



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP)

Meeting Minutes
2015



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	February 5, 2015
Time:	4:12 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel: 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:	Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:12 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the February 5, 2015, meeting be accepted as circulated.
MOTION CARRIED

2.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on December 4, 2014, be adopted.
MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Application for Presentation:

3.1 Lot 27, Lot 29 - Wesbrook Place

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Wesbrook Place
Development Permit:	DP 15001
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Perry + Associates

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the project and provided some background noting the proposed site density of 2.8 FSR under the Wesbrook Neighbourhood Plan. The Panel was asked to comment on how the proposed density is distributed on the site, in addition to comment on the interior courtyards, semi-private spaces, orientation, and the shade and shadow. Michelle Paquet provided some context regarding the project's financing and budget constraints reiterating the desire to achieve maximum density on the site of 2.8 FSR. Raymond Letkeman and Michael Patterson presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The commitment to family within the building is very important.
- Create an indoor amenity space with an outdoor space attached to it for family-oriented gatherings to facilitate a sense of community. Consider the area on the inside bend of the south building wing where the units are quite compromised.
- One Panelist thought the overall form of the building should be revisited and overall there's a lack of: design integration and commitment to quality, careful articulation to proportion, expression of our time, and lack of context for tripartite referencing given adjacency next to Pacific Spirit Park.
- In terms of materiality, one Panelist thought the proposed usage of fibre cement siding was a questionable choice for long term durability. A number of Panelists thought the beige colour palette was not visually interesting and could be more vibrant.
- Further design refinement is needed on the quantity of subdominant elements.
- One Panelist thought the corners of the building at four stories should be all brick to distinguish the corners and help announce that location.
- In terms of the facade composition, one Panelist thought the building architecture was very stark, while rich in landscape, and questioned the level of design and quality was not reflected in the architecture.
- Generally the Panel thought the south building central wing created significant year round shadow impacts in the courtyards, noting people will not spend time in outdoor spaces that are dark. Consider spaces and programming that would be sunlit, and how useful it could be, and how it could be a great community amenity.
- One Panelist had a concern about the maintenance of the small water features and their long term functionality.
- Some Panelists wondered if there might be some more special amenities that are more playful and more distinct and also more appropriate to where the sun is and isn't, because shading is an issue, and the landscape could be more responsive to that fact.
- Explore how the network of outdoor spaces speaks to a diverse community's sense of engagement.
- Consider combining the courtyard spaces with the adjacent development to enable residents to move freely between the four different buildings.
- In terms of shadow, consider how the building massing and siting will impact a future nine-story development adjacent to the site.

Chair Summary:

- Architectural composition and expression needs further development.
- The proposed beige color palette is muted. A colour palette with stronger values would intensify the distinction of the facade elements.
- Carry through the elevation strategies that have been initiated.
- Provide some sort of interior group gathering space for residents to use.
- The south building central wing is compromising the light access and perhaps in some ways the clarity of the thesis with the courtyard.
- Consider programming the courtyards distinctly and then address the diversity of residents.
- The courtyards could be more integrated by softening the edge planting 'line' between the new courtyards and the existing courtyards.
- There is general enthusiasm about the outdoor space network and the capacity of people to move through the site and have different experiences.
- The parking entry strategy is very good, and allows the building to have many more light edges.

Related Commentary:

Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan (for UBC staff)

- Explore whether there is an opportunity to further develop the Wesbrook Place Neighborhood Plan. A more coherent plan would enable applicants to propose a strong urban response on their site with a clear understanding of how it fits in the urban whole and what might happen to adjacent sites.

The Panel RESOLVED to not support the application.

NON-SUPPORT [2-3]

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date: March 5, 2015

Time: 4:07 PM

Location: Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)

Attendees: [Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel:](#)
Gregory Borowski (Chair), Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Steve McFarlane, Leslie Van Duzer

Regrets: Janet Teasdale

Staff: Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)

Presenters: Megan Pohanka, UBC Properties Trust
Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects
Connely Farr, Ramsay Worden Architects
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates
David English, UBC Properties Trust
Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Inc.
Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc.

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda

- 2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the March 5, 2015, meeting be accepted as circulated.
MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Applications for Presentation:

3.1 Lot E, Wesbrook Place

Application Status: Pre-Application
Location: Wesbrook Place
Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
Ramsay Worden Architects
Perry + Associates

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the project. The applicant team: Megan Pohanka, UBC Properties Trust, Bob Worden and Connely Farr, Ramsay Worden Architects. and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates presented the project.

Panel Commentary:

- Panelists were unsure how the loading bay serves the retail along Shrum Lane, it seems like it is the loading bay for the large format retail store. This will create inefficiencies for the far tenant.

- The crosswalk is the connection to the community centre. The northwest corner at Webber Lane, given the loading dock location, needs more study in terms of pedestrian flow between the community centre and the residential building.
- The entrance to the upper floor of commercial space is blocking the lower entry. The staircase becomes more important than the access to the actual space behind it. Given that it is a rental building, and that it's in the town center, those stairs may have to be locked to prevent access to the second floor space in the evenings. The second floor should be office spaces rather than commercial retail.
- In terms of the stairs beside the commercial lobby, look at precedents but also to be inventive.
- In terms of vertical circulation, consider a second residential stair towards the east end. The stairs would introduce animation and would assist in better understanding the building. The second stair is a missed opportunity to bring it to the outside and draw light to the corridor which is quite long.
- The residential entry is a mean, long corridor and need further design development.
- The overall composition of the building is not very confident in terms of the expression of the pieces and particularly at the ends where they fold into one plane. The other two sides present a setback leading to a separation between the base and the commercial activity. The residential above doesn't carry itself around the building. The composition is too complex and needs to be simplified.
- More strongly advocate for housing along the south side, don't have the commercial come to that edge.
- A few Panelists thought the water feature was not useful and resting places along the greenway were not needed. Have the retail double front rather than screen with shrubs, or add four additional loft units.
- The complexity of the program has the potential to bring a lot of vibrancy into the neighbourhood but dependent on how the program is deployed.
- This project has the potential to be much sharper and the skillful designers at the table can bring that level of clarity.
- The landscape architecture is very defined and overly decorative. The parking lot could be more than a parking lot.
- The relationship with parking area has the potential to be a special public space. Consider the space and building compositionally at the end of the square across from the grocery store. The residential expression is really critical to allow the building to read convincingly.
- More imagination for the homes, some outdoor space, better circulation within the units, more breaking down of the massing, less expression of pure economics and density towards something more imaginative with a landscape design that is less decorative and prescriptive and more engaging and an invitation for community and cultural expression.
- Distinguish the program by the relationship of the separate masses to the two-storey volume on the lower level.

Chair Summary:

- With respect to the loading, it appears that may be the only location commercial vehicles can maneuver. If that is the case, carefully study the relationship to pedestrian movement, access to the community centre and the location of the existing northwest crosswalk. The loading would be inefficient if there is a far tenant.
- Some concern about the stair blocking the access to the commercial entry and how that could be secured after hours. Study further and allow the two functions to behave independently, if need be.

- There is a concern the water feature and rest area along the south side is not that useful given there are a lot of rest locations along the greenway. Four more residential loft units would help tie together the community of residences along the south side of the building and strengthen the relationship with the greenway.
- The general composition is not very confident. It is confusing and too complex. Reduce the number of ingredients to make it a confident building, but also allow the scale to be qualified by the thoughtful application of the program and the expression of the program on the exterior. Perhaps there are too many materials.
- Reflect across the greenway and towards the YU building for confidence of expression, which may help tie things together.
- The residential entry feels mean and narrow and requires further design development.
- Look at residential units that are isolated and try to cluster the residences in more convincing groupings.
- In regards to the typology, there seems to be a limitation that is almost setup by the double-load corridor convention. Try to mine as many opportunities as there are from the program to realize special places in the building and allow that to be expressed thereby cutting down repetition and relentlessness.
- In terms of the overall building, look in terms of its relationship to the community centre and the parking area to try and have the building respond in a clear manner to those adjacencies.
- With respect to the landscape, try to focus on the utility of the landscape and the opportunities for use, rather than a more decorative approach.

3.2 Student Residence at Brock Commons

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Location:	Brock Commons Phase I
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Acton Ostry Architects Inc.

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the project. The applicant team: David English, UBC Properties Trust, Mark Ostry and Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc., presented the project.

Panel Commentary:

- The project is an amazing opportunity and the University and the design team should be commended for pursuing the design challenge. Safety is first and foremost. The student residence project will deliver much needed student residence beds in an affordable tall mass timber building. There is going to be a steep learning curve on this acknowledging that there is no guarantee of approvals. The Panel is confident the design team will deliver a successful project and will rise to the challenge of finding solutions that will receive the required approvals.
- A Panelist appreciated the significance of exploration to building construction format with wood and noted this is a tremendous opportunity for discovery.
- One Panelist thought the project could be more architecturally vibrant.
- A Panelist noted that the only wood that is evident is non-structural.
- One Panelist questioned if fewer units might allow for communal spaces that would add visual and spatial complexity, appreciating the tight budget to make this project feasible and the goal to demonstrate the financial viability of wood.
- Some Panelists noted siting constraints presented by the location and adjacency. The building will cast a large northerly shadow. The site is so narrow it forces itself into a slab arrangement, noting the road needs to be realigned in order to accomplish that.
- There is a general consensus that the building needs more wood expression, noting that the structure will need to be concealed to achieve fire resistance ratings.

Chair Summary:

- This is a fantastic initiative to construct a tall building in wood. It represents an opportunity to explore replacing less sustainable materials with more sustainable materials, and an opportunity for BC to lead the way in this respect.
- Life safety is first and foremost.
- Recognition of budget constraints, but some concerns about functionality being impaired by technical constraint. Opportunities to showcase wood should be pursued.
- In terms of the building itself, consider opportunities to achieve more diverse internal spatial volumes in some locations to enhance the sense of architectural quality of the project.
- The project will be under a global magnifying glass, and will be viewed as a showcase building, or at the very least a contributory contextual building. It is critical for the project to celebrate the technology, reveal it in some manner, and find a way to optimize a more expressive image of achievement.
- Find a way to celebrate wood to the extent visually possible.
- There is general support for the design team, and the design team's capacity to address the design challenges. They are encouraged to continue the pursuit.
- Some concerns with the site location and adjacency to the parkade.

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 6:25 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	April 9, 2015
Time:	4:20 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel: Gregory Borowski (Chair), Jane Durante, Oliver Lang, Janet Teasdale
Regrets:	Steve McFarlane, Norman Shearing (Vice-Chair), Leslie Van Duzer
Staff:	Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	David English, UBC Properties Trust Mark Ostry, Acton Ostry Architects Inc. Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc. Doug Shearer, Hapa Collaborative

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:20 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda

It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the April 9, 2015, meeting be approved as circulated. MOTION CARRIED

3.0 New Chair and Vice-Chair – 2015/2016

3.1 Oliver Lang was nominated and elected by majority via electronic vote as Chair to the Panel commencing May 2015. Steve McFarlane was nominated and elected by majority via electronic vote as Vice-Chair to the Panel commencing May 2015.

3.2 Outgoing Chair, Gregory Borowski was thanked by staff and the Panel for his contribution as Chair. Outgoing Vice-Chair, Norman Shearing was thanked by staff and the Panel for his contribution as Vice-Chair.

4.0 Application for Presentation:

4.1 Student Residence at Brock Commons

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Brock Commons Phase I
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Acton Ostry Architects Inc.

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the project and sought refinement and design development advice from the Panel with respect to the kind of interpretative opportunities to announce wood and celebrate wood, visual vibrancy and ground oriented aspects given the important

frontage that will contribute to place making at Brock Commons. The applicant team was introduced: David English, UBC Properties Trust, Mark Ostry and Russell Acton, Acton Ostry Architects Inc. and Doug Shearer, Hapa Collaborative. Mark Ostry and Doug Shearer presented the project.

Panel Commentary:

- This is an exciting project; the University and design team are to be commended.
- We need to have buildings that demonstrate that we can build well and affordably with wood, so this is an important building for campus and the industry.
- The narrow form of the building is challenging acknowledging the site constraints and structural considerations.
- The clear vertical expression on the façade above the base shines through with the choice of materials and colour palette. The treatment of the corner windows is a nice nuance.
- The presence of wood at the base is a welcoming feature.
- Consider creating a common space with a view on an upper floor for all residents to enjoy.
- Visual permeability for ground oriented spaces would be increased if the curtain wall was structural glazing or the curtain wall was a butt joint rather than expressed caps. It would be lovely to see the building 'visually' float above the concrete podium to increase the visual permeability.
- Upgrade the common space between the building and the North Parkade. Screen the parkade from the view of lower-level units.
- Make use of the woodland landscape. Providing more than one environment would add value to residents and the passersby.
- Consider moving some of the trees, and look at it from the lens of safety and security for residents, as well as useable space and outdoor community space.
- The triangle-shaped berm planted with a bosque of cherry trees is supported as it will provide directionality as you move around the campus.

Chair Summary:

- This is an exciting project and the Panel commends the University and the applicant team for the research and the quality of the presentation.
- The visual permeability at the ground floor is welcoming and is a good feature.
- It is important to have upper year undergraduate and graduate student housing at this location.
- The safety factors have been generally well considered. Careful attention to lighting is required.
- This will be a great learning opportunity for staff, faculty, students and the industry. People from all over the world will be coming here and learning more about the construction of this hybrid mass wood and concrete building. An interpretative program would be helpful.
- The approach to International style modernist architecture is well-handled and sophisticated, and has a simple and elegant articulation.
- The introduction of items like the corner windows, the panels and the choice of the colour palette are nice nuances.
- With respect to the landscape, make use of the soft wilderness landscape.
- Further study the space between the North Parkade and the building to consider the landscape as four active elevations to the building rather than one that feels a bit passive and oppressive.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	May 7, 2015
Time:	4:10 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel: Oliver Lang (Chair), Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Gregory Borowski, Janet Teasdale, Leslie Van Duzer
Regrets:	Norm Shearing, Jane Durante
Staff:	Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects Connely Farr, Ramsay Worden Architects Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the May 7, 2015, meeting be approved as circulated. MOTION CARRIED

2.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on April 9, 2015, March 5, 2015 and February 5, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Application for Presentation:

3.1 Lot E, Wesbrook Place

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Wesbrook Village
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Ramsay Worden Architects

Introduction:

Scot Hein gave an overview of the project noting the design challenge for such a long site with a long frontage. It is an important central space in the context of Wesbrook Village. The role of building is not only to ground oriented active uses, but that the scale of the front building face is an important consideration. The Panel was asked to comment on refinements to the architectural form and expression; more specifically, refinements related to materiality and detailing, to strengthen the overall parti, as well as refinements that help build vibrancy.

Michelle Paquet spoke to the use of the project noting it is the last building to complete Wesbrook Village. It is a four-sided building, so there are some design challenges with no back of house. Bob Warden and Michael Patterson presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The northwest corner across from the new community centre is an important corner. There are a lot of design challenges in terms of where the parking/loading bay access is in relation to the new community centre. Having trucks backing out and turning around in a pedestrian area is a safety concern. The angled corner in terms of function and visual aesthetics needs more work.
- There is need for clarity of the parti and how it wants to express itself, and how it sits in its context. It is overdone. Make it simpler.
- Explore reinforcing the parti with a sense of reveal between the two end blocks. There may be an opportunity for a sense of shadow between the volumes to diminish the scale.
- A Panelist thought the two block ends of the building should be treated with the same material.
- The horizontal band of stone along the second floor is broken at the entrances. One Panelist thought stone was too heavy a material to float atop a glass base and was troubled that the stone did not come to the ground.
- There is an unintentional tension between the richness of the stone and the residential quality of the clapboard siding as a result of budgetary constraint. The materials are too disparate.
- The commercial entrance is offset relative to the square. The desire line looks like it is situated across from the Granite Terrace building rather than the sidewalk desire line as you move along the square. Explore whether it might follow the sidewalk desire line.
- Ensure retail/commercial offerings contribute to vibrancy of the public realm. A Panelist thought a pharmacy, being a single point of entry and exit and generally internalized, would not contribute to the vibrancy of the public realm.
- The view on the north side looks out onto a parking lot. The authority that oversees the space should green the parking lots as much as possible so that you are looking at a canopy of trees.
- The west elevation offers a prime view of the park. Take advantage of the view by adding more windows.
- The introduction of natural light in both ends of the corridors is a strong move.
- Extending the townhouses around the corner has cleaned up the relationship with the greenways.
- The loss of patio space on level two in some ways it unfortunate. The presence of the public on the outdoor looking over the piazza area provided pedestrian vibrancy.
- The introduction of the roof deck is a nice amenity that offers some nice views and social space for the residents.
- The upper terraces and the substantial trees were supported.

Chair Summary:

- There has been a lot of improvement in the organization of the building.
- The mix of unit types is welcome.
- The interface improvement between the townhouses and the public green is very positive.
- Bringing light into the building corridors and addition of amenity and social spaces are positive moves.

- The parti and the massing of the building needs clarity. Consider how to transition between the materials. The horizontal stone band on the second floor is discontinuous. The west façade is dissimilar. The materiality could help shape the building if it were treated more volumetrically rather than a veneer that comes to the edges. The stone should come around corners and start defining the building rather than just a finish expression in some areas.
- The northwest corner across from the new community centre is not convincing or fitting; acknowledging that it is a very difficult problem. The angled edge is a foreign element in the design that draws unnecessary attention to the loading entry. The loading bay should be further masked by landscaping and there are pedestrian safety concerns. Further exploration is needed in how the loading bay sits and how it is oriented to the community centre.
- The difference of façade materials suggests budgetary constraints with a lack of intentional integration. The lower level provides substance, whereas the upper level has more of a suburban expression.
- There were a number of comments with regards to the commercial entrance that requires attention to its interface with the public realm and how the parking area transitions to the building.
- The parking lot gives far too much presence to cars rather than to the importance serving as a forecourt to the new community centre, future school and public activities.
- The north views overlook the parking lot; greening the space is encouraged.
- The west elevation has prime views of the park, but has the least number of windows and the least engaging presence.

The Panel RESOLVED to not support the application.

NON-SUPPORT [1-3]

4.0 Acknowledgement

Members and staff thanked Gregory Borowski for his contribution while serving on the Panel.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:40 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date: June 4, 2015

Time: 4:10 PM

Location: Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)

Attendees: [Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel:](#)
Oliver Lang (Chair), Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante, Norm Shearing, Janet Teasdale, Leslie Van Duzer

Regrets: -

Staff: Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)

Presenters: Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust
Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects
Connely Farr, Ramsay Worden Architects
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the June 4, 2015, meeting be approved as circulated. MOTION CARRIED

2.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on May 7, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Application:

3.1 Lot E, Wesbrook Place

Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second
Development Permit:	DP15013
Location:	Wesbrook Village
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Ramsay Worden Architects Perry + Associates

Introduction:

Scot Hein gave an overview of the project redesign efforts, particularly the northwest corner of the building across from the new community centre. The parkade entry/ramp has been shifted to the south and the west residential entry has been relocated. The design team has made considerable effort to rework the western elevation to more visually

engage with the future park. Balconies have been introduced to better articulate the facade and improve composition. With respect to the key issue of “clarity of parti”, the westerly component is now more rectilinear (while secondary in overall massing hierarchy to the easterly block) towards a more cogent and balanced overall composition. Given the role of this mixed-use site to provide a more urban edge to the parking lot, a more contemporary white fibre cement panel system for the upper residential facade expression in lieu of clapboard has been proposed. Further design development to achieve pedestrian path alignments, including the crosswalk to the community centre, and the easterly north-south alignment with the main commercial announcement, have been achieved.

Staff sought advice on the design revisions to address specific concerns raised at the previous AUDP review including clarity of parti, the westerly elevation, the parking ramp and loading areas, the commercial entry, materiality, facade expression/rhythm for residential aspects, and facade systems of ground-oriented uses.

Michelle Paquet also noted the design team has done a significant amount of redesign work since the May AUDP meeting. It is a mixed use, rental building. The commercial space will be used to serve the direct community. Bob Warden and Michael Patterson presented.

Panel Commentary:

- There have been a lot of improvements; most as a result of the distillation process. It is a complex multi-use building with a long frontage. One Panelist recognized the challenge of expressing the pieces individually in a cohesive way, and thought the progression of the design is an indication of the complexity.
- One Panelist thought the different elevations will add to the urban context.
- The parti is still very complicated, there are too many materials, and the wood is an anomaly amongst the other materials. The material pallet could be further simplified. With respect to the masonry, it should be expressed as either “floating” or “grounded”. The masonry to the ground near the westerly entry undermines the strategy to float everywhere else.
- Some Panelists thought the architectural expression was too complex, and the elevations/massing/materiality required further refinement.
- The parking ramp/loading configuration is much improved, but a Panelist remained concerned about pedestrian safety given that children will use the crosswalk to the community centre on a regular basis. More refinement is needed to calm the traffic in the area.
- There are improvements in the relation to the community centre. The ramp location/configuration is a good improvement. The ramp will service many vehicles, which may be of concern. The Panel recognized the loading bay will be used less frequently.
- The boutique retail expression in the future drugstore space is a positive move.
- A Panelist commended the design team for the range and quality of floor plans in a rental building.
- There was a concern that 19 trees are to be removed for the building. Every effort should be made to save the trees either by retaining on site or removing and transplanting elsewhere on campus.

Chair Summary:

- There have been significant improvements in the scheme.
- There are still some concerns about the clarity of the parti, including the articulation of the massing.

- The design team needs to continue refinement towards greater overall clarity of the scheme. There remain concerns with respect the materiality, expression and related detailing.
- The parking and loading areas are improved. One Panelist is still concerned about how to calm traffic near the northwest corner to ensure a safe walking environment.
- There were positive comments with regard to the community facilities, proposed ground use, the relocation of the commercial entry, and orientations.

The Panel RESOLVED to support the application.

SUPPORT [4-1]

4.0 Acknowledgement

Panel members and staff thanked Leslie Van Duzer for her contribution while serving on the Panel.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.



DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	July 16, 2015
Time:	4:05 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel: Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante, Ronald Kellett, Janet Teasdale
Regrets:	Oliver Lang (Chair), Walter Francl, Norm Shearing
Staff:	Gerry McGeough, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Carrie Johnson, UBC Properties Trust Brian Wakelin, Public: Architecture + Communication Inc. John Wall, Public: Architecture + Communication Inc. Robert Drew, Public: Architecture + Communication Inc. Dan Giordano, UBC Properties Trust Craig West, HCMA Architecture + Design Daniel Philippot, HCMA Architecture + Design

1.0 Call to Order

The Vice-Chair called the meeting to order at 4:05 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Welcome New Panel Member

Panel members and staff welcomed UBC faculty representative Ronald Kellett to the Panel.

3.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

3.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the June 16, 2015, meeting be approved as circulated. MOTION CARRIED

3.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the Advisory Urban Design Panel held on June 4, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

4.0 Application:

4.1 Totem Park Residence Infill Phase 2

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Location:	Totem Park Residence
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Public: Architecture + Communication Inc.

Introduction:

Gerry McGeough introduced the project. Access to student housing is a key strategic initiative for UBC. The project will efficiently add new first-year residence beds to address

significant demand for on-campus student housing. This follows on the successful Totem Infill Phase 1 project completed in 2011 that added 567 beds to the Totem Park Residence complex. The existing Totem Park Residence commons block provides dining hall, support services and amenities, and has the capacity to accommodate this additional population. From a social sustainability perspective, additional on-campus student housing allows for more students to realize an enhanced social and academic experience while studying at UBC. The design team has taken the time to analyze the different factors affecting the siting, including its role in the larger campus context. The Panel was asked to comment on the proposed massing options, particularly the fit of the building massing, the perception from the public realm, and how one form performs over the other in achieving a successful social dimension for students. The Panel was also asked to comment on the proposed large multi-use outdoor commons.

Carrie Johnson indicated the project has a very tight budget and a tighter schedule. The design team is looking for some clear direction on how to move forward with the project.

Panel Commentary:

- Of the two iterations of the project presented, "Option A" was the most successful given the shape of the landscape and Marine Way. The obtuse angles of the plan verses 90 degree corners will make for better living conditions.
- The team should be commended. It is great to see a housing project that has a sensitive awareness from a campus wide perspective to the detail at this stage which bodes well for some positive things that will come in the future.
- The Panel echoed Student Housing & Hospitality Services (SHHS) staff comments that the principle of universal accessibility and community is foremost in the development of student residences.
- Ensure the shared program spaces on the east side of the building have sufficient porosity to help animate the space. The use of natural light at the ends of the corridors is a good feature.
- A Panelist thought there were enough elements in the program to lend some visual meaning to west side of the building, even in a modest way, while still maintaining the hierarchy of the public east side frontage. Consider how the lawn area along Marine Drive is accessed and connected to nearby open spaces and the building.
- The "inch worm in the landscape" form gets diffused when you bring the other amenity program areas and plot them dead center. There is a stoicism that gets infused back into the massing and it seems like a contradictory move. The public rooms could expand and spill into the landscape.
- The desire to create a large outdoor commons area with multiple programs needs further study to understand its role in the Totem Park Residence precinct, the appropriate size, and how it is connected to other larger patterns of spaces on campus.
- A Panelist observed pedestrian movement from Totem Park Residence follows more of a diagonal desire line forcing a court-court approach and less of a north-south movement parallel to Lower Mall. Explore whether the landscape design could support that diagonal desire line.
- The Panel will be interested to understand more about the anticipated development to occur east and immediately south of the proposed site.
- The landscape legacy of the campus is the spectacular trees that exist on campus. Careful consideration should be given to retaining existing trees.
- The Panel liked the idea of looking to the history of the detail in the remainder of the complex as inspiration rather than going to the formal and borrowing from it.

4.2 Chan Gunn Pavilion I Sports Medicine Facility

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Location:	Athletics District
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust HCMA Architecture + Design

Introduction:

Gerry McGeough introduced the project and indicated this was the preferred site out of a number of siting options. The building is small in the context of the very large background building - Doug Mitchell Thunderbird Sports Centre. Staff feel it is a strong composition that will help frame this important corridor of the campus as you come to the Athletics Precinct. The Panel was asked to comment on its fit and identity with the larger context and the Thunderbird Sports Centre. In doing so, consider the use of super graphics, dynamic forms, and wood that have emerged from recent projects in the precinct. And the projects compatibility and adjacency with the existing main entrance to the arena.

Dan Giordano stated the project as presented is based on an approach to build the envelope in one construction period rather than a two-phase project as originally planned, but noted there are some challenges to see if they can proceed in this manner. The footprint has been reduced and made as efficient as possible to have a more cohesive, better design.

Panel Commentary:

- Some Panelists thought the architectural expression diverged dramatically from the curves of the Thunderbird Sports Arena. One Panelist felt the angled metal windows and screening detail on the east elevation looked aggressive and unwelcoming.
- One Panelist had difficulty with the siting feeling the noise generated from traffic and events would be antithetic to patient care and thought the building should be more integrated with the Thunderbird Sports Arena.
- The Panel acknowledged the challenges of the space and the site constraints and appreciated the efforts to maximize daylighting without compromising the privacy of patients undergoing treatment.
- The Panel thought the shifting of the two volumes to allow daylight into the lower floor and the support column approach were good moves.
- One Panelist thought the first floor layout was a blocked traditional approach to healthcare and community, but appreciated the user's preference in terms of optimal use of space and interface with patients and other physicians.
- Explore ways of celebrating the dynamic elements of the program. The fire exit stair is centrally located given its limited use. The stairs and the opaque screen are not inviting or effective in conveying the dynamism being sought. The canted glazing in front of office spaces will create functional issues that will be difficult to resolve, such as how partitions meet the exterior wall. Consider celebrating the people who are using the building; they can add vibrancy to the building.
- The project could benefit from zooming out. The scale puts the two buildings in opposition and seems to be driving a two-dimensional response as seen in the canting. Consider exploring another approach.
- Some Panelists thought the super graphics were "muscular" and wondered how to marry them spatially. Explore how to make the spaces inside and outside better.
- The provision for a running track on the roof of the first floor in the future or as funding allows was supported.
- The Panel thought the landscape would benefit from a conceptual study of the site frontage along Wesbrook Mall at an intermediate scale to better inform the whole building

and understand the role the walls and the edge play. The Panel acknowledged at this stage the project scope only covers the immediate area around the base perimeter of the proposed building.

- More relational information is needed as how the Thunderbird Sports Centre space works in the context of the proposed building. The Thunderbird Sports Centre main entrance has a good physical volume and can clearly be seen by pedestrians. The proposed intervention may affect the viability and recognition of the main entrance by people approaching from the northeast. More study is needed on the relationship of the project to the main entrance and the resulting notched space that is created between the adjacent masses.
- The Panel appreciated the need for a separate identity, but more thinking and evidence is needed in the design rationale of how to be sympathetic and complementary to the scale and form, and the entry sequence to Thunderbird Sports Centre.
- Provide a better conveyance of your understanding of what the area is like when there is a major event, different times of the day, and transit, traffic and pedestrian movements. This understanding will start to influence the building design in a positive way.
- Existing trees should be retained as much as possible, or relocated elsewhere on campus.

5.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	October 1, 2015
Time:	4:07 PM
Location:	Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
Attendees:	Members of the Advisory Urban Design Panel: Oliver Lang (Chair), Walter Francl, Ronald Kellett, Maurice Pez, Janet Teasdale
Regrets:	Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante
Staff:	Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Carrie Johnson, UBC Properties Trust Brian Wakelin, Public: Architecture + Communication Inc. Robert Drew, Public: Architecture + Communication Inc. Jason Wegman, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Inc. Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust Joost Bakker, DIALOG Christopher Phillips, PFS Studio

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:07 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Appreciation / Thank You to Outgoing Panel Member

Panel members and staff thanked outgoing development industry representative Norman Shearing for his time and contribution while serving on the Panel.

3.0 Welcome New Panel Members

Panel members and staff welcomed AIBC nominated architect Walter Francl and development industry representative Maurice Pez to the Panel.

4.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

- 4.1** It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the October 1, 2015, meeting be approved. MOTION CARRIED
- 4.2** It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the meeting held on July 16, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

5.0 Application:

5.1 Totem Park Residence Infill Phase 2

Application Status:	Development Application
Location:	Totem Park Residence
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust
	Public: Architecture + Communication Inc.

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the project and asked the Panel to comment on the projects response to anticipated and future context including the pedestrian movement to the main campus, the location and design of the commons block with respect to the pedestrian arrival experience, the outdoor commons and associated programming, and the landscape design and character. Also, the architectural quality, materiality, color and detailing with respect to the existing identity of the Totem precinct.

Carrie Johnson stated the project has a challenging schedule, explaining if the project schedule is postponed by a month, the project will be postponed by a year. Students need to move in August 2017, otherwise the project move-in date would be pushed to August 2018. Brian Wakelin and Jason Wegman presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The Panel generally liked the simple, rationale, cost-effective approach and the departure from the orthogonal grid.
- A Panelist thought the first year residence building is excellent in terms of functionality and the way in which community is built with the residence life system as well as the use of space.
- A Panelist thought the metaphor for the forest is powerful and compelling. In terms of the documentation, some Panelists didn't think the project was described in sufficient detail and the elevations were difficult to read or not drawn.
- The back entry off Northwest Marine Drive is a major entrance yet there is nothing that suggests its prominence. Consider covering the entrance and animating the space so it is more useable. Some Panelists would have liked to have seen the entry open up through to the commons.
- The end stairs could be opened up with more natural light.
- A Panelist liked the context of the brick but thought it was too rational. Explore different expressions that give it more life.
- A Panelist suggested using a different color of brick. The idea of sampling is nice, but not if it becomes almost a replica. It should find its own character and reflect the present.

Commons Block

- The commons block is not a big program piece, it is trying to change geometries and mark a social program. Its role seems ambiguous. Architecturally explore how to connect the housing block to the commons block which then can help to inform the open space.
- The house lounge has a southeastern prospect that is going to be shaded much of the time by the building itself. There does not appear to be an opportunity in the landscape to use any of the space indoor-outdoor.
- Look to a better engagement between some of the ground floor public and shared spaces with outdoor spaces. Take full advantage of the solar performance in locating interior/exterior programming toward maximum vibrancy.

- From a usability perspective, the commons block and the outdoor space is in a shaded area. The orientation aspect is towards the campus and offers a good connection physically but the sun is on the south and west side. Explore opening up more to the forest and reinforce the aspect towards campus. It can be a much more livable building.
- Explore what would happen if the commons block opened up on the south side where there is more light and starts to activate future development in a southeasterly direction. The pavilion is not really connecting with the desire line to the main campus.
- Explore the idea of entry and crossing. The south side of the building and west side entry point where there is a stair could open up and be more inviting with a passageway to the commons. The interaction with the pavilion should be made stronger.

Outdoor Commons

- The proposal started with a desire to create a single outdoor commons unifying active and smaller contemplative spaces. The idea of creating a space with these courtyards and tying them together seems to be a very strong larger urban move, but does not come across in the treatment of the public realm within the scope of the project area. It seems diluted.
- The trees help soften the building. Find ways in the landscape to soften more of the façade.

Chair Summary:

- The Panel supported the universal design, and the materiality of the idea was supported.
- The clean rational structuring of the building and the discipline that is in there was supported.
- The project schedule was supported contingent on recommended studies and the consideration of comments as the applicant works with UBC staff as the project develops.

Resolution: SUPPORT [4-0]

5.2 Lot 27 and Lot 29 – Wesbrook Place

Application Status:	Development Application
Review:	Second
Location:	Wesbrook Place
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.

Introduction:

Scot Hein provided an overview of the design modifications noting the FSR area has been reduced by approximately 31,500 square feet which has expanded the central courtyard and created some common programming potential, adding faculty and staff housing have specific needs forming community. These buildings will be added to the discounted faculty and staff rental pool which helps recruit and retain faculty and staff from other places. The Panel was asked to provide advice to prevailing context, architectural character, courtyard landscape design, and the location and access to bike storage.

Michelle Paquet reiterated the site is designated six-storey with a maximum FSR of 2.8. The reduction in density has expanded the courtyard space creating the capacity to be more integrated with Lot 28. The applicant continues to work on the staff and faculty

program and what type of amenities are most important for faculty and staff. Raymond Letkeman and Michael Patterson presented.

Panel Commentary:

- Stepping down the end portions of each building help the massing blend in with the existing neighbouring buildings.
- A Panelist thought the entries to the lobby are hard to pull out of the design vocabulary and suggested a canopy may make them more recognizable.
- A Panelist liked the response to the street with the brick façade combined with the granite faced landscape wall, but wondered if there is a way to differentiate the buildings with the brick.
- The Panel acknowledged a lighter brick was chosen to differentiate the project's colour palette from neighbouring buildings, however some Panelists suggested exploring inverting the colour scheme. A dark colour at the building top would visually help the segment appear to recede.
- The current colour palette is applied uniformly. Investigate how the application of colour in relationship to the amount of light each elevation receives might have some experiential response to the building unfolding as approached, rather than being predictable.
- There are a variety of proposed unit types. A Panelist liked the two bedroom units. Whereas another Panelist felt strongly bedrooms should have windows, referring to unit types with a den and the two bedroom unit with a secondary windowless bedroom. Children should be able to look outside and have a relationship with the world. Adding there are ways to create affordable homes where people can have a decent living experience.

Landscape

- Reduce the number of north-south circulation pathways for a cleaner and simpler landscape plan creating more open space.
- The programming and spatial organization of the courtyard feels fragmented and binary. Explore ways to create groups or clusters of spaces by putting compatible programs adjacent where they can overlap. Watching children play on a lawn next to the barbeque area might have some synergy and could simplify the planning.
- It was acknowledged the proposed water features are to provide visual interest and the resulting ambient noise to create separation in a multi-use area, however the consensus from the Panel was the water features should be removed or reduced for childproofing, more open space and maintenance issues.

Bike Storage

- The location and access to bike storage should be convenient, efficient and safe for adults and children.
- The bike stair into the underground parking should be straight with no turn in the walk line and sufficiently wide enough to easily navigate a bike.
- Explore adding bike storage at the base of non-fenestrated walls at grade.

Chair Summary:

- The reduction of the south building central wing has opened up the courtyard, improved solar access and enhanced the livability.
- The Panel liked the richer colour palette and the articulation of the building overall.
- The perception of depth from the deep recessed balconies adds to the look of the building and enhances the livability.
- The substantial roof overhang with wood soffit was generally liked and a positive aspect of the building overall.

- The courtyard is an opportunity to create community. The Panel appreciated the idea of outdoor rooms and thought there is a lot of potential. Less pathways, water features and described surfaces are needed. Study the shadow analysis and create some carefully placed common areas for congregation and areas for play and the rest can be landscaped to enjoy. The communities should be given time to find themselves, in other words don't overplan/design the courtyard. Access from the lobbies into the courtyard is a good move – really make them part of the building.
- Bike storage is an important aspect of accessibility. The more convenient you can get to your bike the more you will use it and less a vehicle. Explore opportunities to integrate into the building at grade.

Resolution: SUPPORT [4-0]

5.3 Gage South Student Residence and the UBC Bus Exchange

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Location:	Gage South
Applicants:	UBC Properties Trust DIALOG

Introduction:

Scot Hein introduced the mixed-use project comprised of student rental housing integrated with the UBC Bus Exchange. The University Boulevard Precinct has a social/recreational community emphasis and serves as a key gateway to the campus. The project will help define the street wall along Wesbrook Mall and Student Union Boulevard and is a key arrival point for transit users. The Student Recreation Centre and new Aquatic Centre are currently a challenging interface condition.

Dave Poettcker stated that of the options, this option delivers on Translink's technical requirements. The bus exchange has been optimally located given the dimensional constraints of the site. The tallest building is where there is the deepest structure noting as you step back there is less structure for the building to sit on. The smallest building is on a part of the podium where there is very little structure. Issues that have been investigated include the design of a comprehensive exhaust system, and noise and vibration due to buses. It is a very urban place in terms of the level of amenity offered.

Joost Bakker provided the basic strategy addressing some of the programming considerations in the building. Chris Phillips provided University Boulevard Precinct Design Guidelines background specific to the Panel commentary noting Wesbrook Mall is going through a redesign process.

Panel Commentary:

- Generally, the Panel appreciated the technical and programmatic requirements of the project. The site plays an important role in anchoring the University Boulevard precinct.
- Some scale and massing relationships need to be explored. Explore the logic of the blocks in terms of scaling towards the tower. Consider if there is a program companion to the massing strategy.
- It is a very challenging, complex undertaking where the whole needs to be more than the sum of its parts. Right now each massing component is struggling within itself, not really having a visual dialogue as part of a larger composition.
- A Panelist appreciated the guidelines and the prescribed massing but noted the frame on the façade of each building was the same. Explore whether the architecture could

be more varied, noting that materiality and colour could also cultivate some fluidity and rhythm.

- The massing appears to be from the guidelines. Explore if there is a way where it can find its own identity and character in its relationship between the housing typology, the common spaces, the house types and the idea of terracing. It is interesting that it is following the street and may have a curved façade. Explore if the building could be further articulated on the upper level, so it's not just four large volumes that have an institutional look. Student housing should have a youthful character.
- Visually reinforce "gateway" as it turns the corner along Student Union Boulevard. Explore whether it could be an acute angle.
- The Collegium is at a prominent location. Feature this space and give it more prominence. Explore whether the rooftop could be an animated space.
- As a gateway portal, explore giving the northeast corner of the building a more celebratory expression with a distinct presence.
- Currently, the lobbies don't feature very prominently. The main entry lobby is small opening between the Collegium. Increase their stature.
- Develop the podium of the building so it is a really visible, animated piece of the building. Explore if there is a way to expose some circulation on the end of the building or deck space.
- The townhouses that front Wesbrook Mall are situated in a heavy traffic area. Explore adding some weight to the base.
- Safety and security are important issues. It was noted the placement and number of entries/exits and security are all critical issues that are being refined through design development.
- Consider if there is a way social programs might populate some of the break points, and create opportunities that are bigger than an apartment but smaller than the block that might start to animate the place out of activity on the upper floors. On the site plan are some thoughts about where a nexus is created, and there's a program that attaches to that appreciating economics is as important as the architectural quality.
- Explore the larger idea of connectivity. Consider if there is an opportunity to cross at the podium and help activate the spaces. Explore how the building can facilitate such movement.
- The unit plans don't have a consistent rational amount of common space and the hallways are quite spacious. Explore if there can be more efficient planning inside the units.

Related Commentary

- Andrew Parr, SHHS, noted this an interesting building in terms of the variety of spaces and the types of units. The micro units are an opportunity to provide more affordable housing on campus to low-income students. The different configurations provide an opportunity for students to choose what type of space they would like to live in, whether alone or in a shared space. The corridors become social, active living spaces.

UBC Bus Exchange

- The drop-off area is a main arrival moment which looks into an infrastructure space. Right now the project is trying to work on top of the bus engineering diagram. Further explore how you route and park the buses, arrange the buildings and create some screening and green space and articulate edge of the podium slab; otherwise it's purely an infrastructure space which also takes away from the architectural quality of the Aquatic Centre. In other words create design continuity between the Aquatic Centre, the alighting platforms, the infrastructure and the upper podium.
- Explore the architecture of visual screening and how that may extend/inform interesting visual dialogue with the activities above.
- Explore the architecture of the slab edge, including landscape expression.

- The drivers' facility is in a prominent location. It is an opportunity to develop that component in a creative, interesting way.
- The quality of lighting in the bus layover area is important as is the finishing of the interior facility.

6.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:30 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

- Date:** November 5, 2015
- Time:** 4:37 PM
- Location:** Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building (2260 West Mall)
- Attendees:** [MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL:](#)
Oliver Lang (Chair), Jane Durante (left after item 3.3), Walter Francl, Janet Teasdale
- Regrets:** Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Ronald Kellett, Maurice Pez
- Staff:** Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
- Presenters:** Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust
Christopher Phillips, PFS Studio
Dr. Linc Kesler, UBC First Nations House of Learning
Alfred Waugh, FormLine Architecture
Manny Trinca, FormLine Architecture
Dan Giordano, UBC Properties Trust
Stuart Rothnie, HCMA Architecture + Design
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates
Mike Champion, UBC Project Services
Kyle Reese, UBC Project Services
Donald Schmitt, Diamond Schmitt Architects Inc.
John Scott, HDR | CEI Architecture Planning Interiors

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:37 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the November 5, 2015, meeting be approved. MOTION CARRIED

2.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the meeting held on October 1, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Application:

3.1 Library Garden

Application Status: Pre-Application
Location: 1900 Block Main Mall

Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
PFS Studio

Introduction:

Scot Hein noted Library Garden is an important public realm initiative funded separately from the Indian Residential History & Dialogue Centre. Given they are separate projects the timelines may differ in terms of funding and implementation. The site is historically important and has many layers to consider. Being on traditional territory of the Musqueam people has informed the thinking. In the context of the Indian Residential School History & Dialogue Centre, there is an interest to achieve something that has a timeless elegance and a delicate quality within this landscape opportunity.

Dave Poettcker, Project Manager.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, opened by recognizing the design process has been a collective and collaborative initiative to integrate Library Garden with the Indian Residential School History & Dialogue Centre. The advisory committee, user groups, workshops and open houses have all informed the design process.

Panel Commentary:

- It is a powerful notion of knitting the landscape and architecture together.
- The dialogue between the landscape and architecture, the implied wall, and edge should be celebrated and recognized.
- The stairway is tight to the building and has a confined width. The plantings block the appearance of the landscape moving through the glass.
- The landscape should move toward the informal. The terraced steps should be more random and softer.
- A Panel member thought the natural topography could bring out areas of contemplation, learning and gathering. The landscape bowl does not need to be a formal place of congregation. It is not fitting with the theme, especially on the lower level of facility and its program.
- The water feature was supported. The separation between the offices at the edge of Sedgwick Terrace provides a view and may invite people to go out into that space.
- The landscape bowl looking at the water feature and dead end space of the library has no access. The view upward will help to activate the space.
- Create an invitation to place by considering signage and ease of access.
- Focus on the landscape as something that works with the building.
- Explore how the building with the landscape can find its own strength and give definition to place where it creates a new landscape and an opportunity to give measure to the importance of the IRSHDC program.
- Consider how the outdoor space it is going to be lit at night and how the glazed building facade will interface with the outdoor space at night.
- Universal accessibility needs further exploration. Consider how visitors with mobility challenges can easily access indoor and outdoor spaces.
- A Panel member suggested the Centre could be an aspect of welcoming new students to the UBC community. Outdoor teaching space should be as viable as possible.

- The forested areas are well used by a small number of people. There are also some unique trees in the space that should be retained. Attention should be given to how the space can invite more people yet retain its repose and park-like green space characteristics.

Athlete’s Walk | Ladner Clock Tower

- Provide additional seating around Ladner Clock Tower and Athlete’s Walk to accommodate more people.
- A Panel member like the notion of wrapping the base of the Ladner Clock Tower with a pavilion but thought one side should remain visible from top to bottom.

3.2 Indian Residential School History & Dialogue Centre

Application Status: Pre-Application
 Location: 1900 Block Main Mall
 Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
 FormLine Architecture

Introduction:

Scot Hein noted the Indian Residential School History & Dialogue Centre and Library Garden projects have been advancing collaboratively together in integrated thinking for predesign work and for public consultation. Library Garden will be an important public realm initiative funded separately from the Centre. Given they are separate projects the timelines may differ in terms of funding and implementation.

Dr. Linc Kesler provided an introduction stating the history and legacy of the Indian Residential School System that existed in Canada for more than a century has been the subject of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission which documented the experiences of Aboriginal people who went through the school system. The Centre at UBC will be affiliated with the National Research Centre established by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada in Winnipeg, and will provide a place for former students, their families and communities, researchers and others to access the archive of records gathered by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and others held locally at UBC. It will support community access, public programming, curriculum development, advanced research, and intensive and regular discussion on issues of common concern. The Centre will address the past and how we think about it, and thinking about the future we will share. The site is ideal being central to campus and connection to the records institutions of the University. Despite the central, busy location, the sunken landscape bowl has peaceful qualities. The functions that can bring to the Centre and people’s experience of it are important qualities. It is an exceptional location.

Dave Poettcker noted the Indian Residential School History & Dialogue Centre is an important project which is integrated with Library Garden. Accessibility and access to the site presents a challenge. The lower level of the Centre will provide public information primarily through interactive, digital displays and the upper level is for dialogue, planning and other functions.

Architects Alfred Waugh and Manny Trinca presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The parti was generally supported. The central siting on campus is powerful and will bring community and campus together.
- The level of presentation and thoughtfulness for both the landscape and the architecture was appreciated.
- A Panel member felt the architectural expression could be pushed further where the significance of the building deepens the experience.
- Explore how the building with the landscape can find its own strength and give definition to the place where it creates a new landscape and an opportunity to give measure to the importance of the program.
- The descent, both indoor and outdoor, along the landscape following the topography is a strong concept. A Panelist thought the visual permeability of the north facade is key to the success of project.
- Consider the interface between the landscape and the lower level of the building and explore how the landscape might enter the building to give more strength to the plaza as a place of congregation. Enhance the outdoor relationship on the west end, upper level where the kitchen area is located.
- More clarity is needed around the design intent of the roof and wall. The storm water retention feature was generally supported.

3.3 Chan Gunn Pavilion – Sports Medicine Facility

Application Status: Development Application
Location: NE corner of Thunderbird Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall
Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
HCMA Architecture + Design

Resolution: SUPPORT [4-0]

Introduction:

Scot Hein remarked how the site has an important contextual role to play on several scales. The site forms the northern gateway into the Athletics Precinct from the north, has an academic relationship with the health facilities to the north and reinforces the campus and precinct identity given its prominent Westbrook Mall frontage. There is a desire to create a distinct identity as a unique facility serving both the UBC community and the public. The materiality carries in the tradition of other darker toned, wood-clad pavilions within the Athletics Precinct. The landscaping has faced some budgetary challenges in working with this existing hardscape.

Dan Giordano noted the user group are globally renowned practitioners and researchers. In terms of architecture, the scheme should reinforce the Athletics Precinct identity and distinguish the facility. The facility will house a publicly accessible medical facility, academic research and teaching spaces.

Stuart Rothnie, Architect, presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The relationship of the design to the front door of the Thunderbird Sports Centre is improved and celebrates that movement pattern.

- The siting is very tight to the main entry of the Thunderbird Sports Centre and creates a deep pocket against the building. Consider shifting the building, appreciating the site constraints such as large trees and the berm. Minimize the visibility of the window and back of house entry points adjacent to the front entry of the arena.
- The block appendage area adjacent to Thunderbird Sports Centre misses the opportunity to create a shared entry plaza or create something interesting between the buildings.
- Some Panel members like the proposed use of fritted glazing and slou-sugi-ban torched wood at the upper bar. One Panelist thought the massing should be simplified and the material expression should have more strength and confidence. By itself it is a nice building, but in this context it seems awkward and does not have the appropriate scale.
- The notion of natural light penetrating the interior double height space to the ground floor between the clinic space was supported.
- The retention of existing large trees was supported.

Chair Summary:

- There has been a significant improvement over the last scheme.
- The massing is better.
- Further design development is needed on the block appendage to see if it can be resolved overall.
- The expression in the corner is an urban marker. A Panel member was troubled by context and fit.
- Some Panel members liked the materiality and one Panel member thought the material expression should have more strength and confidence.
- Overall the building was more acceptable and pleasing.

Applicant's Response:

The project team appreciated the feedback and will review the nature of the back of house space and how it could be further developed. In terms of comments around scale, it is an interesting challenge. The pedestrian experience and journey around the building as it relates to the public realm is critical and has led to some erosion of corners which counters the notion of having a more solid two storey expression for the building. The notion this is a signal and arrival to the Athletic Precinct is an important consideration. There is interplay when considering the notion of fit to the arena and a sense of identity with the Athletics Precinct as you arrive on campus. We will review those particular local features again including the comment regarding materiality.

3.4 Undergraduate Life Sciences Teaching Labs

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Development Permit:	DP14030
Location:	6270 University Boulevard
Applicants:	UBC Project Services Diamond Schmitt Architects Inc. HDR CEI Architecture Planning Interiors

Introduction:

Scot Hein provided background information noting the original project scheme was approved in November 2014. Over the intervening year there has been budget challenges and prioritization of program needs. There have been a number of losses including a large lecture hall. Given the substantive changes to massing and expression, the project has been brought back to the Panel.

Mike Champion reiterated the priority objective is programming for undergraduate teaching. In order to meet a restricted budget envelope, changes were made.

Donald Schmitt, Architect, presented noting this is a different building with a simpler plan which has generated a different expression. A northeast entry point has been established so it is more porous, and the footprint of the proposed new east wing is more compact. There is a landscape opportunity created by the proposed demolition of the interior cruciform.

Chris Phillips, Landscape Architect, presented.

Panel Commentary:

- The planning is informing some of the architecture. The framed bay on the proposed east wing is too close to the existing wall of the north wing. The bay does not appear to be an intentional spatial element and lacks design expression. Explore redistributing or shortening the architecture to accommodate the proximity to the north wing more generously and glazing differentially for a cleaner look that is appropriately scaled to the aperture.
- Further exploration is needed to understand the facade, the courtyard and landscape, the entry sequences, and the programs from the inside come out. Consider a different material palette and expression rather than a striated white brick facade. Work so the landscape and facade start to speak to one another and create an exciting experience in the public realm.
- There are two different fenestration typologies depicted along the ground plane of the proposed east wing. Look for ways to simplify the ground plane fenestration so you can clearly read the pattern.
- Provide rain protection along the west facade of the new east wing.
- The courtyard feels institutional and value engineered. It should find its own expression and the architecture and landscape should create a dialogue. Entry from the northwest pavilion into the courtyard should convey a sense there is something to be discovered.
- Demolishing the interior cruciform is an opportunity to create a new connection in the courtyard with a fresh interpretation, cognizant of context and history. The white brick panels on the west facade appear to hang on the building and look rigid. Rather than trying to mimic the materiality and cool palette of the existing sides of the courtyard, consider using metal instead of white brick. Explore warmer tones and pattern. Work to integrate the building with the landscape.
- Extend the northwest corner element language to an aspect of the interior courtyard building facade at pedestrian level. Explore the subtle use of warm colour as possible way to announce the courtyard.
- The framed wood cladding option on the northwest entry pavilion and east wing bay was not supported.

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:55 PM.



Meeting Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

- Date:** December 3, 2015
- Time:** 4:10 PM
- Location:** Policy Lab A+B, CIRS Building, 2260 West Mall
- Attendees:** **MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL:**
Steve McFarlane (Vice-Chair), Jane Durante (left after item 3.2), Walter Francl, Ronald Kellett (left after item 3.2), Maurice Pez, Janet Teasdale
- Regrets:** Oliver Lang (Chair)
- Staff:** Scot Hein, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
- Presenters:** Peggy Theodore, Diamond Schmitt Architects Inc.
Christopher Phillips, PFS Studio
Dave Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust
Norman Hotson, DIALOG
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects
Edward Archibald, Adera
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

1.0 Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:10 PM and noted the presence of a quorum.

2.0 Approval of Current Agenda and Previous Meeting Minutes

2.1 It was moved and seconded: That the agenda of the December 3, 2015, meeting be approved. MOTION CARRIED

2.2 It was moved and seconded: That the minutes of the meeting held on November 5, 2015, be adopted. MOTION CARRIED

3.0 Application:

3.1 Undergraduate Life Sciences Teaching Labs

Application Status: Development Application
Development Permit: DP15038
Location: 6270 University Boulevard
Applicants: UBC Project Services
Diamond Schmitt Architects Inc.
HDR | CEI Architecture Planning Interior

Resolution: SUPPORT [5-0]

Introduction:

Scot Hein provided a summary of the pre-application review noting the design team was asked to look at clarity in the transition between the north wing and new easterly wing, and how that transitional expression and detailing is handled. Also, to look at the envelope strategy for the new east wing with the addition of a continuous weather protection along the courtyard frontage. Staff will continue to work with applicant in design development on this important academic institutional building.

Architect Peggy Theodore and Landscape Architect Chris Phillips presented.

Panel Commentary:

NEW EAST WING

- The colour palette is subdued; more warmth would be welcomed given the building's prominence in the courtyard.
- The weather protection canopy is a successful design feature on the new east wing's elevation.
- The framed projection crowds the north building. Consider a more unified fenestration pattern within the frame. The transition between the new east wing and north wing needs clarity, and could be informed by the northwest corner's resolution.
- The application of white brick below the window glazing should be rethought in the whole material pallet. Explore whether there is an opportunity to relate with elements in the courtyard landscape.

NORTHWEST ENTRY

- Give the northwest entry space a distinguished presence. The entry stairways and ramps are challenging. The soffit treatment to the underside of the corner should be of high quality and well lit.
- Courtyard plantings could inform edge plantings on the University Boulevard side of the entry. The liveliness and vibrancy of the courtyard could inform the corner's identity.

Chair Summary:

- The courtyard is supported. Explore how the programming elements could inform the northwest entry space and the greater public realm.
- The northwest entry space needs a distinguished identity. There is another layer of placemaking that could to be explored.
- Further design development of the framed element on the west facade of the new east wing would help the scheme. Contrast in the expression would strengthen the scheme and resonate more with the northwest entry space.

Applicant's Response:

- New east wing: Work to refine the connection where new meets old.
- Northwest entry: There is another layer of placemaking that could happen in the northwest entry space. Explore the space at a larger scale.

3.2 Gage South Student Residence I Transit Terminal (UBC Bus Exchange)

Application Status: Development Application
Development Permit: DP15035
Location: SW corner Wesbrook Mall and Student Union Boulevard
Applicants: UBC Properties Trust
DIALOG
PFS Studio

Resolution: SUPPORT [5-0]

Introduction:

Scot Hein provided an overview noting the proposed integrated student residence is comprised of four interconnected towers ranging in height with a bus exchange consisting of a bus layover facility at-grade, the roof of which forms the ground plane for the residences, as well as passenger drop-off, and passenger pick-up areas. The visually strategic site frames the campus gateway at Student Union Boulevard and provides an engaging urban edge to Wesbrook Mall along the easterly frontage. There has been some change in the tower height modulation and expression, and overall architectural expression along Wesbrook Mall.

Project Manager Dave Poettcker provided a brief history of the project. The transit terminal, a partnership between UBC and TransLink, is designed to meet the current and future transit needs of the UBC Vancouver campus community. In addition, the Gage South Student Residence will efficiently add over 600 beds to address significant demand for on-campus student housing.

Architect Norman Hotson and Landscape Architect Chris Phillips presented.

Panel Commentary:

- Positive response to the way the bus exchange is resolved. Movements appear logical.
- The plantings in the transit medians should form lush green barriers.
- The overhang on the drivers' facility should be more pronounced.
- More thoughtful integration of the layover entrance scale more consistent with the new Aquatic Centre and the canopies in the passenger areas, is needed.
- The horizontal architectural expression of the lowest block is not visually compatible with the facade composition the larger blocks.
- The at-grade town homes fronting Wesbrook Mall need grade separation to delineate private space from public space and provide a sense of safety and security when entering and exiting the residence. The edges on the outside of the street need further development.
- Explore a finer grained, less imposing architectural expression given the proximity to single-family residences to the east.
- Consider a more playful approach to the massing. Explore ways to let the podium space infiltrate to Wesbrook Mall. The horizontal expression of the lowest building does not appear to be a successful gesture. The other three buildings have a stoic appearance.

- In terms of the ground plane, shadowing impacts are to the north and east which may impact neighbouring single-family residences during the shorter days of the year.
- The renderings depict exterior stairs coming to pavement with no landscaping in front. Explore options to accommodate plantings to mitigate the height of the concrete stair face.
- Make the stairs as engaging as possible so they become an important outdoor feature around a community residence.
- Explore the links between the buildings where the elevator and stair cores are located as potentially interesting places inside the building with views to the west and over the street.

Chair Summary:

TRANSIT TERMINAL

- The entry to the layover area could potentially contribute to a better definition of the street if the scale is more consistent with the new Aquatic Centre and canopies in the passenger areas.
- Favorable comments were made around the excitement of social mix and vibrancy the project has the capability of introducing into the campus.
- There is potential for the drivers' facility to be a bolder statement by extending the roof.
- The transit median plantings should form lush green barriers that are well-maintained.

GAGE SOUTH STUDENT RESIDENCE

- The architectural language needs further exploration. There is a general flatness or two-dimensional quality.
- The town homes that front Wesbrook Mall at-grade need some separation or refinement to help announce or protect the entries for a feeling of safety and security.
- The two exterior stairs meet the ground to pavement. Consider adding some plant material to help mitigate the height.
- The podium is well resolved. The landscaping and potential vibrancy, bearing in mind access control and security, are positive attributes.

3.3 Lot 23, South Campus

Application Status:	Pre-Application
Location:	South Campus
Applicants:	Rositch Hemphill Architects Adera Perry + Associates

Introduction:

Scot Hein noted this is a six-storey market housing project with a density of 2.8 FSR. In related commentary, in consultation with the Wesbrook Place community there is support for six-storey buildings with an interest to manage the scale of these buildings. The community appreciated a variety of architectural expression, the authentic use of materials, and an interest in maximizing ground oriented expression. In addition, some residents expressed an interest in not having too large a water feature.

Architect Bryce Rositch and Landscape Architect Michael Patterson presented.

Panel Commentary:

- More information was needed to assess the proposal. A digitally generated model would have given the Panel the opportunity to view the grade change, site dimensions and context within the neighbourhood.
- The building parti and West Coast design elements were supported.
- The basement is a good use of space and a value-added feature for the residences.
- The building's architecture has potential. A more rigorous and succinct approach around the use of materials and colour will enhance the scheme. A Panel member supported the use of stone at the base of the building.
- Re-consider the roof and upper soffit overhang and depth. The entry canopies are too thin relative to the roof overhang.
- Ground oriented entry expression for individual units are supported.
- The lobby enters the courtyard on an oblique angle which affects the privacy of the unit on the inside corner. Further design development is needed to allow for privacy. Explore simple orthogonal geometries. Consider allowing the entry to work from both sides strengthening the connection to the greenway.

COURTYARD | LANDSCAPE

- The courtyard needs a sense of place.
- A shadow analysis is needed to assess sunlight opportunities in the courtyard.
- The shallow water feature at the entry should be attractive when dry or wet. It was noted water features are generally problematic and have maintenance issues.

Related Commentary to Staff:

To better assess a project at an early stage a digitally generated model set in the neighbourhood context should be a basic submission requirement.

4.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.