



Draft Minutes

Advisory Urban Design Panel

Date:	June 12, 2024 (rescheduled from June 6)
Time:	4:02 PM
Location:	Policy Labs, Centre for Interactive Research on Sustainability, 2260 West Mall
Attendees:	MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY URBAN DESIGN PANEL: Sarah Siegel (Vice Chair), Benn Duffell, Susanne West Hunter, Shane O'Neill, Ouri Scott
Regrets:	Susan Haid (Chair), Samantha Reid, Matthew Soules
Staff:	Matthew Roddis, Brett Liljefors, Linda Nielsen (Recorder)
Presenters:	Jennifer Boyle, DYS Architecture Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates Inc.

1.0 The meeting was called to order at 4:02 PM. A quorum was noted.

2.0 The June 12, 2024, agenda was approved.

3.0 FOR INFORMATION

The March 7, 2024, meeting minutes were approved electronically on April 4, 2024.

On April 18, 2024, the panel elected a new chair and vice chair by electronic vote.

- Susan Haid was elected as chair (May – September 2024)
- Sarah Siegel was elected as vice chair (May – December 2024)

4.0 Thanks and appreciation to AIBC-nominated architect Bruce Haden whose term ended on April 30, 2024.

5.0 Welcome AUDP members

- UBC staff representative Dr. Samantha Reid whose term started April 1, 2024.
- AIBC-nominated architect Shane O'Neill whose term started May 1, 2024.
- AIBC-nominated architect Susanne West Hunter whose term started May 1, 2024.

6.0 Land acknowledgement

UBC Point Grey (Vancouver) campus, sits on the traditional, ancestral, unceded territory of the x^wməθk^wəjəm (Musqueam) First Nation.

7.0 Application:

7.1 BCR Lot 7, Wesbrook Place

Application status: Development application
Location: BCR Lot 7, Wesbrook Place
Applicant: DYS Architecture
Perry and Associates Inc.
UBC Properties Trust

RESOLUTION: SUPPORT [5-0].

Architect Jennifer Boyle (DYS Architecture) and landscape architect Michael Patterson (Perry and Associates Inc.) presented and responded to questions from the panel. Architect Colin Shrubbs (DYS Architecture) and Senior Development Manager Sean Ang (UBC Properties Trust) were also in attendance and responded to questions from the panel.

Brett Liljefors introduced the project.

In addition to general commentary, the panel was asked to comment on:

- The success of the revised materials and expression of the C buildings in addressing the panel's previous concerns about proportion.
- The design of the exterior walkways and patios to optimize for comfortable use and sociability.
- The layout and landscape of the courtyard, including the interface with the adjoining units to encourage and facilitate sociability.

Panel Commentary:

The panel appreciated the responses to their previous comments and the further developments resulting in simplification of the expression.

General support for the modified materiality of the tower to bring a lighter facade to the internal lane and courtyard. One panel member thought the north elevation was less articulated. Clarity on whether the Level 1 plan at the corner next the parcel room has windows to the ground.

The updated expression of the C buildings is more grounded and simplified. The elements create a friendly streetscape that activates the elevation. The railings tie the tower and low-rises together. The introduction of the wood-like doors brings a sense of welcome.

The exterior walkways and connected patio spaces will promote socialization and connection. The larger patios on the walkways are more livable while still providing light in the lightwells.

Some question whether the amenity spaces in buildings A and B could be connected outdoors - appreciating it is a fire lane and amenity spaces are sometimes meant to be more interior.

Some comments the dark-coloured brick at ground level in the courtyard is dark and "somber" and these areas seem reliant on exterior lighting rather than natural light.

The parkade entry next to the lobby is an unfortunate adjacency. The amenities on the side will be sheltered from the entry.

Related Commentary:

Future projects should consider bringing the elevated walkways to the second story to support social opportunities between the upper levels and the courtyard level.

LANDSCAPE

The courtyard interface is generally successful and pathways are clearer.

The courtyard is challenged for direct sun. Seek ways to study the areas of greatest sun access in the courtyard and support their use.

The planters on the elevated walkways add visual interest in the courtyard and help break up the railing. Important that they are included in the permit drawings to ensure they remain post VE.

Appreciation for the focused use of catenary lighting in the interior courtyard and open space for children to play.

Concern the lawn in the courtyard would not be successful due to shade. Suggestion to consider an open hardscape such as pea gravel with larger trees. (The applicant noted subsequently that this area is artificial turf.)

There was a suggestion to use taller plants against the parkade wall to mitigate the slope. Consider a large tree or multiple larger trees in the triangle-shaped open space to mitigate the scale of the framing walls.

Some private patios on the public walkway that face south seem exposed. Consider if there is an opportunity to increase the height of the planters or plantings to create greater separation.

Vice Chair Summary:

Overall appreciation for the scheme and the changes that have been made.

The material expression changes were generally appreciated. The detailing of the screens feels calm and elegant, and generally more grounded, simplified and cohesive.

There was some debate about the dark/light materiality, but was generally supported. Consider the darkness of the courtyard through design refinement.

Some comments about connecting the interior amenity spaces in buildings A and B to the outdoors - appreciating it is a fire lane, so may not be appropriate.

The parkade entry next to the lobby is an unfortunate adjacency.

Support for the exterior walkways and appreciation for the larger patios and sociability of the space, and the lightwells.

Support for the plantings along the railings.

Support for the focused use of catenary lighting in the courtyard.

The triangle-shaped social space between buildings C2 and C3 is improved.

The courtyard interface to the surrounding public realms is well resolved. Some private patios along the south side seem exposed along the primary walkway. Consider taller plantings to help screen.

Applicant's response:

The units on the south side are flow-through units and have private balconies in the interior. The courtyard patios are at grade.

The lawn in the courtyard is artificial turf and will provide "green" in the winter months.

Resolution:

Having reviewed the project proposal, it was moved and seconded and was the decision of the Advisory Urban Design Panel:

THAT the panel SUPPORT the development application.

8.0 Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:59PM.