



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2013



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	January 17, 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen, Mark Ostry, Margot Long, Michael Green, Steve Jedreicich
Regrets:	Lisa Castle, Maged Senbel
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Robert Lange (DGBK Architects), Roger Green (DGBK Architects), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative), Nick Maile (UBC Properties), Jim Hancock (IBI Group), Bruce Hemstock (PWL Partnership), Gwyn Vose (IBI Group)

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 December 6th meeting minutes

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

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 UBCIRL (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Robert Lange, Roger Green, Joseph Fry and Nick Maile, who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on strategies for softening the exterior of the storing module fronting the public road and Imperial Trail, and approaches to sustainability, including solar gain and air conditioning management.

Panel Comments:

General

- Interesting project, the siting, program organization, and expansion have been done correctly

- The site is currently industrial, but will have high market value in the future. A planning study of the future land use of the site (20-30 year plan) must be done so the building fits within future site context
- Keep in mind the fact that people do come to this site via Imperial Trail, and ensure that future land use choices do not cause the site to become unsafe
- Be sure to set the guidelines for future modules to see the design concept through, in case future modules are led by other firms

Sustainability

- Given its large, flat roof (especially after all 6 modules are built) and industrial function, the building is a strong candidate for a green roof. A green roof could dramatically cut energy and air conditioning costs
- The rest of the building is innovative, but not having a green roof is a missed opportunity
- Though budget constraints may make green roof installation unfeasible at present, it could be built into the budget down the road
- Given the volume, burying the building could also assist cooling (if suitable for the surrounding topography)

Indoor

- Consider increasing the height of the processing room and adding columns down the middle of the space – the 9 foot dimension could be higher and this might help with the massing
- The reading room could be more expressive. Consider adding sky lights to this block, expressed as a series of light canons. This wouldn't greatly affect the budget.
- The light opening on the corner adds little to the design, it can be re-thought

Exterior Cladding Finish

- Support the materials and cladding
- Really like the barcode idea, it could be bright, shiny and flat. It should have high contrast (charcoal against silver) to stand out
- The barcode wall provides an opportunity for architects to play artist. Identify potential for public art, consider having the barcode spell out something interesting
- Given the thermal mass, the storage module should be concrete
- Many UBC projects are doing LCA studies, consider doing a long-term (50-100 year) study on concrete versus wood, energy savings and greenhouse gas/carbon footprint
- BRISCO, an LVL made in B.C., has a barcode quality, and is cost competitive to CLT

Landscape

- General approval of the landscape, particularly the overhanging deck. The landscape needs to be thought of as an amenity, as people do come to this site
- The team should consider adding some landscape along the loading bay side

Chair Summary:

- In support of the team's direction, but more understanding is needed of the site masterplan, and how the building will fit within this context
- More development is needed on the energy plan of the project
- In support of the cladding material, but recommend high contrast in colour choice

Panel Resolved:

Panel supports on the proviso that there is an energy cost-benefit analysis (investigating GeoExchange, sinking the building, green roof, LCA study) and a response by C&CP according to those findings.

3.2 Lot 6 (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Jim Hancock, Bruce Hemstock and Gwyn Vose, who presented the project. In addition to general comments, staff sought comment on the towers' scale and orientation in relation to the forest background, the potential for combining the lay-by with the fire access route, and the layout of the townhouses.

Panel Comments:

General

- The towers are elegant and abut the forest nicely, like the tapered fingers that match the forest silhouette
- The variation and ample size of the balconies sets them apart from standard downtown Vancouver towers
- The geometry does not work with the parking plan
- Reminiscent of towers west of Oakridge Mall along Tisdall Street which, despite being the tallest buildings in the vicinity, do not block the view, and provide comfort without having a single-family dwelling feel

Tower Orientation

- Deciding on the best orientation will involve 'playing' with the rotation. It would help to see the tower massing in relation to the other towers to determine the best orientation
- The towers could establish a pattern that influences the orientation of future towers along the forest edge
- Prefer the composition of the west and east façades, which have a larger and more appealing effect, as opposed to the other two façades, which are strongly vertical
- From a sustainability perspective, the narrow façade should have an east/west orientation to minimize solar access impact
- The building aligns with the buildings on Binning Road, but this isn't necessary

Community Character & Forest Relationship

- The tower and townhome design imports a downtown Vancouver/Burnaby suburban tower aesthetic. Much of this is rooted in material issues.
- Address how the project informs the *genus loci* of the neighbourhood and its unique relationship with the forest. The past towers didn't necessarily address this issue, this project can set the tone for future developments. Take chances and establish the spirit of the place.
- The fact that you are across from 6 to 18 storey trees is a lost opportunity. How does this tower relate to this very unique forest context?
- The façade along Binning Road creates a protective wall against the forest, when it should facilitate a transition to the forest

- Review precedent landscape images (e.g. early Erickson houses) for examples of blending buildings with a natural backdrop. Many changes may be minor, such as changing the way the buildings touch the ground or meet the sky
- The university needs to take chances, and incorporate more wood and variation. Avoid the Whistler Village aesthetic of Wesbrook Village. From a marketing point of view, the team could distinguish itself

Townhome Placement

- Consider moving the townhomes to the other side, with private residences on the edge and a wall to the edge of the park. This would be a powerful way of opening the towers to the park
- Lining the townhome entrances along the greenways would create a more pleasant entry experience
- The village stroll is up to now, magnificent. It is interesting how the townhomes are treated as a project within the project
- South town homes feel like a shoe box. Stagger them to create more visual interest when turning in from the main boulevard

Lay-by

- Don't have strong feelings on the lay-by placement, though projects on this site would benefit from more sharing, so that each building doesn't need its own fire lane
- Consider structuring the lay-by for multiple uses (e.g. hockey) rather than being a strictly formal space
- The fire lane and lay-by take up too much open space. Consider having the forecourt on the northeast corner as the main access, and using the fire lane as part of the drop off area but using half of the frontage, freeing up the other side for soft landscaping

Chair Summary:

- Develop a better sense of the *genus loci* of the neighbourhood and how the project fits within the community fabric, this will inform the tower and townhouse design
- Though there is not a strong opinion on the tower orientation, would like a better explanation of what informs the decision
- Create a more engaging use of the lay-by and incorporate more greenery if it is to exist in its current layout
- Focus more attention on the greenway and the experience of moving through it

4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 6 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	February 7, 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Acting Chair), Mark Ostry, Margot Long, Maged Senbel, Louise Cowin
Regrets:	Michael Green, Steve Jedreicich
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Lisa Colby, UBC Campus & Community Planning Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Viktors Jaunkalns, MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects Ted Watson, MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects Walter Francl, Francl Architecture

1.0 Call to order by the Chair and introductions

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

Louise Cowin, Vice President, Students was introduced as the newest appointed member to the Panel.

2.0 Approval of the January 17th meeting minutes and current agenda

A motion to approve the January minutes and February agenda was made by the Chair.
Motion Carried

3.0 Approved Gage South Masterplan (Information Only)

Lisa Colby, Director of Policy Planning, UBC Campus & Community Planning, provided background information on the approved Gage South Masterplan to provide context for the subsequent Gage South Landscape and Aquatic Centre Pre-Application presentations.

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 Gage South Landscape (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg, who presented the project. Staff sought general comment from the Panel to address outstanding concerns before holding consultations with student groups, as a follow-up action to the Gage South Neighbourhood Land Use Plan.

Panel Comments:

General

- Overall support for the reintegration of the historic Commonwealth diving board, and the playfulness it brings, but consider the legal and safety risks. What about using it as a stairs from the gym or SUB?
- It is apparent that the rapid transit plan for the area is far from being determined. This will be a key element to consider before planning the landscape in great detail

Concept A vs. B Field Layout

- It is important that C&CP will be meeting with students to discuss design of the future MacInnes Field
- Unanimous preference for Concept B
- Concept A brings the field edge too close to the bus loop, likely to increase both real and perceived safety risk
- Concept B is preferable as the site has been repurposed and programmed for new uses, requiring a new field shape and size rather than exact field replication
- Concept A, however, speaks to students' desires for square-footage replication. Be sure to address this at student consultations

Field Usage

- There is a lack of field space for intramural sports, particularly for night sports. Try to design field shape and size to accommodate this need. Daytime use would most likely be left for more passive recreation
- The 'backyard' metaphor does not seem to work here; the site is the busiest aperture on campus. The field would serve more appropriately as an 'urban park', with the other side of the SUB as an 'urban paved' space

Mitigating Foot Traffic

- Pedestrians will likely cut across the field for the fastest route to and from the bus loop. It will be a challenge to have pedestrians respect walkways without installing a fence
- Control the edge of the field to prevent desire lines. There is a need to preserve green space on campus
- The bus loop is a very high foot traffic area, especially at the beginning and end of the day. Encourage any strategy, such as increasing the width of the walkway along the bus loop, to relieve this bottleneck

Chair Summary:

- Strong preference for Concept B field layout
- The location of future transit is an important consideration for the precinct landscape design, but will leave this as a comment given the indeterminate status of the transit location
- The desire line situation is a major issue, welcome any strategy to mitigate this without installing a fence

4.2 Aquatic Centre (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant team was introduced: Mark Ostry and Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects, and Viktors Jaunkalns and Ted Watson, MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects. General Panel comment was sought.

Panel Comments:

General

- Great presentation and explanation of the project
- Support the interesting relationship between the pool and the bus loop
- The bleachers seem modest, but if this is part of the program they are adequate
- Encourage skylights, glare can be controlled over the competition pool

Interior Space Layout

- The design team has worked well within the budgetary and square-footage confines of the program; the small site appears to have promoted more innovative use of space
- Great incorporation of a range of recreational and competition facilities in one building
- Consider looking further into the potential financial, space-usage and facilities-sharing efficiencies to be gained from communal, rather than male/female change rooms
- The deck along the family pool seems restrictive. If the program allows it, would prefer a more generous deck area
- Maintain adequate deck space to allow for future slide or rope swing installation

Transparency

- Not convinced of the role of the green space between the pool and the SRC. Can people move through this space? How does it encourage transparency?
- The translucent glass on the east wall doesn't seem to encourage transparency, with the bleachers blocking from the inside, the tightness of the adjacent alley, and its view of the back of the housing complex. Concerned that this could turn into a dead wall and create CPTED issues

4.3 Daycare Addition Design for Wesbrook Community Centre (Development Application Amendment)

The applicant, Walter Francl, Francl Architecture, presented the project. Panel comment was sought on the incorporation of a daycare on the west side of the Wesbrook Community Centre.

- Overall support of the community centre and daycare addition; cannot comment on the landscape in great detail given that it will be designed by the operator, who has not yet been appointed
- The daycare complements the community centre nicely, and the whole building fits well into the site
- Strong support of the building relationship to the play area, and the play area integration with the park
- The edge along the high school works nicely
- The team has fully addressed the comments made at the last AUDP about the northern wall being too stark

Panel Resolved:

The Panel unanimously supported the project.

5.0 Other Business

Gerry McGeough reported on a series of workshops to be facilitated by UBC Campus & Community Planning to refine the design vision as a supplement to the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidelines. UBC Board of Governors requested this work when they approved the Plan. Members of the Panel expressed interest in participating in the three workshops, scheduled April-May, 2013, subject to individual Panel member availability.

6.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 6 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	March 7, 2013
Time:	5 – 6 PM
Place:	Rm 107, Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratory (AERL), 2202 Main Mall
Attendees:	Michael Green (Chair), Martin Nielsen, Maged Senbel, Steve Jedreicich
Regrets:	Louise Cowin, Mark Ostry, Margot Long
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Jim Hancock, IBI Group Gwyn Vose, IBI Group Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Miriam Plishka, PWL Partnership Bruno Wall, Wall Financial Corporation

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

The chair called the meeting to order at 5:15 PM. *Motion Carried*

2.0 Approval of the February 7th meeting minutes and current agenda

A motion to approve the February minutes and March agenda was made by the Chair.
Motion Carried

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 Lot 6 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Jim Hancock and Gwyn Vose of IBI Group, and Bruce Hemstock and Miriam Plishka of PWL Partnership, who presented the project. Staff sought comment from the Panel on ways to soften the façade and mitigate solar gain on the south-facing orientation, and on strategies for developing a more robust approach to REAP Gold sustainability criteria.

Panel Comments:

General

- The project has improved significantly from the preliminary proposal, especially with the simplification of the design
- Strong general support for the project siting
- Consider creating a forecourt by moving the lobby north, and incorporating it with the firelane and parkade entrance. This would visually shorten the firelane, parkade entry and lay-by, and create a smaller and more cohesive area

Tower orientation & solar shading

- Receding the end balconies would emphasize the verticality of the façade and trim the profile, but would also result in less overhanging beneficial for reducing the cooling load. A balance needs to be struck here
- The tower orientation is problematic, and would improve if rotated. This might also solve problems with the lay-by, while keeping the space between the tower and townhouses functional
- On the west elevation, the horizontal shading competes with the verticality of the forest backdrop. Stronger verticality in the shading strategy would be more consistent with the forest expression and would substantially reduce solar gain

Exterior materials

- Strong concern over the artificial wood material; the painted metal misses the natural distinctness of individual wood panels. Use real wood, or otherwise a solid-coloured metal in a warm colour
- The design still has the impression of being transplanted from downtown Vancouver. Please re-evaluate this
- Though the colours of the preliminary tower and townhome design were not complimentary, the new design omits colour too much. Re-incorporating colour into the grey façade could add needed drama to these elevations if not overdone
- Encourage the team to incorporate real wood soffits for punctuations of colour
- Support the grey expression of the townhouses, but the large areas of spandrel glass create an uncomplimentary 'corporate' feel. Explore opportunities to soften the façade

Vertical spires & tower canopy

- General support for the height and scale of the three vertical spires, and how they step over the soffit area, but feel that they read like smoke stacks rather than appealing an organic, forest-like aesthetic
- Consider varying the heights of the spires to mimic the treetops; the west façade should act as a foreground to the forest
- General support of the canopy idea at the top of the tower; consider incorporating it in more places, such as the entrance canopy
- The canopy appears to be latched on; find strategies to better relate it to the design and shape of the building
- The canopy would benefit from a larger presence, if funding permits

Landscape

- Strong support for the finger parks; they integrate the neighbourhood with the forest beautifully
- Overall support of the landscape, but encourage any opportunity to add more landscape on the north side, if possible

Panel Resolved:

The Panel supports the project subject to the project team addressing the following concerns to the satisfaction of Campus & Community Planning:

- Change the tower solar shading on the west façade from a horizontal to vertical design to increase the effectiveness of solar shading and better communicate the forest expression
- Explore further opportunities to integrate colour to add vitality and connection with the forest; potentially by incorporating wood soffits
- If real wood cannot be incorporated on the townhouses, use coloured metal rather than the artificial wood material
- The tower canopy is currently too timid; extend the canopy outwards horizontally to add more presence
- Find opportunities to move away from the 'corporate' feel of the townhomes; reconsider the spandrel paneled façade
- Vary the heights of the three top spires to add a more organic, forest-like expression
- Keep the landscape fingers as is, but extend the north finger so that it is stronger

4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 6 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	April 4 th , 2013
Time:	4 – 5 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Mark Ostry (Acting Chair), Margot Long, Louise Cowin, Michael Green (via conference call)
Regrets:	Maged Senbel, Steve Jedreicich
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Martin Nielsen, Design Dialog Bruce Haden, Design Dialog Rob Barnes, Perry + Associates Dianne Foldi, UBC Project Services

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:15 PM. *Motion Carried*

2.0 Approval of the March 7th meeting minutes and current agenda

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

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 District Energy Centre (Development Application Amendment)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Martin Nielsen and Bruce Haden (Design Dialog), Rob Barnes (Perry + Associates) and Dianne Foldi (UBC Project Services), who presented the project. Staff sought further design refinement from the Panel on the applicant's amendments in response to concerns raised by neighbouring Faculties. Design concerns included: a desire for a calmer and more reserved design expression, warmer material and increased animation fronting the plaza.

Panel Comments:

General

- The project team has used this opportunity to revisit the design in ways that have ultimately improved the building. The amended proposal resolves the design for Phase 1 better than the previous design, and is generally better detailed

- The decision to amend the building from its original design after full AUDP support is regrettable. Within the hierarchy of buildings, utility buildings can still be exuberant. That said, the project team has resolved the concerns of Deans effectively by achieving a more dignified and reserved design
- Full support of the materiality and elevation
- The building still poses strong possibilities for public art, this aspect could be amplified even further

Green Roof

- It is unfortunate that the amended design still lacks a green roof; a desire expressed by the Panel from the project team's first AUDP presentation.
- Building a green roof on this building makes sense from a constructability, maintenance and stormwater management perspective. If a green roof isn't implemented for this project, the project team needs to highlight other areas where the design supports the regenerative neighbourhood concept

Panel Resolved:

Unanimous support for the revised design; the Panel raises no major concerns with the project. Consider further possibilities for constructing a green roof and implementing public art opportunities.

4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 5 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	May 2 nd , 2013
Time:	4 – 7 PM
Place:	Rm 107, Aquatic Ecosystems Research Laboratory (AERL), 2202 Main Mall
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Acting Chair), Michael Green (via conference call), Mark Ostry, Steve Jedreicich, Maged Senbel, Margot Long
Regrets:	Louise Cowin
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Viktors Jaunkalns, MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects Ted Watson, MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects Kristen Moreau, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:20 PM. *Motion Carried*

2.0 Approval of the April 4th meeting minutes and current agenda

A motion to approve the April minutes and May agenda was made by the Chair. *Motion Carried*

3.0 Development Applications

3.1 Aquatic Centre (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Mark Ostry and Russell Acton (Acton Ostry Architects), Viktors Jaunkalns and Ted Watson (MacLennan Jaunkalns Miller Architects), Chris Phillips (Phillips Farevaag Smallenberg) and Rob Brown (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project. Staff sought design comment from the Panel on enhancing animation between the pool and bus loop, and on strategies for striking an appropriate balance between adequate lighting and energy performance.

Panel Comments:

General

- The project is outstanding and has progressed well, particularly through design simplification
- The indoor spaces appear to have expanded; this indicates an efficient siting plan
- The Panel recognizes the still unconfirmed character of the future student housing facing the east side of the site, but advises the team to be cognizant that the largely solid east wall could result in a low level of animation in the east alley

Materials & Energy Performance

- The Panel requests to see the material palette board at the DP stage; the material quality of the large roof in particular will significantly influence the final design
- A careful and sensitive use of materials could bring the project to an even higher level of execution. The grey metallic material could have an exciting effect
- The Panel understands the limits that the approach places on the program, but solar hot water generation should be explored further to apply regenerative building approaches
- If one was to replace window with spandrel to improve energy performance, the upper part of the west façade would be the place to do it
- Explore daylighting in change room areas

Pool / Bus Loop Animation

- The requirements of the competition pool should be made the priority for design, and thus Option A works better for the program. It would also be unfortunate to lose all of the trees and green slope on the south side
- Option A would still provide animation; an outside observer would still see the light and water reflection above the ramp, adding warmth on a rainy day waiting for the bus. This would be more animating than seeing people swimming laps back and forth
- The landscape appears underdeveloped. The south slope could be designed to increase animation (the benches begin to accomplish this). Consider adding stepped planters or cascading foliage to the slope to increase animation further
- The pool will have a constant static audience of people waiting for the bus, creating an opportunity for public art on the south side. For example, consider using LED light projections to achieve this, but be mindful that this does not take away from the building design

Chair Summary

- Strong support for the project, very handsome addition to the campus
- The Panel requests to review the material palette board
- Support for Option A
- Explore public art opportunities on the south side to animate the bus plaza

Panel Resolved:

Unanimous support for the project, subject to the material palette board being submitted for Panel review.

3.2 Mundell Park (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Michael Patterson (Perry & Associates) and Craig Knight (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project.

Panel Comments:

General

- The plans have been well thought out and considered, both at the macro and microscale
- There are currently too many bollard lighting posts; consider removing some
- The Panel understands concerns raised by the UNA about pea gravel, but advises to consider ways to include more natural materials as a break from concrete pathways

Relationship to Surrounding Neighbourhood

- The park supports the superior public realm experience exhibited in the larger neighbourhood, and transitions well to the Sail project
- The park lacks an overall theme, appearing to incorporate many different features but sacrificing a cohesive message; therefore would like to see a distinct character for the park, to provide unique sense of place to identify different parts of Westbrook Neighbourhood
- Consider how the park will relate to the four neighbouring informal green spaces, and how to provide views into the surrounding courtyards

Foliage & Pond

- Currently the park includes only deciduous and no coniferous trees. Would like to see more native greenery, rather than purely ornamental plants
- The park could read as an urban extension of the forest by adding 2 or 3 coniferous trees
- Consider incorporating other sustainable features beyond stormwater, such as berry bushes, if it is part of the campus' mandate
- Place the boulders more strategically to provide better access to the pond. Boulders can act as an important platform to access the water
- Consider alternative options to green lawn, given the fertilization requirements that come with it

Playground

- Support the naturalized play equipment; the park is not play specific park, so it is appropriate to create something sculptural
- Consider incorporating a more naturalized swing to fit with this organic theme, however encourage the idea of a structure that is sculptural and playful

Chair Summary

- Explore alternative options to green lawn
- Consider further options for incorporating coniferous trees, and how this may connect the park to the forest that defines the area
- Support the naturalized play equipment

Panel Resolved:

The Panel unanimously supported the project.

3.3 Geography Courtyard, Frank Forward Pathways & Biological Sciences Road
(Development Applications)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Karen Kiest and Kristen Moreau (Karen Kiest Landscape Architects) and Dave Poettcker (UBC Properties Trust), who presented the project.

Panel Comments:**General**

- It is good to see that UBC pays attention to the design of these interstitial spaces, and designs them incrementally rather than developing all at once
- The Panel exercises trust in this team: the submissions do not provide full planting plans. But if the design fits with the aesthetic of previous public realm improvements, it is highly supportable
- Support the decision for landscape renewal in these areas, hopefully these areas will be maintained to last another 100 years

Geography Courtyard Specific Comments**General**

- Support the lighting plan, but feel that bollard light placement could be better streamlined. Some bollards appear randomly placed

Planting Beds

- Consider finding a different location for the planting beds; the north side will not receive very much sunlight. However, given the strict symmetry of the landscape design, the Panel recognizes that there is limited room to consider different locations
- The current plans convey the planters as large, single beds, this may result in beds being improperly used (e.g. people reaching over plants or stepping into the beds). More refinement of the planter size is needed
- Commend the project team for listening to the desires of the user group, however the team also needs to inform the user group of what is feasible. Community gardens require significant upkeep; weigh out their feasibility when they could be left unused for parts of the year
- Consider designing and placing beds in a way that allows them to act as attractive landscape features even when left empty

Biosciences Pathway Specific Comments

- The fork in center of the accessible route reads somewhat heavy and appears out of character, consider revising for a more slender appearance

Summary

- All three submissions have been well thought out and planned
- (Geography Courtyard) reconsider the placement and size of planting beds to maximize their usability and aesthetic quality
- (Geography Courtyard) review and streamline the lighting plan
- (Biosciences Pathway) consider reducing the thickness of the fork in the accessible route

Panel Resolved:

The Panel unanimously supported the three projects.

4.0 Post Meeting

Meeting Concluded at 7 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	July 4 th , 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Mark Ostry, Maged Senbel, Margot Long
Regrets:	Louise Cowin, Steve Jedreicich, Greg Borowski
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Eva Lillquist (Recorder)
Presenters:	Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust Dean Gregory, UBC Campus & Community Planning (on behalf of Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects) Susan Mavor, Public Design + Architecture John Wall, Public Design + Architecture

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Elect New AUDP Chair

With Michael Green's completion of his term on the Panel, Martin Nielsen was elected the new AUDP Chair. *Motion Carried*

3.0 Approval of the May 2nd meeting minutes and current agenda

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

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 University Centre Landscape (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Dave Poettcker of UBC Properties Trust and Dean Gregory of UBC Campus & Community Planning (on behalf of Karen Kiest of Karen Kiest Landscape Architects), who presented the project. Panel comment was sought on whether to retain the sidewalk on the north side of driveway, and on the appropriateness of including deciduous trees on the lawn in front of the building to reduce solar gain in the summer while maintaining views into the building.

Panel Comments:

General

- The design offers a simple and elegant resolution
- The plant selection appears to favour ornamental landscape design. Consider striking a stronger balance between both native and ornamental plants.
- The walkway from Thea Koerner House to the Chan Centre is one of the most important ceremonial pathways on campus. Within budget constraints, encourage opportunities to celebrate this path, potentially through more formal design treatment (e.g. special paving materials) or by widening the path.

Tree Placement along South Façade

- Approve of the decision to remove the plum trees, which are diseased and likely offer little environmental value.
- If adding new trees, replace with long-live trees (100 rather than 50 year lifespan). Replacement tree selection should be guided by a historic understanding of the site.
- Unlike the Lasserre building, revealing University Centre through tree removal would not offer as much aesthetic or heritage value, as the building façade is not especially notable (with the exception of the building entrance, an architectural feature that should remain visible).
- If tree planting is unfeasible within the constraints of the budget, consider a simple lawn frontage, and then bring trees later as budgeting permits. Trees do not necessarily need to be large upon planting, but should have ample growing potential.
- Consider positioning taller trees close to the building façade to enable views upward to the tree canopy and through to the building.
- Planting trees along the front façade would not only shade the building, but also the walkway adjacent to it, adding drama to the processional walk towards Flagpole Plaza.
- Deciduous, rather than evergreen trees are more appropriate for the site.

Front Entrance Walkway

- Keeping, minimizing or eliminating the walkway along the façade will depend on the needs of the program.
- Unless the area is used heavily as a drop-off zone, consider completely eliminating or narrowing the sidewalk by between 8 inches and 2 feet.
- Alternatively, consider designating a drop off zone through road markings to prevent drop offs onto the front lawn.

Summary:

- Encourage landscape strategies that enhance the formality of Crescent Road
- Approve of the decision to remove existing trees from the front façade; advise the use of long-life, deciduous replacement trees
- Support removing the front sidewalk, but with the condition that the drop off issue is resolved

Panel Resolved:

The Panel unanimously supported the project.

4.2 University Gateways (Development Application Amendment)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant was introduced: Dave Poettcker of UBC Properties Trust, and Susan Mavor and John Wall of Public Design + Architecture, who presented the project. General Panel comment was sought on the materiality and scale of the design.

Panel Comments:

General

- Agree to remove the existing pipe and infrastructure currently at the site, as these do not complement the plaza.
- The strength of the design lies in its simplicity, elegance and abstraction. However, there is concern for the formality of the piece. Consider adding "The University of British Columbia" in small lettering on the sign foundation to raise its profile.
- The use of uplighting to illuminate the sign contradicts the university's sustainable campus identity, and given the site's gateway location, could be a target for criticism. The sign should embody the university's priorities through the use of sustainable lighting.

Occupation Potential

- Given the sign's clear iconic function for visitors to campus, optimize the potential for occupation as much as possible.
- Consider adding an extra panel of paving behind the sign to prevent visitors from stepping into the planters.
- Ensure that the materials and detailing remain clean and unscathed as the sign is repeatedly climbed on. As much as the sign invites occupation, the sign should stay a "gem."

Materiality & Sizing

- Support a brushed rather than polished metal finish to minimize glare. For the base, consider using locally produced, black basalt from B.C.
- The sign colour will contrast well under the shadow cast by the Dentistry building.
- Experiment with finishes for the base to ensure that the sign achieves the desired a 'floating' effect.
- Strongly encourage increasing the letter size as much as possible within safety parameters, the constraints of the median size and the requirements of Translink bus access.

Summary:

- Ensure that detailing, positioning and material choices are designed to endure frequent occupation
- Support brushed metal finishing
- Increase the letter size as much as possible within safety parameters
- Ensure that material and lighting choices communicate an appropriate level of formality while embodying the university's sustainable vision

Panel Resolved:

The Panel unanimously supported the project.

5.0 For Information: Ponderosa Commons Phase 2 Amendment

Further to decisions made at the recent Board of Governors III meeting, Gerry McGeough provided the Panel with a brief update on changes made to the Ponderosa Hub Phase II program. In response to concerns about the project budget, amendments scaled back the budget by relocating the daycare facility to the Orchard Hub, and by removing the Dean of Education office from the program.

6.0 Post Meeting

Meeting concluded at 5:45 PM



Meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	September 12 th , 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Mark Ostry, Maged Senbel, Steve Jedreicich, Greg Borowski
Regrets:	Louise Cowin, Margot Long
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Karen Foley (Recorder)
Presenters:	David English, (UBC Properties Trust) Jana Foit and Derek Newby (Perkins Will), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative), Brian Wakelin (Public Design) and Anita Ryder (UBC Project Services)

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Approval of the July 4th meeting minutes and current agenda

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

- *Motion Carried*

3.0 Approval of Leave for Louise Cowan

Gerry McGeough explained the Terms of Reference and asked the panel for permission of leave for Louise Cowan – Motion Carried

4.0 Workshop/ Presentations

4.1 Orchard Commons Workshop Presentation

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the Orchard Commons project. The purpose of the workshop was to get Panel comments particularly on the project massing and layout. The applicant's presentation was made by David English, Derek Newby, Jana Foit and Joe Fry.

General

The Panel was supportive of the general direction the design team is taking with a preference for the massing and layout of Scheme 2. However, they wanted to see some of the dynamism of Scheme 1 landscape desire lines carried forward into the design.

Open space

From a landscape and public realm point of view, there is a sense of conflicting intentions between the concepts, as the first sets up all the diagonals against the second concept of the quadrangles where there is a very clear open space. As an open space, the Panel preferred Scheme 2 as it provides the needed informal recreation space, and is more in keeping with the campus vernacular of quadrangles, and visually pulls the whole project together. The majority of the Panel members felt the idea of the desire lines from Scheme 1 is a powerful one and good to build the scheme around. One member cautioned about over playing the diagonals saying the desire lines are important but not absolute, while another commented it would have been helpful to have shown more analysis of how they are derived from the larger context.

Several members identified that Scheme 2 creates an aperture and connection between McMillan and the barn and thus an opportunity to reach out to Main Mall. It was felt this area needed further analysis and development, possibly with the inclusion of a passage you can see through or placing the tower on columns to allow views through to the main courtyard. As part of this, it would be important to have a Vantage College presence when seen from Main Mall.

Massing

The prevailing view was the buildings shouldn't be shaped to create the desire lines, but rather should be massed to strengthen both the campus fabric and the outdoor commons space. In addition,, they supported the concept of the buildings being carved away or put on columns at ground level in order to respect the desire lines and to create views through the commons. A number of panel members liked the pavilion concept, as it could be a real gem of timber and glass. A panel member suggested creating more open space , either under the towers,, or the possibility of reducing the podium footprint by making the daycare 4 stories.

South tower

The panel preferred the placement of the south tower location in Scheme 2. It is recessed from Agronomy Road and helps give Vantage Collage a Main Mall presence. A couple of

members felt the tower could be shifted a bit to the west to give distance from McMillian and suggested seeking alignment with an element in the surrounding context. The majority of members preferred the long facades in an ~~opposed~~ orientation with the north tower running east-west and the south tower running north-south in order to frame the commons space, noting that solar gain on the west facade would need to be addressed.

The rotation of the tower is good. One member questioned this orientation recommending views from Main Mall be better understood before finalizing the tower orientation. The panel noted that the towers should have facades that respond to their solar orientation.

Additional Comments

- The panel liked the tower community concept with the glazed, interconnected three floor common spaces, both from creating a social connection and its ability to break down the vertical massing.
- The Panel felt the proposed rooftop food production on the pavilion is a powerful idea which will create a compelling fifth elevation for the project.
- The team will need to go through a programming exercise to see which is the best surface to use for the outdoor informal recreation area to ensure it is robust and durable enough.
- The panel encouraged the use of wood structure in the pavilion building and possibly the podium elements.
- The Panel recommended that the project come back as a pre-application prior to coming back as a complete application as many aspects were in-flux or underdeveloped.

4.2 Applied Science Bike Storage

Gerry McGeough gave a brief introduction of the proposal. Brian Wakelin and Anita Ryder presented the proposed design.

Panel Comments

The panel liked the overall design including the thought process behind the design and the color strategy used on the back wall and door of the facility. One panel member commented that he was concerned with the bias of the steel facade from a security perspective. The Panel's only concern was the color of the steel being used in the surround as they felt the grey exterior could look dull and not provide enough contrast to the vibrant red back wall. The Panel asked that the design team field test this issue before finalizing the steel colour.

Panel Resolved

The panel unanimously supported the project



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	October 3 rd , 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Greg Borowski, Mark Ostry, Louise Cowin, Jane Durante
Regrets:	Norm Shearing, Maged Senbel
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Karen Foley (Recorder)
Presenters:	Trevor and Kevin Mahon (Adera), Bryce Rositch (Rositch Hemphill Architects), Michael Patterson (Perry & Ass.), Penelope Martin (C&CP)

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Welcome new panel member

The panel welcomed Jane Durante to her 1st AUDP meeting.

3.0 Approval of the September 12th meeting minutes and current agenda

A motion to approve the September minutes and October agenda was made by the Chair
Motion Carried

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 Lot 32 (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and the applicant presented the proposed design approach: Trevor and Kevin Mahon, Bryce Rositch and Michael Patterson. Panel comment was sought on the project approach prior to the team preparing their development application.

Panel Comments:

General landscape

- Appreciate that the landscape architect is the same as for Mundell Park to maintain continuity in the design of the public realm.
- Can the park and project landscape be better integrated and read as more contiguous? Encourage more public access through the courtyard by the integration of landscape. Encourage completing the loop to encourage people to circulate.
- Great landscape palette. Important to extend the continuity and soft edges of the Mundell Park into the courtyard.
- Look at the possibility of creating more outdoor space, benches, BBQ area for those who don't have rooftop decks.
- Decks need privacy if they are to be used. Encourage to keep them, but give their designs more thought to achieve some privacy.

Water Features

- The panel likes the imagery and cleanness of the landscape design. Like the flatness and stillness of the water and ask how it will be achieved within a residential budget and the contoured site.
- Take advantage of the level change, and perhaps it is used to transition from the park to the serene front entrance water of the project.
- How can the water feature do something more than be aesthetic? There is an opportunity for storm water retention, which will contribute to the sustainable design aspirations of the project. Strongly recommend the use of storm water to fill the water feature.
- River rock under water is good.
- Water is lovely, but needs more land. Look at changing the ratio of water to ground in the courtyard.

Building massing

- The design has clear and strong massing with good use of balconies, overhangs and rooftop decks.
- Six story massing appears appropriate for this context.
- The panel supports the 6 story massing, the distribution of the massing and how it opens to Mundell Park.
- The building that is accessed through the courtyard does not appear to have a clear street address and could be confusing to locate for a first time visitor or a delivery.

Building Design

- Base of building is not adequately developed. Hopefully it will have a few steps to unit entrances. Raising the ground floor would help resolve this and increase the views through the porte cochère.
- Need to look more closely at the relationship of the building to the sidewalk and the street. Residents will need privacy. Look at the base of the building and consider raising the ground floor access from the sidewalk.
- It looks like the brick at the base along the ground level anchors the building better.
- Several members called for more brick base to manage how balconies structures hit the ground. This will avoid the look of a stretched 4 storey building. One member felt the black building base was good for highlighted the plantings.
- Concerned about how little tree canopy will be left in the neighbourhood. Could you echo the grandeur of the surrounding forest into the project.
- One panel member expressed a desire to see a West Coast design response that speaks of the unique identity and context of both the Wesbrook Place neighbourhood and the UBC Campus.

Material Palette

- The Panel appreciated the deeper colour palette and see it as a pleasant change in the neighbourhood.
- Support the softness and warmth to the material palette provided by the wood soffits.

4.2 REAP Version 3 (Policy)

Penelope Martin, C&CP, presented the proposed improvements in the draft REAP Version 3

Panel Comments:

- The panel supported the REAP upgrades and felt that UBC should be a leader in the field of sustainable development.
- The panel commented that REAP v3 will increase the long term performance of the buildings and raise the bar for future projects.
- Comment was made to see if these guidelines could apply to non-residential buildings in the future.

5.0 Post Meeting

Meeting concluded at 5:45 PM



meeting minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	November 7 th , 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Greg Borowski, Mark Ostry, Louise Cowin, Jane Durante, Norm Shearing, Maged Senbel
Regrets:	
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Karen Foley (Recorder)
Presenters:	Norm Couttie, Kevin Mahon (Adera), Keith Hemphill (Rositch Hemphill Architects), Michael Patterson (Perry & Ass.), Brian Wakelin (Public)

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Welcome new panel member

The panel welcomed Norm Shearing to his 1st AUDP meeting.

3.0 Approval of the October 3rd meeting minutes and current agenda

A motion to approve the September minutes and October agenda was made by the Chair
Motion Carried

4.0 Development Applications

4.1 Lot 32 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project and brought the panel's attention to the projects urban design merits and some aspects that merit discussion. The applicant presented the proposed development design approach: Norm Couttie, Kevin Mahon, Keith Hemphill and Michael Patterson.

The Panel had the following comment:

Model and material palette

- The panel is very disappointed that there was no context and massing model nor material samples board to illustrate the design. It is very difficult to understand and assess how the landscape and building design responds to the grade changes. The 3D modeling illustrations do not provide good representations. The Panel asks that this be a requirement for all future applications.

Building's Response to Context

- A cohesive design strategy is missing; there are 3 buildings with 5 aspects including Mundell Park. The buildings are treated the same, but are addressing different component pieces of the development. This is a missed opportunity for legibility and marketability. Recommend that each relationship should set up a different vocabulary or response in the built form and the architecture.
- Building entrance to Ross drive is hard to read and should be treated with more importance. Design development needs to make it pop.

Colour and Material Palette

- Generally felt there is an improvement in the colour scheme from the previous presentation. Good contrast in colour and quite strong.
- While one member appreciated the green colour as presented, the majority felt it needed to be darker. Tone it down a bit due to the building's proximity to the forest and surroundings which gives it a Zen like effect. A darker colour would also provide a good quiet contrast between the masonry base and the top of the building.
- The Panel dislikes the use of cream colour of the bridge and feel there is no materiality to it. See Bridge comments below.
- The gold colour on the corner of the building seems lost.
- The proposed colour of the masonry is well supported. However, as the masonry clads the building 'shoulders' and the 'grounded shoulders' at the base of the building, there is concern whether the thinness of the material can handle that kind of strength and 'groundedness'. The proposed areas of brick call for as much depth on the returns as possible. Obviously a normal sized brick would give you that, but not sure about the proposed thin masonry material.

Bridge Element over Main Entrance

- The façade of the bridge section should be designed to read as bridge. The Panel encourages the team to look at a curtain wall or window wall or spandrel panels, to make it look like a bridge. More differentiated from the rest of the building is merited.

Integration with Mundell Park

- Panel believes that more work needs to be done to ensure a better flow between Mundell Park and the development. It feels cut off and disconnected.
- Look at the possibility of bringing Mundell Park into the site; perhaps lose some of the water to create a stronger visual link.
- Emphasize more focus at the open space to Mundell Park to attract both residents and visitors. Explore combining the two communal outdoor spaces into one close to the Park to achieve a critical mass and transition between the Park and the project.

Working Landscape

- There are concerns over the amount of water being used, the evaporation rate and the amount of irrigation that would be needed. As this is life-long energy intensive project, the landscaping should respond to reduce energy consumption such as the use of plants to filter the water. Strong panel emphasis on the usage of as little water from the tap as possible and possible storm water retention.
- Consider the possibility of a natural dry look in summer and full in winter.

The Panel resolved: To grant the project conditional support subject to revisions to the satisfaction of staff to address the Panel's six areas of concern outlined above. *The resolution was supported; four in favour and three against.*

4.2 Quantum Matter Institute (Pre-application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the project. Brian Wakelin presented the project and general panel feedback was sought.

Panel Comments:

- The entry to the building has a responsibility and needs further design development to make it a welcoming space. No clever refinements to the surfaces of the landscape can make such deep and low space comfortable.
- The panel looks forward to seeing the use of materials and brick in the design.
- The relationship between the public areas and the corridor, if shifted approximately 10 feet, would enhance the sense of interaction with the exterior and the corridor.
- Concern over how the two buildings will come together. Relationship between the mass and the adjoining building is very tight and needs work.
- How will the building provide weather protection?
- There is potential at the east elevation to play with the geometries of the brick to enhance the ideas at different scales.
- What will be the general landscaping surrounding the building?
- Concern over the daylight issues and natural ventilation opportunities, not to fixate on the specific research at present as this will change over time.
- More focus needed at the end of the corridors for light requirements and interconnection between the floors.



Advisory Urban Design Panel

Attachment A

Date:	December 5 th , 2013
Time:	4 – 6 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Maged Senbel, Norm Shearing, Jane Durante, Greg Borowski
Regrets:	Louise Cowin, Mark Ostry
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Karen Foley (Recorder)
Presenters:	David English, (UBC Properties Trust) Jana Foit and David Dove (Perkins Will), Joseph Fry (Hapa Collaborative),

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Approval of the November 7th meeting minutes and current agenda

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

- *Motion Carried*

3.0 Workshop/ Presentations

3.1 Orchard Commons Workshop Presentation

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the Orchard Commons process and sought Panel comments on the project as a whole along with feedback on campus fit, NW corner (north tower, loading & future building site), outdoor commons, overall sustainability performance and energy load on highly glaze areas. The applicant's presentation was made by Jana Foit and Joe Fry.

The Panel had the following comments:

Massing and architectural design

- The panel agreed that the changes made to the overall layout and massing of the project are a positive improvement to the original plan, providing a more effective use of the site, with good pedestrian flow through the building and acknowledgment of the existing desire lines through the site.

- The project is an evolution of the architectural design vocabulary on campus, while respecting the existing tradition of the campus. All felt the building is of such a large scale compared to other buildings that it will surely have a strong visual presence and identity on campus. The south elevation on Agronomy Road is especially well resolved and successful
- The new Tower façade treatment is an improvement that helps break-up the mass of the large buildings. They do a good job of tying in the design language of the campus, in particular the Ponderosa Commons, while making a distinctive facility.
- The panel felt the 3 storey social spaces at the end of each tower floor create visual interest, improve the massing and bring student activity to the outer edges of the site.

Open space/ Landscape

- The improvements in the project's design have resulted in useable and rational open space. The exterior common areas are well programmed and promote social interaction. The design of the public realm creates outdoor rooms in a tailored and refined way that provides individual spaces with different personalities.
- The use of edible landscaping in the development is a great idea, while the Panel encourages the team to avoid selecting high maintenance landscape elements.
- The pedestrian movement systems are generally well thought-out. Recommend providing areas for respite along the long Agronomy Road accessible route.

NE corner of site and north tower

- The panel believes that the base of the north tower requires further design development to create more continuity and social connection with the outdoor commons and "heart" of the project. Currently, the North tower appears abandoned and disconnected from the amenities and social atmosphere of the communal spaces. The route from the lobby to the outdoor commons and the indoor amenities is rather circuitous and should have a more direct connection or link.
- The experience of living in one tower versus the other will undoubtedly be different. The panel accepts that students in one tower can show-up in pajamas and slippers for breakfast while the other will have to put on something warmer, however further design development of the future housing project could provide an equal or balanced experience with the south tower. The panel is less concerned with the equity there and more concerned with the connection walking back from the vertical circulation into the horizontal one and down into the restaurant.
- The relation of the north tower and the future building needs to be better resolved, and the team should probably anticipate the future building becoming part of the base of the north tower and extending the street wall north long West Mall.

Future site intentions

- The Panel expressed concern regarding the lack of consideration in the short-term use and treatment of the future building lot. While the Panel respects staff concern regarding an interim landscape treatment to ensure no group takes claim to the area, it must also be designed in a complementary manner to ensure continuity of the public realm and open space treatment within the development.

Solar Gain

- The panel felt careful attention is needed to the solar management of the building. This is especially important in the social gathering spaces on the ends of each tower floor and other west oriented glazed spaces that will potentially suffer from excessive heat gain.
- In addition, there is an opportunity for the façade treatment of the towers to respond to and express their particular solar orientation.
- The curved vertical concrete panels appear to be a pure applique on the facade. They are attractive, but the panel was surprised they don't play a solar shading role.

Additional Comments:

- The location of the daycare is problematic and could use more of the frontage to the east, as the current location of the outdoor play area does not seem to get the amount of direct sun exposure required by a daycare.
- The design rationale drawings in the submission are very good and assist in understanding such a large and complex project.
- However, the Development Permit application is incomplete. A project of this size and complexity should warrant a package with far greater detail than provided.
- The Panel was disappointed with the level of detail and resolution of the site/massing model and lack of adequate shadow impact studies. They suggest UBC staff create clear Development Permit submission requirements with particular attention to a physical context/massing model and shadow studies.
- Finally, the panel was disappointed that the design group was not able to meet or at least consider all of the sustainability goals set forth in the Design Brief.

The Panel resolved:

to support the application on the condition of further design development and report back to the panel on: resolution of the north tower and its relationships to the outdoor commons and future building; address the visual impact of the loading bay area on West Mall; managing solar gain throughout the project; interim design of the future building site; providing further design detailing; and augmenting solar access to the daycare openspace. *The resolution was supported; all in favour.*

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 pm.