



Meeting Minutes

UBC DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD (DP-BOARD)

Date: July 17, 2019
Time: 5:00 pm – 7:00 pm
Place: Wesbrook Community Centre, Room 144 (3335 Webber Lane)

Members in Attendance:

Bryce Rositch	Chair - Past member of the UBC Board of Governors
John Metras	Vice-Chair - Member of the UBC Administration
Jason Adele	UBC Vancouver Student
Andre Gravelle	UBC Resident
Michael White	Ex-Officio - Associate Vice-President, Campus + Community Planning

Presenters:

Adam Hyslop	Transportation Planner, Campus + Community Planning
Michael Patterson	Principal Landscape Architect, P+A

Staff:

Grant Miller	Director of Planning: Development Services, Campus + Community Planning
Karen Russell	Manager, Development Services, Campus + Community Planning
Ashley Shapiro	(Recording Secretary) Administrative Assistant, Campus + Community Planning

1. Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair brought the meeting to order at 4:58pm.

There were roundtable introductions.

The Agenda was approved as circulated.

2. Approval of Minutes of the February 13, 2019 Meeting

There was a correction to the Minutes of the spelling of the name Walter Frankl.

The Minutes from February 13, 2019 were approved as amended.

3. Policy Items

3.1. UBC Access + Parking Strategy – Process Overview

Adam Hyslop presented the UBC Access + Parking Strategy – Process Overview and explained the history and purposes behind it. The Campus + Community Planning Transportation Planning team has undertaken a campus wide parking study and strategy development process. This is in response to interest from the Board over the past year regarding frequent variance requested for parking allocation and an interest in informing the Board about the University's current thinking on access and parking. C+CP is in the early stages of developing a vehicle access and parking strategy that is campus-wide, including both the academic and neighborhood lands. There is significant work being done to manage parking with a strategic approach. It is meant to serve as a Focus Implementation Plan within the broader Transportation Plan that will include policies and clear guidance on parking related issues. C+CP wanted to delve into

the more specific decision making processes that will be directed towards meeting important access needs, while also advancing institutional and community goals of sustainability and wellbeing.

Questions and comments from the Board:

- A number of developments within the Wesbrook neighbourhood are providing one space per unit. Are you saying that there is a 42% oversupply?

No, that is the regional number. There was at least one building at UBC that was included within that study.

If it is understood correctly, C+CP is still to do an analysis specific to UBC?

Yes. It is tricky data to actually get, other than the anecdotal data from UBC Properties Trust. There is information with respect to the rental buildings managed by UBCPT and within those, parking use certainly is quite low.

- What is the time range that this strategy is working within?

A time range has not been established yet. It is more near-term as the intent is for this to build off of the 2014 Transportation Plan. That Plan is not too far off from needing to be renewed and that renewal would also tackle a number of these issues. The strategy will cover the near-term policies and actions that could be taken by the University.

Some of the data presented suggest that the changes that will happen may happen over a number of years. If the time frame is shorter, how do these data match the time frame?

It is more direction towards actions that can be taken today, recognizing that a number of implications of these decisions are much more long-term.

- There are questions about UBC specific data. General information has been presented which was interesting to see, but is there a work plan to look at parking utilization in rental properties or bike utilization, for example? This would provide a base-line for where we are at now.

There have been a few SEEDS student projects that have investigated this which could be drawn from, but the current sample size is limited.

The data appear critical to understand for making decisions regarding the current situation, given the unique condition of the location.

C+CP certainly does have more robust data around commuter parking. There are privacy concerns that are involved in this collection of data as well.

- Perhaps there could be a deeper dive into these data with UBCPT and the Strata councils surrounding matters of access. If there is a resourcing issue, to approach other stakeholders to undertake the counts and to look into this harder is of valid concern.

Data driven decisions are key, because there is significant anecdotal information surrounding transportation trends that is often inconsistent.

- In regards to the bike-share program and how well it was used, how does this relate to the current change in vendors?

In the next week, UBC is in the process of launching the new bike-share operator.

What are the differences between the two, knowing that DropBike wasn't the best user experience? The bikes were abandoned everywhere.

There are a few changes being made to the program to address issues brought forward during the pilot. C+CP learned a lot and a number of these changes involve where these bikes were left. The new developer is creating a program where there will be a fee – a surcharge – for leaving bikes outside of the designated hubs. There is also a system of self-incentivised credit being put in place for returning abandoned bikes to these hubs. Apart from this, it is a similar model with free floating bikes based in hubs. There was limited use of the designated hubs during the pilot.

Often, there were a number of bikes present but none would be available due to issues with the solar powered battery system and the bikes were known to “chirp.”

The pilot had a number of hardware and software issues with the bikes themselves. C+CP has been assured by the new operator that they do not have these challenges. C+CP is optimistic that these issues will not occur.

- Reiterating what others on the Board have stated, there is a small captive audience here in terms of residential buildings. It would be easy to go into every single one of them as they do in the Metro Vancouver studies. That way, there could be accurate information that the Board would be interested in seeing.

With no additional questions or comments from the Board, the Chair moved the motion for acceptance of the policy item report on UBC Access + Parking Strategy – Process Overview.

4. Development Permit Applications

4.1. DP17024: South Campus Greenway

Karen Russell and Michael Patterson provided an overview of DP17024: South Campus Greenway and explained the history and purposes behind it. On August 2, 2017, UBCPT submitted a Development Permit application (DP17024) to C+CP to develop a Greenway on Lots 8, 9, and 28 along the Western edge of Wesbrook Place between Nobel Park and West 16th Avenue. The path will be integrated within the existing treed area between UBC Farm and the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. An updated DP application was received on May 16, 2019 for the proposed greenway incorporating draft principles for the South Campus Greenway generated from a workshop held April 25, 2018 along with modifications to the proposed plans. The greenway is designed to be highly accessible to both adjacent properties and the entire Wesbrook neighborhood through its three connections to adjoining greenway systems and the road network. The South Campus Greenway is a key feature of the Vancouver Campus Plan and the Wesbrook Neighbourhood Plan.

Questions and comments from the Board and the Public:

- Public Question: What was the rationale for the surface of the pathway being granular or asphalt?

There was concern expressed that there should be more permeability to the trail system. That came out of comments from the Open House from both a permeability and aesthetic point of view. The asphalt is to provide access to the two development sites that have front doors on the Greenway. The asphalt provides this necessary access to the townhome units. The gravel is in areas where the pathway is a trail going through a forest. This provides a more natural setting to the pathway.

- In regards to accessibility, will the crushed stone or gravel path be able to provide accessible access?

Yes, it will need to be a crushed compacted surface in order to provide this access.

- There were concerns expressed regarding understory removal. Is this something that is being encouraged or discouraged?

Leaving the understory in the greenway untouched is the goal on the West side of the trail. There is a trail being put through the forest, so there are other considerations in place, such as view lines, overlook, safety, etc. With it being so close to the adjacent projects, parts of the Greenway will need to be replanted. These would be new native plantings of shrubs and other understory, as opposed to larger trees.

- In regards to the tensions expressed in keeping the Greenway as natural as possible, has this been considered in conjunction with the two new structures under construction. Particularly with these buildings providing shade to this area, will the plantings be successful? There may be people that go off the trail and into the rest of the area. Is it optimistic that it will be natural?

This is already a shaded site under a forest canopy. It really is a shaded forest floor that would be replanted. There is little concern that native plants will not survive in that setting. Clues will be taken from the planting that is already here to guide the selection of the plants for replanting. The intent in making it as natural as possible, would be to allow the plantings to come right up to the edge of the path. This would hopefully discourage people from wandering in, with additional signage provided along the path to keep people on the path. In Nobel Park there is a play area located at the South end, adjacent to a native zone of trees. There are kids that have made forts and play in the trees. This may be due to the adjacency of the play area. This zone along the Greenway is different. It is not anticipated that people will wander off the path. This can be done with plantings and signage.

- The undefined green space area directly north of Block 11, what might be some of the uses there? It may be proposed that any areas that have larger sizes be left relatively undeveloped for informal play or other community activities. Is this one of the possible options for this site?

Yes, this side of the trail offers an opportunity to re-vegetate the area. It would provide an unique educational opportunity for signage explaining the area. Within that specific zone on the North side of the tower, it could be left as an open green space. When this project was first submitted as a DP, it was indicated as a potential dog park. There was some concern about that

expressed. The other use discussed was for a potential community garden. Leaving it as an open green space is of valid consideration.

- With the connectedness or articulation between the Main Mall Greenway through Stadium Neighbourhood and across 16th Avenue, the trail that was originally proposed was deleted from the plan. Was that due to the sensitive nature of the plantings in that area? Why could this not be continued to 16th Avenue as a continuation of the Greenway as defined?

That is a good question. With the feedback from the public, there was a lot of concern expressed that this area has the opportunity to be a wildlife corridor. Anyone that wants to commute by bicycle or by foot would commute more efficiently along the roadway. It was felt that there was validity to these comments. The connection to part of the pedestrian walkway was felt to be a strong connection. There was a desire to not have commuter bikes using the shared pedestrian Greenway. It was quite difficult to put a 4 meter wide pathway through that section of the forest without compromising more trees.

Is it possible for the trail use or type to change at that location so as to create a much narrower trail up to 16th Avenue that would be just for pedestrians?

Early on in the drafting principals there were some who were advocates for maintaining the wild spaces that we have. It has a well developed sidewalk along the green-edge. A core principal was the nature of the use of the trail. The Land Use Plan conceives of this as a high-speed corridor. The road is a safe area for the commuter cyclists. The crossing of 16th Avenue is coming into a new environment. The decision was to keep this maintained forested area as natural as possible. This comes from conversations with numerous stakeholders and C+CP supports this idea.

Following up on the Stadium Neighbourhood connection, it is notionally shown as connecting through 16th Avenue, but the details of that have not been worked out. The possible reconfiguration of the 16th Avenue road crossing is something that will be further considered in the future. It was thought that this section of trail, given the sensitivity, could be deferred to be thought about within the context of these future changes.

- The material changes along the path seems odd. If it is not for accessibility reasons, it could be seen that the pathways are cut-up. The steps of each unit could be paved, but could it potentially be all gravel? Is entry signage noted at the community garden intended to be an entry to the Greenway?

It would be signage indicating an entrance to the Greenway. There are numerous connections and opportunities for signage along the path.

- Is the intent for the path that cuts through the community gardens to be a pedestrian path to the UBC Farm?

Yes.

- In regards to the fruiting bushes that are being removed, is there another fruiting plant that could replace it?

Yes, that is the intent. The blackberries will be removed and replaced with native vegetation, including fruiting plants.

- What are the mitigation strategies regarding rainwater runoff, including the developments on the edge of the Greenway? What strategies are being used to ensure that the runoff won't affect the farm or vegetation?

The runoff from building sites will be taken care of on that building site. Under the pathway, pipes will be installed so that water won't build up and cause erosion.

- What was the reduction of tree loss through the update of the Plan?
Overall, there are an additional 18 trees that will now be retained.
- Public Comment: In regards to the Farm, there is some concern with how close the pathway is to the Farm. It is an intricate part of this community and it has lost a significant amount of privacy due to the development around it. A number of trees have been lost through development here. Keeping the path through the forest and stopping it where shown helps to mitigate that feeling of change.
- Public Comment: As has been mentioned, the front doors facing the Greenway are of significant note. Keeping the area natural is important, as well as keeping the front doors clearly defined. There could be more formality and structure to the surface changes of the pathway itself. Because those units front onto that Greenway, that Greenway is a fire-response point. Having a paved surface is something that the Fire Department considers important. The compromise made in the design is to keep the pavement where it is important to keep it and to provide the granular surface where it can be provided.
- Public Comment: In replacing parts of the understory, it is important to maintain the local bird population. It is good to have bird-friendly, densely thicketed plants for nesting. Specifically bird-friendly fruiting bushes should be planted as well. On a related note, something should be done with the townhouse windows along the Greenway to mitigate bird strikes.
UBC has a bird-friendly policy to guide these considerations.
- The Board, with a vote of 4-1, reflects the notion of an extension of the pathway through the trees to 16th Avenue to be a future consideration by the University.

There was written commentary provided via email from a member of the public, re: Comments to DPB, which was submitted to the Chair prior to the meeting. These comments were accepted by the Board for information.

With no additional questions or comments from the Board, the Chair moved the motion for approval of Development Permit Application DP17024: South Campus Greenway.

The Board, by majority consensus, **APPROVED** the Development Permit Application DP17024: South Campus Greenway.

5. DP Board Information Items

5.1. Various Development Permit Application Updates

New applications were highlighted that were approved through the administrative discretion of the Director of Planning as well as changes to previously issued Development Permits resulting from requests from project proponents for minor amendments pertaining to development in Neighbourhood Lands. Since February 2019, two minor DPs and twelve amendments to previously approved DPs were received, processed, and issued. This report was submitted as information to the DP-Board.

With no questions or comments from the Board, the Chair moved the motion for acceptance of the Various Development Permit Application Updates.

6. Other Business

With no such business, the Chair moved to adjourn the meeting

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:26 pm.

Minutes prepared by Ashley Shapiro