



# UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

## Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, August 8, 2018  
**Time:** 5:00 – 6:10 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  
**Members absent:** Michael White (ex-officio)  
**Staff:** Grant Miller and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning  
**Guests:** Approx. 4 Guests/Observers  
**Presenters:** Nathan Ma, UBC Properties Trust  
Patrick Cotter, ZGF Architects Inc.  
Robert Barnes, Perry and Associates

### 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 May 9, 2018 meeting.

The Minutes from the May 9, 2018 meeting were adopted with one minor revision.

### 3.0 Development Permit Applications

#### **DP18028: Wesbrook Place Lot 4 – Faculty/Staff Rental Residential**

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the residential project, comprising 136 units in two interconnected 6-storey mid-rise buildings. The context for Lot 4 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood and an overview of the policy documents that guided this development were presented (Land Use Plan, Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan, and Development Handbook). Major themes of the public consultation and advisory body comments were summarized and the variances requested on this project were introduced.

Project Architect, Patrick Cotter, of ZGF Architects Inc., presented the architectural plans and introduced the rest of the applicant team including Robert Barnes, Perry and Associates, who presented the landscape design.

The project was praised for the large south facing courtyard, providing ample additional bicycle parking, and the upper floor setbacks on the east wing. The following comments were provided by Board members:

**Clarification on how the housing mix was derived:**

- In light of some of the public comments regarding the need for larger units for family housing, what are the constraints for building more family housing in the neighbourhood? How do you come up with the unit mix?
  - It is based on our experience with the portfolio and the results of a recently completed unit mix survey with faculty/staff who are currently on the wait list for rental housing.
  - There was a high demand for studio/smaller units in the recently completed Cypress and Pine development.

**Has the proportion of larger units in the unit mix increased over time?**

- Over the long term, the ratio of larger unit to small units has increased but there is a balance act between demand and affordability.

**Consider providing a canopy for the Class II Bicycle Parking close to the main entrance.**

**Will the units with larger patios on Level 4 be charged the same rent?**

- Rents will differ based on the size of the patio provided.

**Clarify what the bicycle locker/storage units will be used for. There is never enough storage.**

- We have kept it flexible for now as we won't know the demand until the building is finished. Bike count and storage area will fluctuate based on the demand for storage from 2 bedrooms units and up.

**Is there a potential for ramp access for strollers and wheelchairs from Scholar's Greenway/Mundell Park? This appears to be a lost opportunity.**

- There is a couple of metres grade change so a ramp would not work in this location. There is a bicycle parking entrance at grade. That is part of the reason we provided an accessible elevator connection to the greenway through the bicycle parking area.

**Architectural Massing. The east wing is successful with the stepping of upper units to fit the context. The west wing does not feel very residential and will be blasted with direct sunlight with no overhang. Did the Design Panel have any comments?**

- AUDP design comments recommended making a strong corner and to respond to the termination of the axial view. The building has been stepped up or down to meet neighbouring building context and the anticipated tower form. We played with the size of the punched windows to reduce the amount of light on the west side. There is a modulation between floors to subdue the impact.
- There was more articulation in the original design and we were encouraged to lessen the impact on the massing, to subdue it, and keep it more consistent.

### **Bike Workshop Aesthetics**

- Will plantings block the view into the bike room at night? Improve the aesthetic for everyone walking by the workshop.
  - There are clerestory windows in the bike room to allow natural light in and to limit sightlines into the room. The planting will cover the foundation walls below the windows.

### **Residential and Visitor Parking Allocations**

- Visitor parking is a desirable commodity as on street parking will become scarce over time as the neighbourhood develops. Prioritize visitor parking at the expense of the additional bicycle parking/storage space. Are there metrics that back up the proposed numbers? Recommend adding more visitor parking and free up space on the street for car share.
  - Based on the recent survey in-building parking is still important however society is on the cusp of a change to shared mobility. The planning for the upcoming Stadium Neighbourhood is suggesting far reduced parking levels. This building is a good opportunity to test out the parking reduction. Reducing the amount of underground parking provided will also keep units more affordable. The actual monthly fee that could be charged for one parking stall is approximately \$200. Tenants are typically charged \$60 per month but this may be increased in the current project to recoup costs and temper demand for the spaces.
  - Street parking is managed by the UNA. Yearly parking passes are currently available for residents (\$120/year) and visitors. As the neighbourhood fills up this program will evolve over time to prioritize visitor spaces over residential use.
  - Population growth in the neighbourhood and changes to mobility that will happen over the next decade will probably lead to less in-building parking in the long run.

### **Energy Performance**

- Surprised to see Step Code 1 and I encourage you to push the energy performance for the building.
  - We'll be doing the air tightness survey for this project and there is a 6-storey wood frame building coming up that will be a Passive House. REAP 3.1 should be endorsed in the fall and energy performance will be a mandatory credit for the next project.

### **Where is the children's play area?**

- In the adjacent Mundell Park, it's preferred to keep this activity further away from the building to mitigate noise impacts on residents.
- **What is UBC Properties Trust corporate stance on limited roof overhangs in a rainforest?** The overhangs are minimal on this project. If you don't have an overhang on the building it could become a maintenance issue in the future leading to increased life cycle costs over time.
  - Traditionally we've provided overhangs on most buildings but effort has been made here to ensure that all of the doors and access points to the exterior deck area are inset and there are additional projecting elements over all of these areas. The treatment of the punched windows on the upper floors is not different than the 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> floors. We will work carefully when detailing the building envelope to maximize protection.

## Chair Summary

The Board approves the application with the conditions noted in the report adding the following considerations for follow up with staff:

- Provide some covered bicycle parking.
- Encourage as much storage and flexibility of storage as necessary.
- Improve access from Scholars Way/Mundell Park to the courtyard for strollers and wheeled items. It was recognized that a ramp might not meet building code requirements but even a steeper ramp would be an asset to the development.
- Encourage multi-generational utilization of the courtyard to include use by younger and older kids/teenagers
- Concerns on Development Permit Boards in the region that there is not enough parking. Big notice from the development permit board that we are concerned about the adequacy of parking for both tenants and visitors. While approving the parking provision in this application, the Development Permit Board expressed concerns about the significantly reduced parking for both visitors and residents and the longer term impact on the Wesbrook Neighbourhood.
- The bike activity room is a recreational amenity whose use should be encouraged. Ensure that overlook into it by adjacent developments is mitigated by adding landscape treatment and/or ensuring the lighting in the bike room does not negatively impact adjacent developments.
- Roof overhangs are strongly recommended to enhance the long term weather-ability and to reduce life cycle costs over time.

Grant Miller shared his participation at the regional level with the Metro Parking Study. Wesbrook Place was included in this study. Preliminary findings in the study show Wesbrook Place was not relatively stressed in terms of the availability of street parking or underground parking. Grant will share these preliminary findings with the Board at a later date.

The following motion for Lot 4 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

**That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director of Planning, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the faculty/staff rental residential development on Lot 4 in Wesbrook Place. The project comprises 136 apartment units in two interconnected 6 storey mid-rise buildings as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by ZGF Architects Inc. (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the required number of visitor parking stalls from 14 to 7 and the required number of parking stalls for people with disabilities from 14 to 7.**
- 2. That Section 7.6 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the number of required on-site Class II bicycle racks from 68 to 58.**

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

#### 4.0 DP Board Information Items

##### *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.

#### 5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:10 pm  
Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq