



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date:	Wednesday, October 11, 2017
Time:	4:45 – 7:00 p.m. <i>(In Camera Session: 4:45 – 5:29 pm)</i>
Place:	Wesbrook Community Centre, Room 201, 3335 Webber Lane
Members present:	Bryce Rositch (Chair) John Metras (Vice Chair) Andre Gravelle Qiuning Wang Jacopo Miro
Members absent:	Michael White (ex-officio)
Staff:	Grant Miller and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
Guests:	Approx. 8 Guests/Observers
Presenters:	Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust Liam Davis, ZGF Architects Inc Michael Patterson, Perry and Associates

1.0 In Camera Session (45mins)

New members were welcomed and the Terms of Reference and Board procedures were reviewed. Per Development Permit Board request, a presentation was made by staff on the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan. Comments and discussion followed.

2.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

3.0 Approval of Minutes from the July 26, 2017 meeting.

The Minutes from the July 26, 2017 meeting were adopted.

4.0 Development Permit Applications

DP17028: Wesbrook Place Lot 11

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, 153 market rental units in a tower and 20 townhouses for faculty/staff, presenting the context for Lot 11 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, Liam Davis, of ZGF Architects Inc, presented the architectural plans and introduced the rest of the applicant team including, Megan Pohanka of UBC Properties Trust, and Michael Patterson, of Perry and Associates, who presented the landscape design.

The project was generally praised for its detailed submission and for adding rental units to Wesbrook Place. The following comments were provided by Board members:

Eagle’s Nest Adjacent to the Development Site

- Feedback was received from residents regarding the eagles’ nest. What measures will the development take to address some of the concerns the residents have regarding the eagle’s nest.
 - The eagles nest has existed for a long time. We are required by the Province to protect the zone around the eagle’s nest. The parcel immediately surrounding the nest will remain undeveloped as part of University Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS). During the development process on Lots 7&8, UBC Properties Trust engaged an environmental consultant to prepare detailed instructions regarding a minimum setback that guided the footprint on the Lot 11 project, as well as impacts from construction activity during the nesting period. A link to the report was provided to the Board member.

Unit Size:

- This development does a good job of providing a variety of housing options. Are there targets or requirements to the number of bedrooms identified in the Wesbrook Neighbourhood Plan
 - The Wesbrook Neighbourhood plan gives guidance on that to encourage a range of unit types and tenures.

Rationale for Tower Shape:

- Clarification was requested on the rationale for the tower design. Why is it not a square to maximize internal space available?
 - The tower follows the contours of Ross Drive. Interior design elements ensure the units are as spacious of possible.

Amenity Spaces:

- How is the ground floor amenity space to be used? Will it be sufficient for this project, given potential mental health impacts on residents in micro units? .
 - The design has been patterned after market rental projects in Seattle and Toronto. In addition to the approximately 1,000 square feet in the ground floor amenity area there is a generous rooftop area. The ground floor space is envisioned as a lounge area with WIFI and television which spills out to the exterior as an indoor/outdoor space. The exact programming of the space will be finalized during the construction process.
- Consider providing kitchen/bathroom space within the fobbed amenity area on the 1st floor, this is increasingly important given the prevalence of small unit sizes in the building.
- The applicant team was commended on providing a rooftop amenity area with a pergola. Consider increasing the habitability and use of the space with slightly more protection from the elements.

Tree Retention along the Buffer with the Farm

- Clarification was requested on the tree buffer to be retained and the location of the eagles' nest.
 - The extent of the tree buffer with the farm and the locations of the eagles' nest and roost trees were identified on the Landscape plan. There is consultant confirmation that there is enough setback between the eagles nest and the Lot 11 development.
 - Tree heights vary but some reach the height of the tower. There is expected to be a partial view of the farm from the tower.

Replacement Trees on Site

- Confirm quantity of trees that will be removed and replaced as a result of this development.
 - 104 trees will be removed and 57 trees will be replaced on site. Locations for the remaining trees not replaced on site will be identified at a later date in consultation with the University Landscape Architect in accordance with the 1:1 replacement policy.

Accessibility:

- Accessibility in the tower was noted as good, although all townhouses appear to have a stepped entry.
 - All townhouses have a stepped entry.
- Accessibility issues are important to the University. In the future, consider increasing the percentage of units that are accessible from grade.

Stormwater Management:

- What is the stormwater management plan for this site to minimize the impact on the Farm?
 - Stormwater runoff will be managed by Geopacific and further reviewed during the Building Permit process.

Sustainability/REAP:

- There are significant REAP points being claimed under the Innovation section. Confirm what's being done to meet REAP Gold Innovation and Student Research Project Credits.
 - For the Student Research Project, details are to be determined. Applicant to work with SEEDS group to produce a study of value similar to studies on Lots 27/29 and The Laureates where a Master's student conducted a study on bicycle storage in residential buildings on campus.
- Concerns were raised regarding the low amount of the potential Energy points claimed (15 out of 52 points). While connection to the District Energy is great and ultimately a long-term benefit, there is a disconnect on the energy front by focusing on the Research points that do not drive the performance of the building. Campus and Community Planning to consider this in future projects.
- Are electric vehicle charging stations being thought about for the underground parking?
 - There are a couple of thresholds in REAP regarding adding rough-in and/or installing electric vehicle charging stations. Rough-in can typically be provided if requested by a resident. UBC Properties Trust will work with Campus and Community Planning to forecast demand for electric vehicle charging in the neighbourhoods.

- Confirm the material cladding on the Building?
 - We haven't finalized the material but phenolic panels are an option. It will come down to overall cost analysis. Products will be chosen based on maintenance and durability.

Profile of Residents of the Tower

- 50% of the units are 1 bedroom or smaller. Can you confirm the anticipated resident mix in the development?
 - A general spectrum of unit types has been offered. Based on previous market rental sites, we anticipate quite a few students in this building. A nice spread of unit size has been provided to cover both students and families.
 - Project was commended for providing rental units with some devoted to Faculty and Staff.

Setback Variance:

- Clarification on the locations of the setback variances were provided.
 - Campus and Community Planning has been tasked to examine whether the 2.5m setback rule should change or whether it should no longer be accepted as a variance, given the increasing frequency that this variances has been requested in recent projects.

Building Massing and shadow over Future Elementary School:

- Will the winter shadow cast by the tower impact the future elementary school?
 - During the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan Amendments, solar studies of the tower locations were considered. The school has some tolerance, compared to the public parks due to the breakdown of activities during the day. Midday playground usage will not be impacted by the placement and massing of the tower.

Balcony Design Rationale:

- 75% of units have access to a balcony within their suites. The outdoor rooftop amenity area, and patio in the public space can provide additional area. City of Vancouver mandates a depth of 6' is recommended for balconies and most of the current balconies provided are not made of a dimensional quality to encourage use.
 - C+CP is not aware of a minimum dimensional requirements. Campus and Community Planning to review the livability of the small balcony areas.

Construction Impacts on the Farm:

- Are there any special considerations to be made during construction to handle dust, dirt and runoff as it relates to the farm?
 - At the moment a geotechnical consultant is not on board. It is expected that Geopacific Consultants, who are familiar with the proximity of the farm, will be engaged during the Building Permit process to develop the appropriate Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.

Use of Flex Space:

- What do you foresee as the use of the flex spaces with the window wells?
 - Private office or rec room is the likely intended use.

Building Form

- Provide the Design Rationale for the move to a more solid building compared to neighbourhood precedents referenced in your package that were generally more open, transparent, and glazed.
 - Early in the design process, the level of sustainability and a move away from window and curtainwall design were discussed. AUDP comments to add additional transparency on the first two levels of tower were incorporated into the project.

Members of the public were invited by the Chair to comment on the project and there were no questions.

The following motion for Lot 11 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director of Planning issue a Development Permit for the mixed market and faculty/staff rental residential development on Lot 11 in Wesbrook Place. The 173 unit project which comprises 153 apartment units in a 14 storey high rise (market rental) and 20 townhouse units (faculty/staff rental) is subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That SC2B.4(a), SC2B.4(b) and SC2B.4(c) of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project to permit reductions in minimum setback requirements on the front, side and rear yards at various locations for porch canopy (townhomes) and balcony/building (high rise) projections; and**
- 2) That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the required number of visitor parking stalls from 18 to 15.**

The project was Moved, Seconded, and carried by a vote of 5-0.

DP17007: Wesbrook Place Research Park

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for the Wesbrook Place Research Park 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.

Project Landscape Architect, Michael Patterson, of Perry and Associates, presented the landscape plans and introduced the rest of the applicant team including Paul Young, of UBC Properties Trust.

The project was commended for adding additional park space to Wesbrook Place and the following comments were provided by Board members:

Community Gardens

- Will the width between rows and terrain be accessible?
 - Not all the pathways will be accessible. Due to high demand for community gardens, we want to get in as many as we can. UBC Properties Trust referenced an example in Hawthorn Community Gardens. Every second pathway is

- accessible by wheelchair or wheelbarrow. Pairing up the plots to allow for alternate widths of pathways is an opportunity that can be explored here.
 - UNA preference is for bark mulch for surfacing. This item will need to be resolved in consultation with the UNA.
- Is this an effective use of space in the middle of the park, given that there will be little activity during the winter months?
 - Parks that have community gardens become very social places during the busy growing season. Nobel Park was cited as an example. If it turns out that gardening isn't the best use of this space, the UNA is welcome to revisit this space in the future.

Playground Areas

- There is demand for additional playground areas for older kids. Can you clarify the equipment that will be included? There is a high demand for a basketball net. Will this be considered in the future?
 - Options for older kids include the climbing rock and a slack line.
 - Basketball nets are not being considered for this site. In a dense urban neighbourhood you have to be careful of where you place a basketball court. The reverberation of sound could be bothersome.
- Are there noise concerns due to proximity of children's play area to proposed townhomes along the greenway?
 - Play area was sited to maximize the distance between play area and the nearest lots (8-11metres). Planting could provide a visual buffer and the sound of the water as it flows through the channel will help mitigate noise impacts.

Open Areas

- Given the narrow width of the park and the tree canopy is there sufficient space to engage in activities such as Frisbee, soccer, badminton, etc..? Where will the older kids go to engage in this activity? Is this a good place to incorporate larger, square open areas for unstructured play for older children? Toddlers and older teenage are well served.
 - We were trying to create a space that is fairly flat and open so it can be used for a variety of activities. Tree canopy has been provided for shade.
 - At the neighbourhood plan stage, the objective was for the parks to be a network that maximizes direct access to green space from the residential areas. 95% of the development sites in Wesbrook Place are flanking/adjoining a park. Nobel Park and the playfields by the high school and future elementary school site provide larger play areas.

Subdivision

- Is the subdivision finished that surrounds the park?
 - The neighbourhood plan establishes the subdivision boundaries and subdivision is currently in progress.
- There are generous developable sites in this subdivision. The park feels really constrained.
 - Permeability of adjacent lot landscape areas should mitigate this feeling of constraint. This has worked well in other development sites in Wesbrook Place.

Fire Access

- There is a need to engage with the Fire Department to ensure appropriate access to the townhouse units at the back of the lots.
 - Every second property line has a 6metre wide fire lane to service the townhouse units. This and the location of fire hydrants will be finalized in consultation with the fire department.

The following motion for the Wesbrook Place Research Park was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director of Planning issue a Development Permit for Research Park (not yet formally named) including four connecting greenways designated as Useable Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS). The project is located on Lot 10 on the site of the former BC Research lands in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood.

The project was Moved, Seconded, and carried by a vote of 5-0.

5.0 DP Board Information Reports

- *Various Development Permit Application Updates*

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

The Board's sole recommendation was that going forward, updates should include a brief rationale for the reason for the amendment.

6.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq