



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2014



DRAFT Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	January 9 th , 2014
Time:	5 – 6:30 PM
Place:	Policy Room A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Martin Nielsen (Chair), Louise Cowin, Norm Shearing, Greg Borowski
Regrets:	Mark Ostry, Maged Senbel, Jane Durante
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Katie Keenie (Recorder)
Presenters:	Nick Maile (UBC Properties Trust), John Wall and Craig Simms (Public Architecture + Communication), Jose Gonzalez (ISL Engineering)

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

The chair called the meeting to order at 5:20 PM.

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

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

3.0 Workshop/ Presentations

3.1 Quantum Matter Institute (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of the Quantum Matter Institute process and sought Panel comments on the project as a whole along with feedback on weather protection, interior daylighting, north facade, solar shading, foundation planning and public realm hardscape. The applicant's presentation was made by John Wall and Craig Simms.

The Panel had the following comments:

- Panel felt that the design team has been very successful in taking an uneventful lab building and using brick in a very thoughtful and innovative way to create engaging façades.

Weather Protection

- The free standing rain cover element on East Mall should be deleted as it competes with the street trees and is not providing any weather protection benefit. Equally the Panel felt the East Mall façade is best continuing uninterrupted to the ground and therefore the weather protection should not be extended across this façade.

- Consideration should be given to increasing the weather protection at the south entry way.

Landscape

- The Panel agreed with staff that there should be a continuation of the landscape treatment of the broader precinct, while infusing some of the building concept/character into the landscape. The design team should work with staff to this end.

Additional Comments:

- Panel was all in agreement that the brick work for the project is very well thought out and designed. Appreciate that the design team have tested their concept with masons. The Panel felt the landscape buffer at the base should be removed to ensure that the full effect of the brick is felt by seeing the brick landing to the ground.
- Consider using a creative window design to buffer the labs for privacy.
- The playfulness of the social spaces is a great way to bring people out of the labs and promote a social atmosphere among students and faculty.
- There is not enough strength of material in the north facades vertical fin to serve as the terminus of the façade. Needs to be stronger and more thought out.
- The 25mm overhang language of the box window should be carried throughout all of the windows to add to the poetry of the windows as they are currently static.
- Include a skylight or transom window over the north side stairwell to increase the interior daylight.

The Panel resolved:

The resolution was supported; all in favour.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 pm.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	March 6, 2014
Time:	4:00 – 6:00 PM
Place:	Policy Rooms A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Acting Chair), Norman Shearing, Jane Durante, Leslie Van Duzer
Regrets:	Martin Nielsen, Mark Ostry
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Hugh Ker, Polygon Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Inc. Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc. Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Kim Perry, Perry and Associates

1.0 Call to order by the Chair

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

2.0 Welcome New Panel Member

Leslie Van Duzer, Professor and Director, UBC School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, was introduced as the newest appointed member to the Panel.

3.0 Approval of the January 9, 2014 meeting minutes and current agenda

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

- *Motion Carried*

4.0 Presentations

4.1 Lot 13, The Laureates (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comments on the project along with feedback on the drop-off court, sustainability strategy, character along the pedestrian realm and materiality. The applicant's presentation was made by Hugh Ker, Walter Francl and Bruce Hemstock.

Panel Commentary:

Townhouses

- Townhouse street façade is very well composed.
- Encourage the use of softer materials given the proximity to the landscape.
- They have a good relationship to the common area.
- The west end of the townhouses is less resolved, yet the most exposed. Needs some further development.

Tower

- Like the tower design.
- The vertical elements on the tower interrupt the fluidity of the design, particularly on the east elevation.
- The terminus of the tower seems less resolved. Work on the massing to distinguish the top three floors.

Drop-off court

- The drop-off court is rather grand for a low traffic street on the edge of forested land. Will not be heavily used. Is there another way to deal with drop-off?
- Further design development is required as it is still a big paved area and needs to feel like it is integrated with the public realm.
- The porte-cochere canopy could use some fluidity.
- Reduce the amount of hardscape in the courtyard or alternatively change to a layby.
- Drop-off court will likely result in being used as short term parking.
- It is a luxury that feels strange on a neighbourhood street. Feels suburban.

Landscape

- There is a disconnect between the form of the buildings and forms of the ground. Therefore, showing and linking the floor plans to the landscape plan is important.
- Like the split between the buildings and entry and viewing of the landscape beyond. Concerned it is only a viewing experience rather than an invitation to enter.
- Troubled with the non-public nature in the commons areas. It feels suburban.
- Troubled with the amount of grass. These spaces could be more interesting.

Sustainability

- Disappointed with the lack of sustainability discussion.
- The balconies provide passive shading and therefore off-sets the amount of thermal bridging.

Chair Summary:

- The Panel likes the direction of the project and the townhouse relationship to the common area.
- There is a reasonable balance between passive shading versus thermal bridging.
- Greater articulation is needed on the west end of the townhouses.
- The terminus of the tower needs more study with respect to clarifying the articulation at the top of the building.
- More work to be done around the drop-off court or review the necessity of this solution for such a singular project adjacent to the park.
- More porosity could be accomplished in the landscape.
- Look at the landscape in the context of the curvilinear edges of the building.

- The ratio of grass in the landscape should be re-visited.

4.2 Lot 45, Housing Action Plan (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview of UBC's Housing Action Plan. He explained there was no material in the AUDP package given the project's very tight timeline provided by the Board for this first pilot Housing Action Plan project. General Panel comments were sought. The applicant's presentation was made by Paul Young, Raymond Letkeman and Kim Perry.

Panel Commentary:

General

- The University and the applicant should be commended for producing affordable housing under the Housing Action Plan.
- The choice of site is interesting for a property that is targeted for family units.
- A six-storey building is a nice scale and good proportion for the end of the block.
- The pathway paving needs to be reviewed to suggest a more identifiable route to the unit.

Building design

- Step back and simplify the design.
- Question the needs for the building to have so much articulation.
- The palette of components is not clear and too many things are going on: brick, panel and stone. The design of solid and void is ambiguous. Need to rationalize the design with passive design or other purpose.
- The building lands abruptly at grade. Can the ground floor transition more?
- The ground floor is not differentiated from the street. Showing or adding gates and pathways could assist.
- Is it possible for the building to have more porosity to integrate with the site?

Chair Summary:

- The Panel commends UBC and the applicant for building affordable housing and larger three-bedroom units on campus.
- The Panel is disappointed there was no submission package for review in advance, but acknowledges the applicant's tight timeline and rationale.
- The six-storey scale has good volume.
- The building expression has too many elements. There needs to be clearer rationale as to where and how the elements are located.
- Access to areas to where children can play needs to be strengthened.
- Opportunities for the building to engage the patio areas should be explored.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 PM.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	April 3, 2014
Time:	4:00 – 6:00 PM
Location:	Policy Rooms A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Chair), Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Oliver Lang, Steve McFarlane, Janet Teasdale, Leslie Van Duzer
Regrets:	Jane Durante
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM

2.0 Welcome New Panel Members

Oliver Lang, Architect AIBC, Steve McFarlane, Architect AIBC, and Janet Teasdale, Managing Director, UBC Student Development and Services, were introduced as the newest appointed members to the Panel.

3.0 Motion to Elect a New Panel Chair and Vice-Chair

Gregory Borowski was elected as Chair to the Panel and Norman Shearing was elected as Vice-Chair to the Panel.

-Motion Carried

4.0 Approval of the March 6, 2014 Meeting Minutes and Current Agenda

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

-Motion Carried

5.0 Presentations:

5.1 Health Precinct Improvements (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on this project. The applicant's presentation was made by Karen Kiest and Dave Poettcker.

Panel Commentary:

- The existing 1980s geometry has a strong character that consumes the space, and creates fringes that become more of a visual than an active space. The pedestrian cross path is welcome given the geometry. To what degree should one celebrate the existing context by adopting elements from it or should one find a way to make the intervention look more distinctive? What do your new interventions have to say about the old? There's an opportunity to create a dialogue between the new and the old so the new is of our time and respects the integrity of the old. Materials that you are proposing like wood would be distinctive from the existing concrete edges.
- The lawn area is a critical juncture between the landscape that is generated from the hexagon geometry and the orthogonal landscape that is the proponent's intervention. The space is missing an opportunity to be an interesting, elegant resolution of the two geometries. As you shift from one space to another those junctures are important design moments and challenges.
- Each element in itself is competently handled but may not always serve well the overall reorganization of the space.
- The courtyards are an opportunity to create spaces that have clarity. There is a lot of problem solving rather than saying 'this is what the Patient courtyard is about', and 'this is what it can do best'. Move some other ideas to the other courtyards just so each have clarity.
- The lack of unity of the paving across the road surface is more vehicular friendly than pedestrian friendly. If you want to be successful in the "pedestrian comes first" goal and slowing the cars, you may want to strengthen the pedestrian connection. This may require changing the pavement in that entire area to signal that both sides can happily co-exist. It is important to bring that effort all the way to East Mall in a more consistent way.
- The canopy is a critical part of the scheme and is a big budget item. Is the intent to improve the lighting, increase the transparency or reimagine what that space could be? It is represented as both a restored canopy and a temporarily enhanced canopy. It would be interesting and respectful of the original work to make any of the new interventions reflective of today and create a dialog between the new elements. An element like this can be powerful both as linkage and definition. Maybe it needs to be moved or re-positioned so that it doesn't have that single purpose as one passageway but also gives the space more definition.
- The deck feels underdeveloped. It feels static and needs a more inventive ordering system.

Chair Summary:

- The user strategy was well received. The pedestrian paths as a whole are well treated. The public realm improvements are helping to improve life on the campus which is a very good initiative.
- There were some questions about the 1980s geometry. The existing context chews up the space somewhat. Working with a lot of existing context and not trying to reinvent it is a challenge. It is difficult to think afresh unless you substantially re-do what is there already.
- As you move towards East Mall the vehicular path is creating a division in your perception of your ability as a pedestrian to use that space. Make the space more integrated and multi-use.
- There is a consensus among the panel that the canopy is a critical item. The Panel would like to see further clarity on the role of the canopy and how it might be

resolved. This could require further exploration for the Panel to understand and to result in a good outcome. The lack of transparency is one of the challenges.

- The deck area could be more sympathetic to the existing architecture, allowing it to serve its existing purpose in a way that doesn't necessarily need to draw so strongly on the existing geometry.
- One of Panel member thought the green spaces could be diverse and distinctive; they don't necessarily need to tie together entirely.
- There is an interest in creating an identity to the overall space. Perhaps the lawn area could tie together the space more comprehensively and address the character vacuum concern.
- The parkade presents an unattractive façade. Consider envisioning the plantings in the context of creating a space that looks attractive in both in the winter and summer.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application on the condition of further design development based on the Panel's comments and reporting back to the Panel.

5.2 Lot 45 (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on the project along with feedback on the building expression and landscape. The applicant's presentation was made by Raymond Letkeman, Michael Patterson and Michelle Paquet.

Panel Commentary:

- Further to the initial presentation the team has done a lot to distil some of the elements. The distilling could be carried to a further stage to give the building a sense of presence and conviction about what it is, especially on the more public façades. The Panel appreciated the celebration of the entry/exit on the west elevation, the reduction in the number of different materials used on the façade, and the integration of the landscaping in the patio area into the public realm.
- A Panel member appreciated the ways in which the plan considered the community and the opportunity for children of all ages to engage in the building.
- From a livability perspective, the suites feel comfortable with conventional floor plans and fairly conventional massing. In a university setting there is an opportunity for a more ambitious approach, where the building suggests that this is Vancouver looking into the future rather than the past. It is in quite a privileged position given the close proximity to a future school and an adjacent greenway, so it will be observed differently than other buildings in the neighbourhood. With that comes a certain responsibility to do something that has confidence, represents the neighbourhood, and is carefully articulated.
- The granite-faced landscape wall territorializes the building. An effort should be made in which the building visually becomes more accessible in terms of the way it sits on the campus and has a confident presence.
- In terms of the treatment, there are parts of the project that have reached a critical mass and there are other aspects where the treatment has a veneer quality. The veneer quality is more apparent on the north façade. Consider fewer jogs, and more uniformity to vertical columns on the west façade and corners. Consider how the light colored elements on the façade meet the ground, and also the number of gestures the building has to let it confidently be a brick grounded object, given its siting at a mid-block t-intersection. Would encourage you to simplify further and consider turning the volume down on all the different treatments on the façade.

Chair Summary:

- It is a great community initiative to do this kind of housing for faculty, staff and families on campus.
- There is generally a good response to the comments that were made previously by the Panel. The reduced number of materials is moving in a positive direction. The move to celebrate that opportunity for entry and exit on the west side is positive. The project represents a livable environment in an important location.
- Further clarity is needed on the distribution of the brick, the vertical dimensions and disposition of the piers, and whether the brick at the base on the outside corners, for example, is necessary. There is a too much light wall panel cladding (fibre cement board). Maybe it doesn't need as much small scale articulation as has been represented.
- The project can be more courageous. Allow the building to be more strongly what it is: a six-storey structure.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application on the condition of further design development based on the Panel's comments to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

5.3 Applied Science Quad – East (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on the project. The applicant's presentation was made by Dave Poettcker and Michael Patterson.

Panel Commentary:

- There are some concerns around the potential level of noise in a multi-use space in a small green area cornered on all sides by classrooms.
- The commemorative plaque is an important statement for the university. The language on the plaque should be thoughtful and the surrounding symbolic elements should reflect the diverse international population on campus.
- A concern that the possible future connection through the CEME building into the courtyard at the northwest corner might negatively affect the contemplative aspects of the space. A potential safety concern also relating to the use of the space for active recreation such as frisbee. It would seem okay for this space to be a spatial eddy rather than a connector.
- Integrating lighting into the space to highlight different elements within that space would heighten its identity.
- In some ways the strength of this space is the simplicity that you are striving to give it and that lends itself to contemplation verses multi-use because it is not overly programmed.
- The benches lend themselves to more active use. Individual seating could drive a design that facilitates a space for individual reflection.
- The row of trees along the west side and the paving is quite strong.

Chair Summary:

- There was a general consensus among the Panel that this is an important space.
- Further exploration is recommended to determine the extent to which this space should support a multi-use function or whether it would be beneficial to see the space in a more singular manner as a space for contemplation.

- The commemorative element needs to be carefully managed and the appropriateness of the maple leaves reviewed.
- Consider whether there might be other elements within the space that reinforce the commemorative role such as vertical elements, and the manner in which seating is distributed through the space.
- The access, the steps and the ramp work well.
- The extent of paving at the commemorative plaque and at the end of the courtyard needs further clarification, as well as where and why the paths terminate.
- Review the role of the two existing trees proposed for retention to determine whether they are reinforcing the space.
- Consider the northwest connection as a destination rather than a passage through the courtyard.
- Consider whether the two existing campus standard light poles are the strongest solution to how this space might be illuminated in the evening.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application on the condition of further design development based on the Panel's comments to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	May 1, 2014
Time:	4:00 – 6:00 PM
Location:	Room 200, Neville Scarfe Building (2125 Main Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Steve McFarlane, Janet Teasdale
Regrets:	Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Leslie Van Duzer
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Inc. Hugh Ker, Polygon Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc. Jana Foit, Perkins+Will Derek Newby, Perkins+Will Joe Fry, Hapa Collaborative David English, UBC Properties Trust Christine Lintott, Christine Lintott Architect Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Doug Regelous, UBC School of Theology Board

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM

2.0 Approval of the April 3, 2014 Meeting Minutes and Current Agenda

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

3.0 Presentations:

3.1 Lot 13, The Laureates (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on this project along with feedback on the landscape, courtyard, drop-off court, west façade/terminus of the townhouses and terminus of the tower. The applicant's presentation was made by Walter Francl, Hugh Ker and Bruce Hemstock.

Panel Commentary:

- The landscaping in the forecourt is improved with pedestrian-scale trees and shrubs.
- There is good resolution between intermittent cars and pedestrians in the forecourt, but the space has the potential to be more multi-use.
- The curvilinear hedge on the patios pick up referentially with the curvilinear forms of the park so the walkway/bikeway seems like it is cutting through the park. From a landscape point of view the changes are good.
- The water feature is pleasant but feels as if it is establishing ownership.

- The curvilinear lines on the ground reflect the building forms.
- The building treatment used to inform the canopy borrows heavily from the compound curves of the tower expression, which is somewhat detached from the low-rise. The simple curves on the north side don't quite achieve the unity the complex deserves.
- The townhouses have been nicely unified. The west end has been improved and unified with the rest of the townhouses.
- There is a clear three-dimensional expression of building modulation in the low-rise. It would be nice if the scale of the low-rise could permeate into the scale of the tower to give it more unity, solving issues on the southwest and northeast corner.
- There is clarity in how the architectural elements are organized on the south side of the low-rise that could inform some clarity in the terminus of the tower.
- The southwest terminus of the tower has not quite realized its potential. The differentiation of the colour at the top is not as evident in the view as a result of the shadows underneath. Perhaps the tower looks more extruded at the top than it is.

Chair Summary:

- Efforts have been made to optimize the pedestrian experience in the forecourt such as elevating the sidewalk.
- Look to provide the opportunity for people to cross the site.
- The reflection of the building shape in the landscape was well received.
- The blending of the park with the greenway side of the low-rise building is nicely managed.
- Consideration should be given to concealing the parking garage by way of a trellis or another device visible from above and along the sidewalk.
- The three-dimensional modulation of the townhouses concludes the detail at the corner nicely.
- Top of the tower, the three-dimensional resolution: consider whether the top is informed more by what is being accomplished in the townhouse to unify it more.
- Review the canopy and how it marries to the low-rise building.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application.

3.2 Orchard Commons I Vantage College (Revisions to Development Application)

The design of the tower was supported by the Panel at its meeting on December 5, 2013. Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on the project along with feedback on the base of the north tower, loading bay, future building site, daycare open space and solar gain. The applicant's presentation was made by Jana Foit, Derek Newby, Joe Fry and David English.

Panel Commentary:

North Tower

- Thoughtfulness has gone into treating the outdoor commons. The interface and the connections between the buildings at the ground plane are carefully executed and the scheme is strong.
- The common spaces at the end help animate the campus and bring a sense of community to the building.

- A Panel member was disappointed to see opacity in the dining area because there was great unity in the space. The Panel member acknowledged the variety of challenges that caused it to happen, but encouraged the applicant to give the space more consideration.
- It would be prudent to understand how the wind is going to behave around the buildings to ensure the public space is successful.

Loading Bay

- The loading bay has been improved upon by adding a roof over the bay and a protective wall.
- There is still a distinct 'loading bay quality' to the space. Softening the edges would strengthen the scheme and how it is viewed upon from the roof plane.

Future Building Site

- Future building issues were addressed.
- Explore having some connections in the future building at the ground level to find a way out of the public space.

Daycare Open Space

- The shadow and program has been comprehensively studied so that it can be used successfully in a challenging location with respect to sunlight.
- The daycare has a lot of program ideas and sketches that look at ways of engaging children in play and learning.

Solar Gain

- The Panel acknowledged the solar management strategies such as use of fixed shades, opaque elements and reduced glass in the student lounges.
- The student lounges are dramatic spaces. To heat up a space and mechanically cool it down is contrary to a sustainable a design philosophy, but the Panel acknowledged the budgetary considerations and other challenges such the variable occupant load that require a mechanical strategy.

Chair Summary:

- The appearance and configuration of the loading bay was addressed. Explore treating the wall and roof surface to blend in more.
- The landscape intervention is versatile and was well received. The road has an abrupt edge to it which might merit some review.
- The solar management in the student lounges area, as a whole, has been improved.
- The daycare has advanced well. The orchard concept is nicely managed in the overall program.
- The building interfaces are good.
- The future building site was generally well addressed. Consider pedestrian porosity through it at a future date.
- Attention should be given to the first-year student arrival and living experience.
- A wind study for the configuration of the building would provide some science to the effect the wind will have on the ground plane.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application.

3.3 Somerville House (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment on the project. The applicant's presentation was introduced by Doug Regelous and made by Christine Lintott and Michael Patterson.

Panel Commentary:

- The Panel appreciated the challenge of reconsidering the form and character of the building to reflect the change in use from residential to institutional.
- Given the site constraints, the management of scale is important. The large roof is a strong device which might be overly dominant where the building is sited.
- The roof could flow more and serve to create a dialog between the existing and new elements. The large roof might be awkward given the tight site.
- The proposed cruciform as well as the vertical framed elements which serve to buttress the east and west façades may be too expressive. The articulation should be balanced and more modest.
- The Panel suggested putting a modern frame around the windows that is suited to the base and refining the window surrounds on the upper three floors. It was noted that the existing lintels on the ground plane have simplicity about them. The proposed use of window jamb blocks and arch window surrounds adds too many architectural elements.
- The removal of the residential scale balconies on the west and east façade was well received.
- The proposed location of the wheelchair access creates a barrier and limits social interaction. It was suggested that the wheelchair access be located on the front façade of the building.
- A simple, relatively open podium is a good idea notwithstanding changing the grade for wheelchair access.
- Cruciform and large column is ambiguously located.
- Consideration should be given to how the building represents a modern form of faith. The proposed design has an obvious articulation of church, so thought should be given to how to create a strong architectural expression of diversity that recognizes the different ways of faith and spirituality.
- The proposed scheme needs more time to resolve.

Chair Summary:

- The Panel acknowledged the challenge of transforming a residential building into an institutional building, and the site constraints.
- Consideration should be given to floating the transition between the fourth floor and the roof.
- The window surrounds need to be simplified.
- The project should be more cohesive and the expression more aligned with its siting and use.
- There should be a harmonious relationship between the existing elements and the proposed new vertical elements. Need to pull the totality of the project together.
- The tower and columns compete with each other.
- Consideration should be given to providing integrated wheelchair access at the front façade of the building in order to facilitate a socially inclusive and accessible environment.
- In an environment of diverse faiths and different forms of spirituality, it is important to represent the campus and community as one of inclusiveness where all feel welcome.

The meeting adjourned at 6:20 PM.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	June 5, 2014
Time:	4:00 – 6:00 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Steve McFarlane, Janet Teasdale, Leslie Van Duzer
Regrets:	Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair)
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Karen Kiest, Karen Kiest Landscape Architects Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust Christine Linttot, Christine Linttot Architect Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates David Dove, Perkins+Will Chris Phillips, PFS Studios Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM

2.0 Introduction

Gerry McGeough introduced Scot Hein, Urban Designer with Campus and Community Planning.

3.0 Approval of the May 1, 2014 Meeting Minutes and Current Agenda

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

4.0 Presentations:

4.1 Health Precinct Improvements (Revisions to Development Application)

Scot Hein gave a brief overview and sought Panel comment with respect to the asphalt paving in the vehicular zone of the drop-off and the concrete paving in Patient Park. The applicant's presentation was made by Karen Kiest and Dave Poettcker.

Panel Commentary:

Landscape

- There are a lot of good ideas, but the vocabulary needs refinement. The simplicity of the precedent example of Children's Park was appealing where trees populate the space amongst grass mounds.
- The circular areas could be strengthened by having a simple geometric clarity to the pathway.

- The lawn mound at the end of the fire lane in Koerner/Purdy Court feels fragmented and the path disjointed. If the whole space in that area was treated with feature paving it might gain some identity.
- The two lawn mounds along the walkway have the strongest character, but the large planted mound needs some tightening up.
- The success of the mounds will depend on their height. When you walk you get a sense of generosity and when you sit down you get a sense of intimacy. Understanding the distribution of height is essential.
- Access from Koerner Pavilion to Patient Park is important. To block it off raises the question of accessibility and use of that space.

Hardscape

- The removal of the retaining walls was a good strategy.
- The pedestrianization of Health Sciences Mall has been a good evolution.
- The band of colour pavers in front of the Health Sciences Parkade entrances may not serve to slow vehicular traffic or communicate the emphasis on the pedestrian. A comment was raised whether it needed to be a two-lane street. Increasing the width of the sidewalk would put more emphasis on the pedestrian and reinforce the east-west asymmetrical grid.
- Demarcating with paving the actual shape of the vehicle turn-around is unfortunate.
- A surface treatment in the drop-off area could distinguish it as a multi-purpose zone where both pedestrian and vehicle co-exist, and send a message to watch out for each other.
- There was a suggestion that the turn-around area needs to be looked at as more unified with the overall geometry of the space. The feature paving that serves as a fire lane and path ends abruptly and needs to be resolved.

Chair Summary:

- There are good areas for people to congregate and the flow of people generally feels pleasant.
- The Panel was supportive of taking the retaining walls down and of the principle of the circular devices.
- Review the geometry and the distinction between pedestrian and vehicular drop-off and terminus to Health Sciences Mall.
- Due to the dimensions of the paved area, particularly in Patient Park, determine if trees might be able to populate the space more without inhibiting the movement of people through the area.
- The exit from Koerner Pavilion and entrance to Patient Park is important to the utility of the space.
- A Panel member suggested the transition of the curve and geometry between the Koerner Pavilion and Purdy Pavilion could be clarified.
- The height of the mounds is critical to find that right balance between visibility and separation.
- There is an opportunity to step back and look at the totality of the landscape now that Health Sciences Mall has been unified with the space and whether there are some further connectivity opportunities.
- As the space bleeds down to East Mall there may be opportunities for the sidewalk to be widened to reduce the prioritization of vehicular access to the parkade.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application. [5-0]

4.2 Somerville House (Development Application)

Scot Hein gave a brief overview and sought general panel comment with respect to the balance between distinguishing the building architecturally while being contextually responsive and specific advice on materiality, color, and the vertical proportion and composition of the façade. The applicant's presentation was made by Christine Lintott and Michael Patterson.

Panel Commentary:

Proportion and Composition

- The clarity of the articulation of the volumes has been improved.
- It was suggested that the cruciform element be located on the street façade rather than offset in a secondary location. This could mark the entry, give it verticality, break the roof plane along with the two halves in center, and introduce some ideas of symmetry.
- The buttresses look decorative. It was suggested that a wooden entry canopy might replace the buttresses in terms of having some sort of three-dimensional feature on an otherwise taut façade.
- The buttresses are small elements of a larger gesture and compete with the cruciform element.
- The symbolism of the cruciform is important and warrants more of a front-and-center role that celebrates the role of building. With the elements that are being deployed right now, it relies on a side-view to experience that.
- It is a challenging project from a symmetry point-of-view. The asymmetrical cruciform element fights with the symmetry of the existing building.
- With respect to the overall composition, there are no medium elements to bridge scale. The cruciform is a very large scale and tall element. It could be expressed as a medium scale element.
- The punched-out windows on the third floor are starting to develop a nice language. It was suggested the fenestration could be treated similarly elsewhere.
- The proportions on the fourth floor need more refinement. The small windows on the third floor polarize the scale of the third and fourth floors, which creates a micro-macro relationship.
- The wood buttresses could be scaled down to support the roof at the upper level rather than four-stories high.
- The scale of the roof could be reduced.
- A Panel member had a concern that the building isn't very welcoming. Given the role that it plays in the precinct, it should invite people to come in.
- The parapet of the ramp at the main entrance should be flat, not sloped, so to strengthen the expression of the podium.
- There was question concerning the accessibility and usage of the terraces, as well as the amount of hard space.
- The front-back entry through-court was well received.

Materiality and Colour

- A Panel member was not convinced by the use of SWISSPEARL®, referring to it as a 'skin' material, not a 'grounding' material. Consideration of a durable material such as brick or masonry would give the base of the building strength. Care should be taken in the way the SWISSPEARL® is installed, in terms of concealing the fasteners.
- A lighter colour wall panel material, as depicted on the renderings was favoured. The lighter treatment would be more energy efficient.
- The longevity of the wood elements outside is a maintenance issue. If the cruciform is in wood it should be protected to have a long-term durability and beauty to it.

Chair Summary:

- The scheme has improved and there is more restraint shown.
- There are concerns about the location and form of the cruciform element, but an acknowledgment of an expression pertinent to the purpose of building.
- The buttresses look decorative, and are maybe not done in an appropriate way in their present expression. Further refine and reduce the number to make the expression more compatible with the thesis.
- The buttresses compete with the cruciform. Maybe one element could be stronger with respect to the religious purposes of the building.
- The scale of the glass articulation band on the fourth level is too large.
- The glass spandrel panels at the wings were questioned relative to the punched window expression on the main body of the building.
- If a cement composite panel system (SWISSPEARL®) is utilized, attention should be given to concealments of the fasteners as the treatment is a dominant part of the expression of the building.
- The color of the proposed cement composite panel should be lighter as depicted in the rendering. This would also reduce the energy consumption.
- The Panel had concerns regarding the longevity of the wood exposed to the elements and suggested finding a protection solution that does not require a maintenance program.
- The through court front-to-back entry was well received.
- A Panel member had a concern about the amount of hard surface on the ground level.
- If possible, carry the resolution of the planted and landscaped area across the property line, as shown, to tie it together in a unified way.
- There was a concern about the welcoming quality of the building.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application on the condition of further design development based on the Panel's comments to the satisfaction of Campus and Community Planning. [4-1]

4.3 UBC Life Building (Pre-Application Workshop)

Scot Hein gave a brief overview and the design team sought commentary on the project; in particular the façade, access and entries, and the forecourts. The applicant's presentation was made by David Dove and Chris Phillips.

Panel Commentary:

- The retrofit of the building is an engaging and challenging project.
- The Panel recognized architect Kenneth Snider who submitted the winning scheme in 1964. The SUB building was a bold design for the era.
- Work towards the essence and strengths of the original concept with fewer elements rather than adding more. Employ current ideas about spaces, social engagement and multi-functionality.

Façade

- The proposed removal of the exterior balconies and the addition of new glazing assemblies will improve lightness and transparency.
- The visual porosity of the building is very important. Internal programming that is visible from the outside may be stronger than intervening a lot on the exterior expression of the building.
- The second floor courtyard glass roof is a good strategy. Daylighting is needed in the lower space, particularly the middle of the building.
- A panel member discussed the idea of a mat-building where vertical penetrations allow the activation of it and life within. Bring out its strengths and have moments of

landscape on the inside, vertical ideas, sectional ideas, oblique ideas that allows it to become a mat-like building.

Access and Entries

- Circulation paths and the context of the façades will evolve as new and future projects are completed in the precinct.
- The south passage between the new Nest and Life Building is a challenge due to close proximity. Consider inserting a tubular space that captures the light, unifies the space between the two buildings and plays off the high activity on either side.
- Establish a basic language; within that language give each of the entries their own character, whether through the use of material or colour.
- The proposed threshold elements are playful. When restoring the purity of the building there is a danger of compromising it by having too many elements actually embedded into the architecture verses elements that are simply visible such that you can pass through into the building and experience them.
- The entries are big gestures. A more powerful approach might be a subtractive one rather than an additive one.

Forecourts

- North Plaza: The proposed angled ramp condition coming from the northwest desire line is a way of working with the landscape where the inner floor plates start to join instead of being additional elements. Play with the landscape plates so the stairs flow together.
- The north ramp and the switchback approach are macro in scale but get lost because the building is so powerful. Explore the use of colour. Aim for robust and confident gestures.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58 PM.



Advisory Urban Design Panel Minutes

Date:	July 17, 2014
Time:	4:00 – 6:00 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Janet Teasdale
Regrets:	Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Steve McFarlane, Leslie Van Duzer
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	David Dove, Perkins+Will Chris Phillips, PFS Studio Rob Brown, UBC Properties Trust Michael Green, Michael Green Architecture Terry McKaig, UBC Thunderbirds David English, UBC Properties Trust Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects Richard Findlay, Landscape Architect Inc. Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 PM

2.0 Leave of Absence

Vice-Chair Norman Shearing was granted leave by the Panel from the July 17th AUDP meeting, as per the Terms of Reference.

3.0 Approval of the June 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes and Current Agenda

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

4.0 Presentations:

4.1 UBC Life Building (Development Application)

Gerry McGeough gave an overview of the project development since the pre-application. The applicant's presentation was made by David Dove and Chris Phillips on behalf of UBCPT. Janet Teasdale abstained from voting. Steve McFarlane provided written comments to the Chair prior to the meeting.

Panel Commentary:

- The Panel generally liked the direction the project is going and the design team's sensitive understanding of the existing building.
- The Panel supported removal of the existing "infill" balconies, the design of the second floor over the existing concourse and revision of the above-grade South Plaza skylights to at-grade skylights.

- A Panel member challenged the need to inflect the geometry of entrances so literally, especially when existing stairs and sidewalks don't respond similarly. Another Panel member thought the exterior stair piece compromised the space below the stair.
- The primary entrances appear successful from a massing perspective. The second and tertiary entrances have difficulty announcing themselves in the context of the existing building. A more straightforward and robust strategy would warrant further exploration.
- The south entry could have an extension that serves a dual purpose capturing traffic from the bus loop and providing a purposeful backdrop to MacInnes Field during events.
- The Panel liked the glazing treatments and colour direction. The glazing with the integral honeycomb baffles provide nice visual animation that changes from transparent to opaque, depending on the viewing angle.
- A Panel member thought the steps were brilliant, but suggested it would be nice to have an element at the end of the axis that leads you out from the inside.
- The close relationship to the new SUB Nest building creates a challenging resultant space. The introduction of more transparency is important, but it remains a rather harsh interstitial space and should be developed further so it does not feel like a remainder gap. The space will also be a major circulation path.

Chair Summary:

- Generally a nice balance.
- The glazing and colour strategy was supported.
- In general principle the approach to the doors is okay, although there were concerns about the tertiary entrances.
- The north steps and plaza entrance was supported, although there were questions about the need for the bridging component of the stairs.
- The skylight and atrium concepts were strongly supported along with the approach to the skylight that might reflect the geometry of the two-directional grid underneath.
- Address the main entrance coming from the bus loop to ensure the success of that with the events going on in the background in MacInnes Field.
- The SUB interface is an interstitial space that needs an intervention of some kind.

The Panel resolved:

To support the application. [4-0]

4.2 Baseball High Performance Training Facility (Pre-Application Workshop)

Gerry McGeough gave an overview of the project. The applicant's project was introduced by Terry McKaig and the presentation was made by Michael Green on behalf of UBCPT.

Panel Commentary:

- The building will be the first one you see from both approaches off West 16th Avenue.
- A Panel member commented on the incline of the ramp and questioned whether the ramp is wheelchair accessible.
- A Panel member wondered whether utilizing one primary ramp that is twice the width may be explored, offering more of a viewing opportunity and removing the darker interstitial space.
- The ramp is a nice idea but looks a little like an appendage. The ramp is fundamental in organizing the public aspect of the building. It would be nice if the building and ramp work together. The building needs to engage the space more. Fences become the ramp; the ramp becomes the wall.
- The project is part of a larger collection of projects. Is the ramp part of the building or part of the landscape and other intermediary architectural elements like bleachers, fencing and other components.

- A Panel member asked if curving the ramp, which would reduce the length, may be explored.
- The Panel appreciated the challenge of bringing daylight into a large volume interior space needed for batting cages.
- Athletes Walk is a very long, linear path. A Panel member asked if there are opportunities for other interventions in the context of the project or future projects.

4.3 Site B – University Boulevard (Pre-Application)

Gerry McGeough provided context within the Neighbourhood Plan and Vancouver Campus Plan regarding the development and usage of the site and future development of the surrounding area. The applicant's presentation was made by Doug Ramsay and Richard Findlay on behalf of UBCPT.

Panel Commentary:

- A Panel member appreciated the reverence given to the form of the War Memorial Gymnasium. The War Memorial Gymnasium is a significant heritage structure. The portal at the lower two levels however impedes one's ability to view an elevation that has always been appreciated.
- The volume of the scheme is too large for the site. Explore whether the physical length of the volume can be broken into two components to allow the gymnasium to have more presence from the boulevard.
- The boulevard is an entry gate to the campus. This is an opportunity to shape the space in innovative ways and find massing expressions that are suitable to the site.
- University Boulevard is a pedestrian priority street. The volume of the massing is overwhelming.
- A Panel member thought the proposed scheme could be anywhere.
- This is an opportunity to introduce some innovative housing typologies. The proposed units are prescribed and formulaic. The 300-foot hallway is relentless. The repetition does not work well for the culture of the building. Explore orientations, indoor-outdoor relationships, and provide a variety of interpretations in how you can live in and furnish the units. There has to be a sufficient balance of differentiation in the repetition.

Chair Summary:

- Site B is an important street wall project that frames University Boulevard; it is part of the whole social/arrival precinct.
- The proposed mixed uses are okay.
- Given its prominence and role on University Boulevard, the building scheme is an opportunity to be innovative.
- The volume of the building for a slow pedestrian street is too large for the site. Explore breaking up the building.
- The length of hallway, repetitive layout of the units, and lack of balconies do not enrich the culture of the building.
- Consideration should be given as to how to strengthen the building's character.
- A greater sense of porosity is needed to the War Memorial Gymnasium.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	December 4, 2014
Time:	4:10 – 5:05 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Gregory Borowski (Chair), Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Janet Teasdale, Leslie Van Duzer
Regrets:	Steve McFarlane
Staff:	Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects Richard Findlay, Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM

2.0 Approval of the Current Agenda

A motion to approve the December 4, 2014, agenda was made by the Chair.
-Motion Carried

3.0 Presentation:

3.1 University Boulevard – Site B (Development Application)

Scot Hein introduced the project. The Panel was asked to comment on the redistribution of density, the revised form and the north side landscape. Doug Ramsay and Richard Findlay presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The architectural strategy of tapering the ends and distinguishing them from the main mass is a good move and establishes a more human scale.
- Some further refinement of the façade strategy is needed.
- A number of Panelists thought the entry was too tight in proximity to the elevators.
- One Panelist thought safety lighting and noise transmission should be explored given the intended mixed-use building program.
- A Panelist thought the vertical shade elements worked well for screening the vents.
- One Panelist was concerned the proposed white brick specification may yellow over time affecting the visual relationship to War Memorial Gymnasium which has large white surfaces.
- A number of Panelists thought the proposed water feature was too small in scale and would present ongoing maintenance issues. Plantings were suggested.
- One Panelist thought the proposed use of Trembling Aspens, which have a strong, linear character, is visually appealing.

Chair Summary:

- Overall there is a significant improvement to the scheme.
- The reduction in building area and length has improved the appearance of the building and the relationship to adjacent context, including War Memorial Gymnasium.

- A number of Panelists thought the west elevation should be reviewed to see if there is an opportunity for refinement given its short term prominence.
- Take a further look at reconciling the fenestration logic and composition.
- With respect to the form, the double height area at each end of the building creates a welcoming quality.
- The garbage area should have some landscape screening.
- The circulation patterns are hugely improved.
- Generally there was an appreciation of expressing the stairs functionality and invitation but they have should be better integrated and consider the manner in which they open to the adjacent open spaces.
- The entry way to the west side is a bit too tight to the elevators as you go in.
- A concern the north elevation is a little bit too stark and seems to be the least considered of all the elevations.

The Panel resolved:

To support the development application subject to the Panel's recommendations. [5-0]

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 PM.