



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date:	Wednesday, February 24, 2016
Time:	5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Place:	Classroom, Tapestry, 3338 Wesbrook Mall
Members present:	Andrew Irvine (Chair) John Metras (Vice Chair) Andre Gravelle Qiuning Wang Victor Ngo Michael White (ex-officio)
Staff:	Joe Stott and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
Guests:	Approx. 12 Guests/Observers
Presenters:	Edward Archibald, Adera Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the October 28, 2015 meeting.

The Minutes from the October 28, 2015 meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application

3.1 DP16003: Wesbrook Place Lots 23

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot 23 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. The project is a 6-storey wood-frame market residential building totaling 10,315m² (111,033 sq. ft.) with 106 dwelling units. KR stated the recommendation with conditions outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board and provided a summary of recent changes incorporated into the project in response to the February 9 Public Open House and online feedback received. Including but not limited to:

- Building elevation modifications
- Lanai stairway enclosures have been reduced in size and shifted more towards the centre of building
- Shadow diagrams have been expanded to show additional times of the day and all four seasons. The shadow diagrams for Nobel house have also been included.
- REAP score increased from 45 to 54 points.

- Class I Bicycle parking has been increased slightly to 230 spaces.

KR presented the relaxations requested by the applicants as explained in the report.

Edward Archibald from Adera unveiled the new project name "Virtuoso" and handed the presentation over to Project Architect, Bryce Rositch, of Rositch Hemphill Architects who presented the architectural plans. Michael Patterson, of Perry + Associates Landscape Architecture presented the landscape design.

The following comments were made by applicant/staff/public in response to questions from the DP Board:

Lack of connectivity between Lot 23 and Lot 22(Nobel House): Landscape plans as shown have barrier elements.

- Nobel House fence, parking ramps, retaining wall and grade changes limit the amount of contiguous space remaining. Unlike this project, previous projects with shared courtyards benefit from the same ownership and user groups.

Lack of Interior Amenity Space:

- No additional amenity space is provided within the building due to the proximity to abundant nearby UBC neighbourhood and campus amenities. Additional resources were placed into the courtyard amenity.

Rationale of Variance Request:

- Roof/balcony projections into setback are on the North, South, and West sides. Shifting the building to the east to avoid the variances would reduce the size of the courtyard and negatively impact Lot 22 (Nobel House) and exacerbate some of the concerns that have been brought up in the consultation process.

Shadowing: Could we reduce the number of units on the south east end and redesign building to allow more sunlight into the courtyard? Is there a way to show shadow studies in 3-dimensions to show which floors will be most severely impacted?

- Building has been shifted to the west to double the minimum setback to mitigate impacts on Nobel House. Within the constraints of the Neighbourhood Plan we've responded to the site limitations as best we could. Removing a floor or wing would result in an increase in the building footprint.
Depending on the time of the year, generally the first couple of floors will be impacted by shadowing.

Consideration for Integrated Landscape Materials:

- The Landscape Designer for Lot 23 also designed the Lot 22 (Nobel House) project. Changes requested by AUDP to improve integration between the courtyards were incorporated. There are ways to soften the relationship between the two buildings through strategic landscape.

Courtyard Trees: Are trees beneficial in the courtyard with little light?

- Trees provide a sense of canopy, separation between the two buildings, and filtered views.

Water Features on Campus: Barrier-free water features are a safety issue for young children.

- The water feature at the building entrance is very shallow at ¾" in depth. The water feature in the courtyard is currently flush with paving but a guard could be put in place if requested.
- The Chair requested feedback from the Director of Planning on the response to water features University wide. Generally the water features are very popular in residential neighbourhoods. The feedback on recent rental projects was to tone down the water features on site. On the main campus, there are many water features with shallow depth. The BC Building Code regulates anything deeper. Guards have been put in place where required.
- The Board has asked staff to undertake a neighbourhood wide review on the safety and sustainability issues surrounding the use of water features in the Public Realm and courtyard spaces.

Sustainability: The applicant was lauded for achieving REAP Gold and the inclusion of larger units.

Bicycle Parking: Comments were received from the gallery that bike storage is inadequate in Wesbrook Place. In response to the feedback at the Public Open House, the applicant provided additional Class I bicycle parking in this project. The Chair requested a review of long term demand for bicycle storage in the neighbourhoods.

Additional Pathways in the Public Realm: A concern was raised regarding additional pathways shown adjacent to the current green street that may impact the future proposed community garden space.

- Part of the function of the green street is to provide access to ground level units. Typically sidewalks and pathways are located in the public realm and several examples in Wesbrook Place were provided.

Building Accessibility: Concerns were raised regarding accessibility within the building and why the more stringent accessibility measures in the Vancouver Building Code are not in place.

- Grades on site resulted in the stepped floors within the building. UBC is governed by the BC Building Code.

Chair Commentary:

- Campus and Community Planning staff will arrange for a study on bicycle parking utilization in Wesbrook Place and the results reported to the Board at a future meeting.
- Campus and Community Planning staff will *undertake a neighbourhood wide review on the safety and sustainability issues surrounding the use of water features in the Public Realm and courtyard spaces.*

The following motion for Lot 23 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the market residential development on Lot 23 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

1) That SC2-A.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project to permit reductions in minimum setback requirements at various locations for architectural roof and balcony projections.

The project was Moved, Seconded, and passed 3-1

4.0 DP Board Information Reports

4.1 *Draft Wesbrook Place Design Vision Supplement and Proposed Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan Amendment.*

Joe Stott provided a brief history of the Wesbrook Place Design Vision process; reviewed the draft Wesbrook Place Design Vision Supplement consultation process; and subsequent amendment to P-10 Plan of Land Uses in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan.

Clarification was requested on the sequence of development in Wesbrook Place. Paul Young (UBC PT) responded that sites are developed generally from North to South and from the centre to the outside. Sometimes sites are leapfrogged over to allow for construction staging and parking which minimizes the impact on surrounding street network.

Deadline for comments on the draft Wesbrook Place Design Vision Supplement and Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan Amendment extended to February 29, 2016 for the Development Permit Board Members. **No comments were received.**

4.2 *DP Board Information Report - Various Application Updates.*

The Chair asked the board members if they had any questions for staff. There were none. The Report was adopted as circulated.

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq