



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Minutes

Date:	Wednesday, March 14, 2018
Time:	5:00 – 6:15 p.m.
Place:	Wesbrook Community Centre, Room 201, 3335 Webber Lane
Members present:	Bryce Rositch (Chair) John Metras (Vice Chair) Andre Gravelle Kyle Bruce Jacopo Miro Michael White (ex-officio)
Staff:	Grant Miller and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
Guests:	Approx. 9 Guests/Observers
Presenters:	David Dove, Perkins + Will Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative

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 11, 2017 meeting.

The Minutes from the October 11, 2017 meeting were adopted.

3.0 Development Permit Applications

DP18001: Wesbrook Place Lot 8 – Ivy on the Park

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the market residential project, 159 units in the tower and 23 townhouses, presenting the context for Lot 8 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood and an overview of the policy documents that guided this development (Land Use Plan, Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan, and Development Handbook). Major themes of the public consultation comments were summarized and the variances requested on this project were introduced.

Project Architect, David Dove, of Perkins+Will, presented the architectural plans and introduced the rest of the applicant team including Joseph Fry, of Hapa Collaborative, who presented the landscape design.

The project was generally praised for its sensitive, elegant, and well resolved detailed submission and for bicycle accessibility and sustainability features (electric vehicle charging). It reflects the overall aspirations of the Wesbrook Place neighbourhood plan and

responds to the context of the forest and the landscape. The following comments were provided by Board members:

Sustainability/REAP:

- Clarify what's being done to meet REAP Gold Innovation and Student Research Project Credit.
 - Nothing yet planned.
- The project was commended for the quantity of electric vehicle charging spaces provided.
- Is there some consideration for these REAP scores to increase over time? We tend to see scores in the same range and there appears to be a high ceiling. Is it a scale/compliance/incentive issue? What's the challenge in getting those numbers higher?
 - The REAP checklist is about to be renewed and you will start to see some changes in future developments. The applicant can't speak for previous projects but this project is at the high end of REAP Gold near REAP Gold Plus and there are a number of items that are yet to be determined what credit they will receive. It's conceivable that the project will attain REAP Gold Plus but the project has committed to the conservative estimate of REAP Gold at this time.
 - Campus and Community Planning is in the course of aligning with changes to the BC Building Code to enhance energy and envelope performance. REAP is to align with the greater regional/provincial aspirations and improve performance over time. An information report will be provided to the Board once REAP has been amended.
- The project does not appear to be applying for the Commissioning credit. It seems like low hanging fruit, in terms of tuning the mechanical
 - Agreed, it is low hanging fruit and we will follow-up.

Building Cladding

- This is the first building that we've seen that uses a lot of white. Thinking about this in terms of longevity, cleanliness, and aesthetics, will that be an issue?
 - It shouldn't be an issue. White performs quite well.

Bird Friendly Materials

- Are there materials and colours that could mitigate the number of bird strikes?
 - It's the reflection of the materials and not the colour. The majority of strikes occur within the first 6 floors where birds cannot tell the difference between the reflection on the glazing and open sky.
- Have you considered a fritting pattern on the glass on the lower six storeys?
 - No we have not. That would be a challenge for most residences. The building is about 50% solid panel and believe bird strikes will be less of an issue.

Trash Collection

- Clarification on the trash and recycling collection process was requested.
 - The trash container is picked up below grade. Just the recycling comes up to the street for pickup. A waste disposal company has reviewed the plans and is satisfied with the current parking level layout.

Accessibility:

- Can you describe accessibility through the site? What units are accessible by wheelchair without assistance?
 - All units in the tower, and stacked townhouse units are accessible by elevator. North facing townhome units are all at grade.

FSR:

- A clarification was requested on the details of the FSR calculation. It is recommended that going forward the report/evaluation matrix show the calculation net area/site area to mitigate some of the ongoing concerns about density in the neighbourhood.
 - It's net area over site area. C+CP will show the FSR calculation going forward in the report/evaluation matrix.

Advisory Urban Design Panel presentation:

- Please confirm whether there were different iterations of the plans. Was there a singular point that was problematic or challenging?
 - This is the first submission to the Development Permit Board, but the project did go before the Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP) twice for non-voting and one voting session. The project was workshopped with the AUDP.

Variations

- Parking ramp variance. Was it only to accommodate a separate lane for bikes?
 - That and bringing the landscape up over the parking entry as we are bringing a structure over the ramp in the setback.
- Will the additional width to accommodate a separate bike lane be part of subsequent projects? Have we seen it on other projects?
 - Not in this way. Staff has encouraged separate access to the underground Class 1 bicycle parking. Cyclists have the option to use it.
- Will the canopy on the south side, within the 2.5m, setback hang over the sidewalk?
 - It comes within 1.5 metres of the sidewalk and should appear quite light. The 8" assembly will be at 10-12' above the sidewalk.
 - Setbacks are general for the tower massing. Campus and Community Planning supports the scale and utility of this canopy.

Construction Debris and Noise. :

- Are complaints around construction debris, traffic and noise a standard occurrence? If so, is there a mechanism to file a complaint.
 - Comments are received from time to time. The mechanism in place is to contact Campus and Community Planning and our Compliance Officer will be dispatched to investigate.

Tree Removals

- There has been some community concerns regarding the proposed removal of the cedar trees in the north east corner of the site. These trees were identified in the arborist report as dead/dying/in decline. Is there an opportunity here to highlight the fact that the trees might not be healthy?
 - Two of the trees are leaning towards our site. We can highlight this in the arborist report and note during our ongoing consultation with the public. Reforestation is a strategy that we've like to work with the proponent on site.
 - Paul Young, of UBC Properties Trust confirmed that at least (4) evergreen trees on the north west corner of the site will be relocated into the greenway. Street trees proposed for removal will be replanted in other places in the neighbourhood as places become available.

Family-Oriented Space.

- How does the plan for the development reflect the needs of families?
 - A lot of it is on the ground plane with amenity spaces that have the opportunity to spill out onto the landscape. AUDP comments encouraged striking a balance between public and private patio spaces. Hoping these spaces to become draws for social activity. The community garden has the potential to be very successful.
- Child safety regarding water features and design elements at grade (sharp edges and fall hazards).
 - Water feature on the existing site is fairly shallow with a small porch to provide an overlook. No other water features are proposed for the site.
 - In terms of nature play logs and steppers are fairly low impact.
- Outdoor amenity space supports families. The Board needs to support active families and livability in the neighbourhoods. The proposed interior amenity space seems programmed for adult use. Encourage incorporating more interior amenity space to support families such as study spaces, music rooms, and active play areas.

Outdoor Bicycle Racks

- Applicant was commended for the number of bicycle racks provided. Will the two racks closest to the tower be covered by the canopy? Would you consider providing more covered bicycle racks?
 - If they are not fully covered they are partially covered. We can consider extending the canopy to ensure the two racks are covered.

Townhouse Design

- Tower is an elegant design with great proportions that is a complementing foreground to the trees in the background. Concerns were raised regarding the dark boxiness of the townhouses. There are current design approaches for keeping it very crisp. What is it about the townhouse design that supports the aspiration of the Wesbrook Neighbourhood? Existing townhouses in the neighbourhood show delight, elegance, interest, variation and colours and I'm not finding that in these townhouses. Nearby 2-3 storey townhouses will be impacted by the 4 storey stacked townhouse. Applicant noted that they had also questioned the starkness and sparseness of the design. The following design elements were included to add expression: textured spandrel panel, frame around the glazing that pushes out, a recessed pre-cast illuminated address panel, full door with side panel, and the slight offset of one third running bond. We've chosen to look at the finer grain details to provide visual interest and texture rather than big gestures. It presents a tailored approach with a tight colour palette within the same range. Townhouses are knitted with the tower, by way of incorporating the bricks into the tower entrance wall that registers through the lobby. Design team has played with the massing and fenestration but landed on a quiet and appropriate response.

Chair Summary

- Panel thought it was an elegant and sensitive design that is supportive of the idea that it is suitable for families.
- Some consideration for more cover to the Class II bicycle parking near tower entrance.
- Regarding the tree removals, accentuate the rejuvenation and the replacement of the landscape.
- Appreciation for the family supported design. Encouragement for more indoor family oriented amenity space.
- Board has supported the variances.

Board Discussion on Townhouse Motion

- Ends of the townhouse units adjacent to the waterway are pretty stark.
- Missed opportunity to provide a corner unit. However it's not clear that the floor plans can support that change.
- Will it stand the test of time? There are some very subtle nuances to this that can make it work. Pay careful attention to how you provide some accentuation so it doesn't exacerbate the stark frontage.
- Could some of the starkness be dealt with through plantings?
- Expectation for the design team is to address these issues through the final steps of this Development Permit process, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning. There are likely creative ways that they can do this without altering the floor plans.

The following motion for Lot 8 in the 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-lease residential development on Lot 8 in Wesbrook Place (Ivy on the Park), comprising 159 apartment units in the 22-storey high rise and 23 townhouse units as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by Perkins + Will and HAPA Landscape Architecture (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That SC3B.5(a), and SC3B.5(c) of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project to permit reductions in minimum setback requirements on the front and rear yards at various locations for balcony or canopy projections; and for the projection of a northern portion of the parkade ramp structure into the rear setback; and**
- 2. That the applicants work with staff to address concerns and comments raised by the Board including townhouse design improvements and weather protection over outdoor bicycle racks; and**
- 3. That staff report back to the Board on the applicant's response to the concerns and comments raised by the Board.**

The project was Moved, Seconded, and carried by a vote of 6-0.

4.0 DP Board Information Reports

4.1 Various Development Permit Application Updates

A summary of minor applications approved through the administrative discretion of the Director of Planning as well as amendments to previously issued Development Permits were presented.

4.2 DP17007 Research Park Update:

The Board had a lot of comments the last time. What design development has taken place since the last meeting?

There were a number of comments and responses noted in the October 11th minutes:

- Garden plots were reconfigured to facilitate accessibility: There are now fewer but larger plots with wider aisles to allow access.
- Concerns about lack of openness regarding the constraints of the park: Some of the planting was removed to provide more open lawn space.
- Concerns regarding playgrounds not being responsive to older children: During the meeting there was reference to the climbing rock and slack line proposed within the park. This is one of five parks in the area and there are other options within Wesbrook Place for older children.
- Subdivision: The subdivision plan approval process is currently under way.
- Fire Access: UBC Properties Trust reiterated that there will be no Fire Access through the park. All fire access will be handled on the future development lots.

The Development Permit was issued on February 22, 2018 and the detailed Streets and Landscape Permit is currently under review. The Campus and Community Planning Landscape Architect recommended the removal of additional planting along the edges of the greenway so the individual development sites can respond to the existing condition.

The Board requested a report back as an information item at the next meeting including a summary of the changes made and presentation of the final SLP designs. It's beneficial for the Board to understand the journey of the project.

4.3 AUDP Notification of DPB Comments:

The Board Chair referenced some of the previously approved Lot 11 design concerns (monolithic building, balcony, and livability). It's important that if the Board feels it has design related concerns that this message be sent back to the AUDP to ensure buildings are designed that are supported by the community.

The Ex-Officio member recommended that it would be helpful if a letter from the Board was sent to AUDP, to highlight recent design related concerns so that greater scrutiny may be applied in these areas in the future. Important for AUDP to know how the design has evolved.

The Chair volunteered to draft a letter and circulate it to the rest of the Board for their input.

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq