary**

Further consideration is needed for

- Siting: too late but want to state that the project is not living up to their goal of protecting the forest.
- Materials are supported.
- Massing – supported but the north side feels pinched: move the stage.
- Expression of entrance – recessing and landscape – add more forecourt and seating.
- Like to see teen room doors.
- Signage concerns with way finding.
- Concern about daycare - is it the right location? Develop further to confirm.
- Landscape – look at concrete and types of trees, consider green roof.
- Shift to west to create space between community centre and parking lot.

## **Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project subject to the applicant working with Campus & Community Planning to resolve the elements mentioned above.

*Motion Carried*

## **3.2 UBC Multi-use skatepark**

Gerry McGeough introduced Mark van der Zalm (Landscape Architect) and Adam Cooper from (C&CP Transportation Planning), who are bringing the plans for the skatepark back to the AUDP after having made adjustments suggested at the May meeting.

General

- Great project, good changes.
- Terrific project – like simplicity.
- Great community amenity.
- Concerned about seating but not sure how many people sit around skateboard park
- The laser cut aluminum would look nice as long as the design would appeal to the users of the park.
- Like the opacity of the laminated glass but the cost factors may be limiting.

Landscape

- Make sure good tree protection measure are in place during construction, as some of these trees are really critical.
- Explore moving the trees rather than cut them down – donate to a tree supply company.

## **Chair Summary**

Further consideration is needed for

- The fence materials.
- Donating the trees rather than cutting them down.

## **Panel resolved:**

Panel supports the project

## **4.0 Other Business**

### **4.1 The Artificial Turf field at the Community Centre**

Gerry asked Craig Knight to give the group an overview of the artificial field that is going to be next to the Wesbrook Community Centre.

#### **Panel Comments:**

- Feels like there's too hard a line between the field and other play space of the Community Centre.
- Resolve symmetry of the bleachers on the field.
- Visitors and home supporters will not stay on opposite sides of the field – they tend to follow the sun.
- Make sure there's enough room so that there can be tents for the players.
- As food can't be taken onto artificial turf, should have some areas that are non-turf so that viewers can eat/drink without having to stand behind the fence.

It was decided that the field could go ahead with the support of the panel, subject to the applicant working with Campus & Community Planning to resolve the elements mentioned in the summary above.

## **5.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:48 pm



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Date:</b>       | October 11, 2012  |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00 - 6:25 PM  |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)   |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Maged Senbel, Margot Long, Mark Ostry (step-in Chair), Martin Nielsen, Steve Jedreicich   |
| <b>Absent:</b>     | Michael Green (Chair), Lisa Castle  |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)  |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Karen Marler (Hughes Condon Marler Architects), Shirley Blumberg (KPMB Architects), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative), David English (UBC Properties Trust), Steve McFarlane, (McFarlane Biggar Architects & Designers), Rob Brown (UBC Properties Trust) |

---

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

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

### 2.0 Approval of the July 26th meeting minutes

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

### 3.0 Development Applications

#### 3.1 Ponderosa Commons Phase 2 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough provided a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Karen Marler (Hughes Condon Marler Architects), Shirley Blumberg (KPMB Architects), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative) and David English (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on the appropriateness of two tower cladding options with respect to colour and material, on sustainability strategies to manage solar gain along the south side, and on strategies for opening up the garden level to the public realm to increase vitality along University Boulevard.

## Panel Comments:

### General

- Elegant and beautifully realized on the site: courtyard, West Mall, University Boulevard.
  - Really like how the tower comes off the ground, and the strong coloured soffit allows the tower to float – it lifts the spirit
  - Like the way the courtyard opens to the east
  - Landscape concept works well, including the private courtyard
- Supportable at a preliminary level
  - Support for the development and massing
  - Support the big gesture, but many important details need to be resolved
  - Three of the four corners are most resolved, however the one under the Dean's Office needs more resolution and animation
- Need a shadow study
  - Day lighting for daycare outdoor space is a concern; raises questions about whether it will receive direct sunlight at noon. Important that this area receives as much sunlight as possible
  - Garden level courtyards – curious whether sunlight will shine into the lower courtyard
- Breezeway off University Boulevard seems a bit tight, would like it to be slightly more generous.
- It would be unfortunate if the Ponderosa Pine were lost due to water table changes. This must therefore be studied well
- Upper floors are monotonous, be sensitive to the user's experience. Could you introduce a lounge to break them up?
- Loading may have a big impact on the future development – study it carefully
- A larger model for the University Boulevard interaction with Phase II would be helpful at the next panel review

### Tower cladding and colour

- Solar gain on south tower is a concern. The comfort of tower residents must be addressed
- Massing is very good, but it feels like a single developer has taken over the area. Wish for a little more variety, as it could feel a bit too relentless
- Indifferent about the material options of the tower, but the coloured tower option should not have come up. More subtle colour options are encouraged
- Concrete sandwich panel is much more elegant and appropriate for a university. Window wall feels commercial. Can you inject finer grains of colour similar to those in the small spandrel panels?
- Like the idea of the tower cladding getting lighter
  - Pleased with the grey gradation, but concur that sandwich panel is the better option; can the two be married?
  - General preference for the precast, but like the way that the window wall provides necessary relief
- The massing and materials embody the language and special qualities of the UBC campus, and harken back to the earlier generation of UBC buildings

- Yes the concrete panel is more dignified, but using it across the entire Phase I and II complex is heavy and daunting. In this context, the window wall of varying shades of grey provides a necessary element of relief.

#### Location of grand stairs and animation of University Boulevard

- Really like the grand staircase coming down – the stairs and inner courtyard locations are fine
  - Don't feel there needs to be a connection from the interior courtyard and interior stair to University Boulevard
  - Good to have the interior courtyard and grand stair on the inside
  - Perspective of second stair option by the window shows more promise
- Option 1 (agenda package option) has too much dead space fronting University Boulevard
  - Hopefully the classrooms along University Boulevard have windows to provide relief and animation
  - Need the front University Boulevard space to be more animated
- Like the grand staircase as is, while adding strategies to animate and prove the animation of University Boulevard. Like the third highbred option
- Sunken courtyard needs more study given its limited access to sunlight

#### **Chair Summary:**

- Support for the development and massing, but there are several important aspects that need to be resolved
- Like the grand staircase as is, but need to develop strategies to animate University Boulevard. The hybrid study provided by the consultant is moving in the right direction.
- Shadow study needed, particularly for daycare open space.
- The concrete panel is dignified, but window wall of varying shades of grey provides necessary relief to the whole project.

#### **Panel Resolved:**

The Panel concluded to not vote on the application due to a number of important aspects not being resolved, and due to an incomplete submission package.

### **3.2 UBC Bookstore Addition** (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Steve McFarlane (McFarlane Biggar Architects & Designers) and Rob Brown (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on ways to incorporate passive energy efficiency strategies, and on avenues to communicate a theme of sustainability through the project.

#### General

- Great project, A+
- The existing corner needs more of a presence. The project provides this presence while remaining modest and not competing with the surrounding context
- A great and needed addition
- Simple and elegant, the bookstore needed some help



- Like the white brick as an entry to the campus core
- Like the design of the disabled accessible level
- The outdoor space needs programming to fill it

#### Glass treatment on street facades

- Like the glass for being light and airy
- Love the permeability of the glass – would like to see management maintain this permeability
- Like graphic piece on the windows
- Like the idea of the fitted glass and working with the community to populate it

#### Areas for refinement

- Like the white brick, but it feels flimsy and thin and does not turn the corner. It should turn the corner
- Exterior ramp feels tight at the top. Can you slide the ramp and stairs down so it doesn't feel like an access ramp?
- The concrete plinth – could it be a place that creates opportunities for things to happen?

#### Catwalk

- Question support for catwalks at the second level – why would you go up there? It is an odd thing and maybe it would work for being odd, but perhaps you could program it
- There is a JJ Bean on Alberni Street that has a very successful cat walk
- Majority of Panel members felt that the catwalk would be successful as is

#### Sustainability

- Project is sustainable as you are making the existing structure work for another 100 years
- A bit worried about the amount of glass – can it meet the energy target of 42% below the model building?
- There is not one native plant in the project and yet we are seeking to be a sustainable campus – cherry and plum trees sequester the least carbon. Consider native plants to help tell the sustainability story
- Sustainability performance could be showcased in the stair area where people slow down and are able to read messaging

#### **Panel Resolved:**

Panel unanimously resolved to support the project.

#### **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:25 PM



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Date:</b>       | November 8, 2012   |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 4:00 - 6:20 PM   |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)  |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Michael Green (Chair), Margot Long, Mark Ostry, Martin Nielsen, Steve Jedreicich, Lisa Castle  |
| <b>Regrets:</b>    | Maged Senbel   |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)   |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Karen Marler (Hughes Condon Marler Architects), Shirley Blumberg (KPMB Architects), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative), David English (UBC Properties Trust), Martin Nielsen (Dialog), Dianna Foldi (UBC Project Services), Bruce Haden (Dialog), Rob Barnes (Perry + Associates) |

---

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

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

### 2.0 Approval of the October 11th meeting minutes

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

### 3.0 Development Applications

#### 3.1 Ponderosa Commons Phase 2 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Karen Marler (Hughes Condon Marler Architects), Shirley Blumberg (KPMB Architects), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative) and David English (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on childcare centre outdoor space solar access, two colour options for the tower cladding sandwich panelling, the width of the breezeway opening, animation along University Boulevard, loading bay location adjustments for tree preservation, the relationship between the Ponderosa Pine and surrounding water table, and strategies for maximizing green space within the courtyard area.

## **Panel Comments:**

### Daycare

- Ongoing studies are needed to find a more optimal location for the daycare within the constraints of the program and challenges of the massing.
- This is not an ideal space for young children. The daycare should be moved to a sunnier location, as the current space receives too little sunlight according to City of Vancouver guidelines.
- If the trees along the north side of the building are not preserved, the daycare would look out onto a building. Ideally the daycare should look out onto the public realm.
- The program could potentially move children between daycares and public open spaces across campus to provide the required sunlight exposure.
- Consider shifting the mass of the tower with the daycare to the deck on the eastside for more sunlight.

### Tower Cladding

- The charcoal colour creates a nice contrast to surrounding buildings and trees.
- The strong colour is a welcome change from the washed-out greys typical of Vancouver buildings.
- Ensure that the colour ages well and is maintained overtime.
- Support the coloured soffits. Are there any opportunities to include wood soffits for a more 'B.C.' feel?
- The elegance of the cladding will depend on how well it is detailed.
- Concrete panels are more appropriate for an academic environment, but reflect light less than window wall. There needs to be a balance of concrete, coloured windows and greenery to prevent the grey from becoming too stark.
- Have efforts been made to mediate solar gain on the concrete panels?

### Courtyard Accessibility & Daylight Access

- The concept is very strong and well detailed. Improvements have been made in all areas within the constraints of the program.
- See the courtyard becoming an important meeting space.
- Lack of access is a problem. Consider ways to address mobility issues and create more points of entry.
- Make sure that the landscape works from a species point of view.
- The maples are a good choice, and might work well in the upper courtyard too as dogwoods need lots of light.
- The lower courtyard does not receive enough sunlight. Consider raising the massing on the north side while lowering the south bar to introduce more light.
- The tall structure surrounding the courtyard creates a relationship issue between massing and open space.

### University Boulevard Animation & Breezeway

- Interior animation is critical along University Boulevard in the Level 1 garden plan. It must frame activity in the area around it and encourage the community to come together in a lively space.
- The breezeway opening looks great and is the right size.

**Summary:**

- Universal support for the project.
- The daycare location is a concern.
- Fairly universal support for the charcoal tower cladding colour, though there are some shade, solar and reflectivity concerns.
- Courtyard accessibility and daylight access is a concern.
- More animation is needed along University Boulevard.
- Support for the size of the breezeway.

**Panel Resolved:**

Panel unanimously resolved to support the project. The Panel encourages any opportunity to find a better daycare location.

**3.2 District Energy Centre** (Pre-Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Martin Nielsen (Dialog), Bruce Haden (Dialog), Rob Barnes (Perry + Associates) and Dianna Foldi (UBC Project Services), who presented the project. General Panel comment was sought.

**General**

- Great for the university to pursue the project so creatively. A fascinating and well thought out project – on the right track.
- Think it is important that the campus infrastructure is being highlighted.
- Like the transparency of the design, and the participatory concept.
- Consider contacting Ray Cole about including this building as a UBC regenerative architecture workshop pilot project.

**Materials & detailing**

- The quality of this type of design will depend on how well the details are executed.
- Recommend VM over Rhein zinc, as the colour is warmer and darker.
- Is it possible for one side to be made of metal cladding and the other of concrete? This could add an interesting dimension.
- Strongly approve of the basalt choice.
- Consider extending the windows around the corner.
- The dialogue between the wood and concrete is critical.
- Like how the building celebrates the industrial while incorporating sculptural elements.

**Relationship to surrounding buildings**

- Determine whether or not Phase 2 is confirmed. Create a back-up landscape plan if Phase 2 is not guaranteed.
- The project holds its own in a complicated site, but is respectful of the Pharmacy Building.

**Roof**

- It is unfortunate that the landscape cannot climb onto the roof. Wood could slide over the top to create separation.
- A climbing roof could be used for multitude of purposes, and would save open space as the campus densifies.
- A green roof is appropriate for an industrial building, and would attract attention as there will be many eyes looking onto it.

## Landscape/Public Realm

- Explore the potential of a heated landscape on the building to create a unique landscape. Consider Parliament Hill in Ottawa, which is covered in tulips early in the year, creating a striking image.
- Like the non-linear flow of the public realm along Health Sciences Mall, it enables moments for pause and reflection.
- The facade offers great possibilities for public art and performing artistry. Begin collaboration early if pursuing this, there is huge potential for commissioning.

## Climbing Wall

- Use organic materials like bricks or concrete. This would create a beautiful wall, regardless of whether or not it is used for climbing, and would work with the language of the building and landscape.
- The wall should be horizontal (not vertical) to avoid injuries, and the west side landscape would need to complement the wall artwork.
- Landscaping around the wall would need to target students, not just passersby.

## **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 6:20 PM



# meeting minutes

## Advisory Urban Design Panel

|                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Date:</b>       | December 6, 2012  |
| <b>Time:</b>       | 3:00 - 5:20 PM  |
| <b>Place:</b>      | Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)   |
| <b>Attendees:</b>  | Martin Nielsen (acting Chair for 1 <sup>st</sup> presentation), Mark Ostry (acting Chair for remainder of meeting), Margot Long (participated via written submission), Lisa Castle, Maged Senbel  |
| <b>Regrets:</b>    | Michael Green, Steve Jedreicich   |
| <b>Staff:</b>      | Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)  |
| <b>Presenters:</b> | Ray Letkemen, Raymond Letkemen Architects<br>Greg Voute, Raymond Letkemen Architects<br>Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates<br>Chadwick Choy, UBC Properties Trust<br>Al Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust<br>Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust<br>Martin Nielsen, Design Dialog<br>Bruce Haden, Design Dialog<br>Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates |

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

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:15 PM. *Motion Carried*

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

A motion to approve the November minutes was made by the Chair. *Motion Carried*

### **3.0 Development Applications**

#### **3.1 Lott 22 (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Ray Letkemen (Raymond Letkemen Architects), Greg Voute (Raymond Letkemen Architects), Michael Patterson (Perry + Associates), Chadwick Choy (UBC Properties Trust), Al Poettcker (UBC Properties Trust), Paul Young (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on the height of front gate columns and accessibility to the raised courtyard area.

## **Panel Comments:**

### **General**

- Significantly improved design from previous submissions.
- Appreciate how sustainability through higher density was a central consideration for the application.
- The choice to include 3-bedroom units responds to the provisions of the UBC Housing Action Plan.

### **Courtyard accessibility**

- Agree that accessibility to the raised courtyard must be addressed.
- Like the straight line from the front entrance to the courtyard.

### **Design elements/detailing**

- The choice to increase to six stories improves the design and tastefully emphasizes the vertical nature of the building.
- Like how the building steps down on the north side, but would like to break away from symmetry with a higher corner on the south side.
- Appreciate how the development moves away from Wesbrook's 'Whistler Village' character towards a more modern expression.
- Approve of the slight tilt of the building to follow the orientation of the park.
- Mixed opinions on the columns at the building front entrances. Some feel that the columns complement the stronger lines of the building façade, while others think they should be removed. Consider revisiting with more studies.

## **Panel Resolved:**

Panel unanimously resolved to support the project.

## **3.2 District Energy Centre (Development Application)**

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Martin Nielsen (Dialog), Bruce Haden (Dialog) and Rob Barnes (Perry + Associates), who presented the project. Staff sought comment on cladding material options, the appropriateness of public art commissioning given the sculptural nature of the building, and the character of the west side landscape fronting Health Sciences Mall.

## **Panel Comments:**

### **General**

- The building adds to the design qualities of adjacent buildings and surrounding outdoor space.
- Ensure that the slanted walls enable sufficient clearance for pedestrians, particularly for the visually impaired. Or design the landscape so people avoid the bumping hazard.
- Given the proximity of the site to the skate park, anticipate the possibility that skateboarders may want to frequent the landscape.
- Re-emphasis on the importance of design detailing for the success of this project, particularly on the roof sections, and the importance of including a green roof.
- Strongly support the colour coding for the mechanical piping for added animation.
- Appreciate the legibility of the submission, however would have liked more clarity on phasing put forth for Panel approval.

- Agree with Staff that the project is a sculptural piece, and thus do not see public art commissioning as a priority.

### **West side landscape design**

- The east landscape effectively recognizes the natural paths of pedestrian movement, but the west side needs more design development.
- Would have liked to see the angular west landscape presented in the pre-application carry over into the development application.
- Landscaping along Health Sciences Mall should facilitate informal social interaction to increase the visibility of the display window. This can take the form of public seating, but more importantly should encourage pedestrians to spend time in the space.
- Given the site's symbolic significance as the 'heart' of the campus, design development on the west landscape should be more civic rather than suburban in character. Consider creating a plaza by replacing green swaths with concrete.

### **Cladding materials**

- Recommend maintaining simplicity in materials to avoid overcomplicating the complex shape of the building, and to highlight the origami concept. Consider combining perforated and solid materials, but using only one tone, or tone on tone materials to maintain cleanness of lines and angles.
- Support the metal material over zinc. The lightness and reflectivity of the metal would be a better compliment to the white brick design tradition of the campus.
- If Phase II is not approved, the elegance of the origami concept would need to be communicated by Phase I on its own.

### **Panel resolved:**

The Panel supports Phase I, with the condition that if Phase II does not proceed, the east end and east landscape of Phase I will be refined to the satisfaction of Staff and returned to the AUDP at Staff's discretion. Further, the Panel supports the design of Phase II as presented, should Phase II proceed as a project by the university.

## **4.0 Post Meeting**

Meeting Concluded at 5:20 PM