



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date:	Wednesday, August 10, 2016
Time:	5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Place:	Centre for Interactive Research on Sustainability, Policy Labs A+B, 2260 West Mall
Members present:	Andrew Irvine (Chair) Andre Gravelle Qiuning Wang David Sametz Michael White (ex-officio)
Members absent:	John Metras (Vice Chair)
Staff:	Grant Miller and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
Guests:	Approx. 1 Guest/Observer
Presenters:	Daniel Giordano, UBC Properties Trust Andrew Emmerson, GBL Architects Inc. Chris Phillips, PFS Studio

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 April 27, 2016 meeting.

The Minutes from the April 27, 2016 meeting were adopted subject to the correction of minor edits.

3.0 Development Permit Application

3.1 DP16013: University Boulevard - Site D

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Site D in the University Boulevard Neighbourhood. The project will front the north side of University Boulevard. It is located just south of the existing Aquatic Centre/outdoor pool and west of the mixed use residential/commercial project (Central) currently under construction on Site B. The 6-storey non-market residential development will house those who work at or attend UBC and totals 6,750m² (72,661 sq. ft.). It comprises 90 dwelling units and five commercial retail units at grade. KR stated the recommendations outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board. Variances related to the reduction of vehicular parking spaces (commercial, visitor and handicapped) and outdoor bicycle parking spaces were requested for this project.

Daniel Giordano of UBC Properties Trust introduced the applicant team. Project Architect, Andrew Emmerson, of GBL Architects Inc., presented the architectural plans and Chris Phillips of PFS Studio, presented the landscape design.

The project design was generally praised and the following comments were received:

Vehicular Parking:

- There is a need to align required commercial and visitor parking in the precinct with the overall mission of the university, focusing on enhanced transit services and parking structures/parkades.
- There is a need to examine unmet commercial and residential parking requirements and to look at adaptability over time. A non-binary approach regarding residential and commercial parking may be acceptable.
- Long term, the applicant has identified the former GSAB site to alleviate some of the precinct-level concerns.
- The lack of parking provided at other recent projects in the neighbourhood has created an unmet demand (Alumni, AMS Student Nest). Site D is burdened with far more regulatory parking requirements than neighbouring buildings due to the regulations in the Development Handbook that don't apply to academic buildings. Parking allocation can be adapted once we get more data from parking demand studies.
- At a minimum, the project should attempt to be parking neutral.
- Adaptability is required to ensure we are meeting the need of commercial demand over time. A Site D parking adaptability plan to propose short-term and long-term solutions for the building should be completed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

Parking Study:

- A study to determine what is needed at the precinct level and to fine-tune the existing parking situation has been initiated by Campus and Community Planning who will report back to the Board once the study has been completed. The Consultant will be asked to formulate both an interim and long-term parking strategy for the precinct.

Stage 2 Bicycle Parking:

- Applicants will work with Campus and Community Planning staff to find additional Stage 2 bike storage nearby. The applicant has stated they will take a precinct-level approach when allocating additional bicycle parking. However, it was noted by the Board that pedestrian flows around MacInnes Field should be a consideration when locating the additional bicycle racks.

MacInnes Field:

- In response to questions from the Board, the current plans for MacInnes Field were shared. An artificial turf field with distinct edge conditions is planned. A permanent barrier on the west side would force pedestrian flow around the field and prevent crossings. The field can be divided into three smaller fields if required.

Amenity Room and Outdoor Balcony: A typical unit appears to have been converted to an amenity space on the north side of the building. Are wall treatments and design solutions in place to mitigate noise transmission to nearby units?

- Applicant has confirmed an acoustical engineer will join the project and review all Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings in the building.
- Landscaping on balcony provides additional privacy barrier.

CRUs: Type of CRUs intended for this building.

- Larger restaurant on west side, commercial services in the middle and smaller food services on the east side to animate building, walkway and paths.

Interior Design Guidelines: Bath tub in master bedroom or living area? The preference in the condo market is for a shower in master suite and a bath tub in common area.

- Applicant to review satisfaction of current bathroom design with Kathy Barr, to see if existing tenants are satisfied.
- Interior Design guidelines are best reviewed during pre-application meetings to ensure feedback is funneled to designer early. For faculty and staff housing, it is important for the Housing and Relocation Services team to be consulted. Interested parties are asked to forward interior design feedback directly to Karen Russell, Manager, Development Services.

Juliette Balconies: Have you included Juliette balconies in the micro suites?

- Juliette balconies have not been included in the micro suites.

Junior 2 Bedroom: What is a JR2 Bedroom?

- One-bedroom and den units in the building have been modified into a junior two-bedroom to provide two small bedrooms to meet demand for students looking to share, as well as small families.

Sequence of Development: Please confirm the sequence of development and whether demolition of the Aquatic Centre and construction of MacInnes Field will impact future occupants of Site D.

- Ideally demolition of the Aquatic Centre/construction of MacInnes Field will run concurrent with Site D construction to mitigate construction impacts to future residents of Site D.

Stormwater Management: Describe the Storm Water Management strategy for this project.

- A precinct-wide strategy is required for this site. A series of precinct-wide interventions have been implemented over the last couple years.

Mix of micro and larger units: What surveys have been done regarding for future demand?

- Property managers have been key to figuring out the right mix. Students are expected to be the predominate tenant in the building. It is a similar mix to what we have in the Site B building.

Noise/Proximity to AMS Student Nest:

- Design team was careful with the percentage of glazing on west elevation of the building. It has been minimized.
- Lease language, similar to Site B, will be in place, advising of the potential noise impacts in the neighbourhood due to its central location close to student activity areas.

- Details will be explored during the Building Permit stage to minimize impact. Noise abatement will meet industry standards.
- Acoustic performance can be included as a condition on the development permit, and will meet industry standard for residences near active uses.

The following motion for Site D in University Boulevard Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director of Planning issues a Development Permit for the 6-storey mixed use non-market rental residential and commercial development on Site D in the University Boulevard neighbourhood comprising 90 residential units and five (5) at grade commercial units as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by GBL Architects and PFS Studio (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project to permit the number of required on-site parking stalls for people with disabilities to be reduced from a minimum of 9 to 4;**
- 2. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the required number of on-site visitor parking stalls serving the residential units from 9 to 2;**
- 3. That Section 7.6 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the required number of on-site Class II bicycle spaces for the residential units from 41 to a minimum of 8, contingent upon the applicants working with staff to identify more spaces to locate racks on site and/or in the vicinity, taking into consideration the anticipated pedestrian flows around MacInnes Field, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Transportation Engineer prior to Development Permit issuance;**
- 4. That Section 7.6 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the required number of Class II bicycle spaces for the commercial units from 20 to 0, contingent upon the applicants working with staff to identify more spaces to locate racks on site and/or in the vicinity prior to Development Permit issuance; and**
- 5. That Section 7.6 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to permit a portion of the Class 1 bicycle spaces to be reduced in length from 1.8m to 1.2m to allow for vertically mounted racks.**
- 6. That details on the landscape plans related to plantings, street furnishings, parking/loading layby and bicycle rack allocations be resolved to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.**
- 7. That the Development Permit will be issued subject to the acoustic performance of residential units meeting industry standards for residences close to active uses, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.**

The project was Moved, Seconded, and passed unanimously. (5-0)

4.0 Business Arising

4.1 *Report on REAP Credits*

Ralph Wells of UBC Sustainability summarized the findings of a review conducted, at the request of the Board, on the uptake of credits applied for under REAP Version 2.1 and Version 3.0. The credits were summarized at the category level and it was found that the

uptake of credits on both versions is good, however, the findings for REAP Version 3.0 should be treated as preliminary due to the relatively small sample size.

This work has proven to be a useful exercise for identifying credits that consistently are not selected. These will be monitored and considered for revision or elimination during future updates of the REAP program. The evaluation of REAP 3.0 credits will be updated as more projects are completed and submitted. Staff will take a closer look at the "Reuse Building Materials" credit which may be more popular once REAP is applied to renovation projects in the future. The community car sharing credit is underused due to good neighbourhood car share opportunities.

An invitation was extended to the Sustainability staff to return to the Board with a larger sample size once additional projects have been completed and submitted.

The following Business Arising motion was Moved, Seconded, and Carried.

That the Development Permit Board request that staff complete parking studies underway and bring forward to the Board recommendations and resolutions to adequately address both interim and long-term parking needs at the precinct level. The results of the Parking Study on University Boulevard will be presented to the Board at a future meeting.

The motion was Moved, Seconded, and passed unanimously. (5-0)

5.0 DP Board Information Reports

5.1 *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. There were no questions.

6.0 Other Business

7.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq