



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes  
2003



## Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Thursday, February 20, 2003

**Time:** 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:**

**Harold Kalke**, Chair

**Jim Taylor**

**David Barnes**

**Dr. Michael Goldberg**

**Al Poettcker**

**Fred Pritchard**

**Others in Attendance:**

**Judy McLeod**, Campus & Community Planning

**Mark Anderson**, Carey College project manager (Applicant)

**Walter Francl**, Walter Francl Architects Ltd. (Architect)

**Paul Whitehead**, Diamond Sharpe Landscape Architects (Landscape Architect)

---

#### 1.0 Call to order by Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm and introduced each of the Committee members. He clarified the mandate of the Development Permit Board and its objective to improve the physical environment at UBC on a continuous basis towards the goal of a campus unsurpassed in the quality of its attributes.

The Chair then introduced the first item on the agenda.

#### 2.0 Carey College Townhouses – DA 02033

Judy McLeod introduced the Development Permit application for a 2 ½ storey, 24 unit townhouse proposal by Carey College on Wesbrook Mall in the Theological Neighbourhood. The Carey College architect, Walter Francl, the Carey College Representative, Mark Anderson, and Paul Whitehead of Sharpe Diamond Landscape Architects were introduced prior to presentation of the project. Judy McLeod informed the Board that the project has been reviewed internally by UBC staff, the Development Review Committee, the Advisory Urban Design Panel, and presented to the community at a Public Open House January 23, 2003 where no concerns or objections were raised. Staff recommended approval of the Development Permit for this project.

Judy McLeod advised the Board that the Development Permit could be issued subject to granting of a variance to the Development Handbook definition of “*story, half*” to permit the habitable space of the top floor to be 60 percent of the floor below, on the condition that the building not exceed the building envelope limits set out in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Development Handbook. The proposed project meets all other requirements.

Walter Francl presented the plan for a 24 unit, 19,521 square foot, 2 ½ storey Townhouse Building primarily for students, faculty and staff, but also for market users. The proposed building would be located south of the existing Carey Hall facing Wesbrook Mall.

*Board member questions and responses:*

Q: Will some of the units be market rental housing or affordable housing?

A: Some of the units would have this designation. The pricing projections (\$1.50/sq ft./month) are based on those in St. Andrew's dormitories so that these units are considered affordable housing.

Q: With reference to design guidelines for the Theological Neighbourhood in the CCP and the Neighbourhood Plan, why have the proposed materials for the building been selected?

A: The AUDP had pointed them to the Iona Building, which is masonry material, as an icon for development in this precinct. Granite appears around entry staircases and walls, but is costly and could not be used for the entire building. Grey brick with the same tones as granite is proposed for the primary wall surfaces. A metal roof was selected because it also appears on the Iona Building and it is a sustainable material. Cedar planks from the on-site dorms that were demolished were saved to utilize in the vaulted ceilings on the upper floors. Painted concrete will only appear on the walls to the parkade.

Q: How have community concerns about the siting of the building in relation to the street been addressed?

A: The buildings were set back a further 12 to 15 feet after the May 2000 public meeting regarding dormitory demolition.

Q: What improvements to Military Road would be undertaken in the provision of access to the underground parking?

A: Mark Anderson responded that the townhouse driveway location would allow Military Road at grade with bollards to remain where it now terminates and that extension of the road is not necessary for this project. Landscaping as part of the Jewish Garden and play area will be undertaken. Portion of the existing stand of trees closest to the lane will remain.

Q: How does the project respond to what exists in the UEL? The fenestration and roof materials do not appear to convey a residential character to connect the project to housing in the adjacent UEL.

A: The intent was to create a transition in character to reflect use from the Iona Building, to the Multi-Use Building, to the Townhouse Building, then to the residential use of the UEL neighbourhood.

Q: Will there be adequate parking and underground storage?

A: The policy of a maximum of two parking stalls per unit has been met and 33 stalls would be provided. There is underground bicycle storage for 48 bikes as well as storage area for other goods under stairwells within the units.

Q: Will the building meet LEEDS certification standards?

A: The townhouse building has been assessed and would meet all requirements; however, he has not been instructed by the client to make this designation official.

Q: Will the building height be within the 35-foot requirement?

A: Yes, it was below the height standard by 6-7 feet. The maximum building height was set in conjunction with the UEL as part of the CCP and NP and the plans are consistent.

Q: Why is the density 0.6 FSR when 1.2 is allowed? Campus space is such a precious commodity.

A: The density was largely driven by design.

Q: Can you please speak to the following livability issues: (1) personal security in the parkade, (2) mitigation measures for acoustics, and (3) management of exterior light pollution?

A: CPTED principles had been applied to landscaping and parkade design. The wall thickness meets standards for acoustic concerns. Exterior lighting is intended to be controlled so as not to spill into the adjacent neighbourhood.

Q: Will the timing of construction be appropriate for the linked servicing of the Townhouses to the Multi-Use Building?

A: The intent is to build both projects simultaneously.

*Public questions and responses:*

Q: The corner location of this site makes it significant in terms of creating a first impression for the area. Are the proposed materials for this rental housing project sustainable to ensure that the building continues to fit the residential character of the neighbourhood of its surroundings far into the future?

A: Selection of materials has considered durability as well as fit.

Q: Are there plans for a buffer between cars and pedestrians on the sidewalk in this area? Will Wesbrook become an arterial?

A: The road design meets all necessary standards, but can be revisited by UBC. Road designations are addressed in the OCP and this preserves the existing collector designation.

*The Board then considered a letter from a UEL Resident who could not be in attendance.*

The Board considered a motion to approve the Development Permit application for this project subject to additional conditions.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit for the proposed Carey Theological College Townhouse Building be issued subject to the following conditions:

- a) That a variance to the Development Handbook definition of *storey, half* be granted to permit the habitable space to be increased from 50% to 60% of the habitable space of the floor below, on the condition that the building not exceed the building envelope limits set out in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Development Handbook.
- b) Staff being satisfied that the roof material is consistent with the Iona Building.
- c) That there be no exterior painted concrete.
- d) That windows be enhanced to increase the residential character.

In addition, the Board directed Staff to explore the feasibility of changes to the width and location of sidewalks along Wesbrook Mall.

### **3.0 Carey College Multi-Use Building – DA 03032**

Judy McLeod introduced the Development Permit application for a 44,416 square foot, 5 storey Multi-Use Building for students, faculty and staff and for other university users. The proposed building would be located west of the existing Carey Hall facing Iona Drive. Judy McLeod informed the Board that the project has been reviewed internally by UBC staff, the Development Review Committee, the Advisory Urban Design Panel, and presented to the community at a Public Open House January 23, 2003 where no concerns or objections were raised. Staff recommended approval of the Development Permit for this project.

Walter Francl presented the plans for the new Multi-Use Building meant to replace and enhance a number of the programs the college has historically provided for its students, faculty and staff. The new facility will become the primary academic building for the educational program as well as containing dormitory rooms and 6 apartment units.

*Board member questions and responses:*

Q: Has there been a coordinating effort between the five land tenures in the area to coordinate design of development?

A: Design guidelines have been created in a coordinated effort between all four of the Colleges here and UBC. Discussions with the neighbouring Colleges are ongoing to connect the sites and respect significant views. Features in the public realm such as lighting and street furniture are being dealt with through a separate process by the same landscape architecture design team.

Q: Why had they not gone to the maximum amount for parking? The concern is that campus parking problems might spill over to the adjacent neighbourhood.

A: They introduced as many stalls as they could achieve at one level underground and have 11 stalls on the surface, which provides a number within policy guidelines.

Q: What drove the location of the entrance to the parkade?

A: A desire to preserve trees along Iona and to avoid presenting a parking entrance along the roadway.

*Jim Taylor left the meeting at 6:45 pm.*

Q: Will the building meet LEEDS certification requirements?

A: Yes.

Q: Will the housing units be furnished?

A: All units will be furnished except the apartments on the top floor.

Q: What is the justification for the present layout of the studio dormitories?

A: The orientation of the bathroom in the studio units was chosen to address accessibility issues, but this can be revisited.

Q: Why does the site utilize only 20% of the allowable density?

A: The density of the building is taken up mostly by institutional use and was constrained by the height envelope.

The Board considered a motion to approve the Development Permit application for this project subject to additional conditions.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit for the proposed Carey Theological College Multi-Use Building be issued subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Staff being satisfied that the character of the building is consistent with that of the Theological Neighbourhood area.
- 2) That roof materials and detailing be consistent with the Iona Building.

**Action:** Judy McLeod to schedule subsequent meetings for the third Thursday of every month. Follow-up by staff required.

*The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 pm.*



## Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, April 16, 2003

**Time:** 5:00 – 8:30p.m.

**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke, Chair  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
Fred Pritchard

**Regrets:** David Barnes  
Michael Goldberg

**Presenters & Staff:** Judy McLeod, Campus & Community Planning  
Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Recording Secretary  
Thomas Llewelin, University Architect/Landscape Architect  
Geoff Atkins, Associate VP, Land & Building Services  
Terry Sumner, VP Administration & Finance  
John O'Donnell, Ledingham McAllister  
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill & Associates Architects  
Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill & Associates Architects  
Brian Hemingway, Architect  
Andre Chilcott, Polygon Developments Ltd.  
Joe Frye, Phillips, Fareyaag Smallenberg Landscape Architects  
Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect  
Tom Miller, Intracorp Developments Ltd.  
Bud Philips, VST Properties Management Corp.  
Martin Bruckner, Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects  
Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects  
Jim Hancock, Hancock Bruckner Eng & Wright Architects

***Seven members of the campus and greater community were in attendance and signed in.***

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting of February 20, 2003 were approved.

#### **1.0 DA 03006 Mid Campus Lot 7 Townhouses**

Judy McLeod introduced the project. The project has been reviewed internally by UBC staff, by the Advisory Urban Design Panel. Staff recommends approval of the project subject to confirmation of no net loss in the total amount of Usable Neighbourhood Open Space and a variance to the Development Handbook to allow for stairs that project into required front yards.

John O'Donnell told about history of his firm. He described the purchasing profile for this project as those wanting to downsize from Vancouver's west side. Rental suites were designed with UBC faculty and staff in mind.

Keith Hemphill described the project and presented the site plan, renderings and elevations.

*Board member questions and applicant responses:*

Q: The secondary suites and ground orientation successfully meet OCP guidelines. Can the secondary suites work as part of the main unit?

A: Yes, they can be incorporated into a single residence.

Q: Can you please elaborate on the character of the stairs, including materials, in relation to the street?

A: The approach is a very urban design to enhance the entrance to the streets from West Mall. Ashlar cut granite stone will be used, which reflects a University character and is the same as what is used throughout the adjacent park.

Q: The stone archway to the southeast has to be moved. Will the developer be doing this?

A: Yes. Visual image, safety and accommodating the width of the driveway are the concerns and the developer is to incur the cost. Staging of construction will be such that rebuilding considers continued use of the public open space.

Q: The Advisory Urban Design Panel commented that the UBC Planning Principles are not wholly followed, particularly in terms of creating a unique place. Please respond.

A: The planning guidelines received included the OCP and Mid Campus Plan. The ground lease asks for a traditional form of architecture. There are no design guidelines for the neighbourhood. The debate concerned interpretation of the word 'innovative.' We have tried to achieve a more distinct form like what is in the west side of Vancouver, more appropriate to UBC.

Q: The panel agrees that it is compatible with its location and adjacent uses. What is being done to achieve sustainability beyond the student rental suites?

A: An underground parking garage was avoided. The Committee was referred to Appendix 1 of the Staff report where there is a list of green design guidelines that are met.

Q: Will the townhouses be gated and what is being done to simplify wayfinding? The Committee reminds the applicant of the need for clear signage at UBC and the wayfinding policy.

A: There will be a gate across the access to the centre of the site and its primary function is to prevent the greater public from using the path through the townhouses as a short cut. For wayfinding, each unit will have either a West Mall or 'New Name' street address clearly marked, with signage off the driveway to indicate the back units.

Q: Please explain the integration of the units with the park.

A: The landscaping will provide an urban edge along West Mall, with more organic forms and greater use of native plantings on the eastern edges towards the approach to the park. There will still be clean lines and the vegetation will be layered with variety for seasonal activity.

Q: When would the applicant expect to proceed? Prior to construction, the applicant is instructed to consult with and meet the neighbours in the adjacent development, to be arranged by Jim Taylor.

A: Construction could begin in June. A preliminary construction meeting with the neighbours can be arranged.

Q: The durability and quality of construction reflects on the University itself. Does the applicant have envelope failure coverage?

A: This is required under the Home Protection Act and a building envelope specialist has been retained.

*Public questions and responses:*

Q: How big are the units? Will there be carpeting in the dining areas?

A: The units average 2,500 sq. ft. Formal dining areas have carpet; however the kitchen nooks have readily cleanable floor surfaces.

Q: Is there a conflict of interest because the President and CEO of UBC Properties Trust sits on the Committee?

A: This is the only Committee that he sits on. The Terms of Reference for this Committee are set by the Board of Governors who appoints the members. The Board follows the conventions set by municipalities of having staff sit on such a committee, with the exception that UBC also invites outside participants. The DPB is essentially an extension of the Staff that focuses on pragmatic, technical aspects of proposed projects.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit be issued for the 28-unit townhouse proposal by Ledingham McAllister subject to the following conditions:

- a) Confirmation of an easement over Lot 8 to the east, to ensure that the 44 sq metres of park space lost on Lot 7 in the reconfiguration of the driveway entrance will be provided on Lot 8, and there will be no net loss in the total amount of Usable Open Space as a result of this proposal.
- b) That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for stairs that project 2.13 m into the required front yards, whereas the Development Handbook states that projections should not exceed 0.8 m into required yards more than 2.1 m (Policy 7.3).
- c) An agreement with the developer being reached regarding completion of work phasing and completion prior to occupancy of the units.

The applicant was also asked to meet with neighbouring residents prior to the beginning of construction.

**2.0 DA 03007 Maquinna Pointe**

Judy McLeod introduced the proposal for an 18-storey, 95-unit apartment building, which will be the only high rise in Mid Campus. The project has been reviewed internally by UBC staff, and by the Advisory Urban Design Panel. The public has access to the project on the website the applicant presented the proposal to a meeting of Friends of the Garden on April 9, 2003. Staff recommends approval of the project without variances.

Andre Chilcott introduced the special team that worked on the proposal. This is a unique site on which they felt fortunate to design.

Brian Hemingway spoke to the significance of the site in terms of its spectacular northwest setting and amenities that include Rhododendron Wood to the east, a 360 –degree view and the neighbouring Botanical Gardens. The opportunity on this site is akin to designing on Park Avenue across from Central Park in New York. The metaphor that was used is that of a lantern in a garden as a landmark and a beacon. The siting and massing was chosen with respect to sun, views and approach to the site. The building is primarily glass, with glazing and 8 foot



balconies to address solar heat gain. The ground plane responds to the context with granite and trellising. The landscaping reflects the west coast environment.

Judy McLeod explained that the property to the north is designated for townhouses. Al Poettcker said that these densities are set out in the OCP, CCP and NP documents.

*Board member questions and applicant responses:*

Q: Please describe the relationship between the site and Rhododendron Wood.

A: There is a pathway connection and careful edge treatment to integrate with the forested area. The path here is to connect with the Mainway that runs from the Rose Garden, to the Stadium and through to Pacific Spirit Park. The path connection from this site is gated with trellis to respond to interior trellising and prevent the greater public from traversing the site as a short cut. The landscaping along this edge will include bamboo groves and flowering trees and small retaining walls.

Q: With reference to the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan, how is tree retention being handled?

A: There are no trees on the site at this time, as this is a site of a former parking lot. Arborists were retained to consult the applicant with regard to the proximity of the underground parkade to Rhododendron Wood and there is no conflict with this use.

Q: With reference to Section 3.4.4(d) of the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan that addresses building style and architecture, there is the feeling that this building is not a UBC building in terms of its glassiness, right down to the base. Please respond, giving attention to the view of the non-resident from the sidewalk and road.

A: The applicant disagrees. The intent is to project the vocabulary of a tower, as prescribed. This form was chosen because of its cleanliness. The glass planes are not driven to the ground. Rather, there is extensive use of other materials to provide a rich ground plane. The view from the street and from passersby will be of a tower set in and projecting above a stand of trees. There are a number of glassy buildings on campus and, over time, this building will help to consolidate them.

Comment: High rises invoke a lot of passion. More high rises would have been preferred; however the OCP has set out the limits. The previous comments are respected in terms of the contrast with the adjacent neighbourhood. The AUDP saw this project as an innovative solution. The proposal seems to have met the requirements in terms of massing and choice of materials.

Comment: The building successfully addresses UBC planning principles in a number of ways. Density and height were requirements of the proponents for the site. This building will add incrementally to the University. The setback from the street will take advantage of the forest creatively. The use of glass is a sensitive approach that will reflect the changing nature of the sky. There will be less impact on the adjacent uses than a solid face building.

Comment: All new buildings should be leading edge in design and sustainability. The question is whether this building is a worthy addition to campus that lives up to global standards.

Q: How is sustainability dealt with, and in particular, stormwater treatment?

A: The Board is referred to the green building appendix of the Board report.

*Public questions and responses:*

Q: How many units are there per floor? What is the square footage? What is the average cost?

A: There are about six units per floor. The units are approximately 1,000 – 1,600 sq. ft. The exact cost cannot be set at the DP stage; however, they will probably be greater than \$200,000.

Q: Are the balconies faced with glass? The concern is interference with the flight paths of birds.

A: There are many intermediate pieces and varying depths so that the face will have much more variation than just a pane of glass.

Q: What is the lifespan of the building?

A: Current building technology is functionally operative, with maintenance, for about 200 years.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit be issued for the proposed Maquinna Pointe Development, subject to:

a) The applicant contacting Jim Taylor to coordinate a meeting with the residents adjacent to the site prior to construction.

**3.0 DA 03010 Theological Lots 14-20 Residential Development**

Judy McLeod introduced the proposal for 55 units of market housing, which will be the first residential building on the VST properties. The proposal responds to the OCP and the NP, particularly in terms of transition from UEL residences to the Iona Building. The public has been consulted on this project through a public open house that was advertised via the Internet, a mail-drop to all UEL residents, advertisements in the Vancouver Courier and the Ubysey and a Public Open house on April 7. Staff has reviewed this project and are confident that easement requirements will be met through the strata plan. Several variances are being sought that concern parking space dimensions; however, Staff recommends approval of the project.

Tom Miller introduced the design team for the proposal, which will include 49 apartment units and 6 duplexes. They expect to begin excavation in July and anticipate a 15-month build out.

Doug Ramsay presented the plans. A living street, or woonerf, will connect the duplexes fronting onto Chancellor with the amply terraced apartments immediately south. There are urban edges at grade on the north and east edges. As per the OCP, 40% of the units are ground-accessed and some have two storeys. Parking for residents is underground. Use of granite is intended to respond to the character of the Iona Building, while the massing and materials of the duplexes respond to the residences in the UEL.

Q: Why are cars being allowed in the lane (woonerf)?

A: They will be on private property and are intended as short term and visitor parking for residents in the duplexes. There will not be many cars. The intent is to create a single-family, drive-up feel.

Related Comments:

- This type of parking will not be enforceable because it is on private property where Campus Parking and RCMP cannot control it.
- There should be no resident parking at grade. Can visitor parking be marked?
- There is no visitor parking underground. There are six required visitor spaces and they are in the mews.
- This is a poor solution because it cannot be policed.
- It was intended to have parking stalls at grade, which is a unique solution to reducing traffic. The proposal has been designed to the maximum number of spaces allowed; the visitor spaces at grade do not exceed parking requirements, but rather meet the requirements in combination with those underground.

- One Board member endorses the notion of visitor parking at street level, which is only six spaces. One way to address the concerns raised is not to allow overnight parking. This was effectively used at Hampton Place to ensure the visitor spaces are for the benefit of the complex.

Q: How does the middle duplex tie into the character of the Theological precinct?

A: The design ties into the strong roof forms and brings this down to the street level, while providing variation along the northern edge. These units marry the character and form of the duplexes to the more modern apartment building. They relate to the newer, more modern UEL homes, while tying into the traditional.

Q: Why is a variance being sought for the driveway width?

A: The sizes are equal to those used in most municipalities, including Vancouver and Richmond. The Development Handbook requirements are much wider based on the general public parking in the parkade, whereas this will only be used by residents who will be familiar with the space.

Comments: The Development Handbook is being revised now that we have some experience in working with it.

Q: This is the first project along Chancellor, and Theological Mews will extend east-west through subsequent projects. What is being done to ensure that the mews will be rationalized along its length for consistency? Will there be parking all along the mews?

A: Kim Perry Landscape Architects have been retained by the Theological precinct to ensure a standard of uniformity. The themes need to be the same and surfacing materials and lighting will be consistent throughout the length. It is not intended for each project to be identical, but that the materials, landscaping, lighting and other features be consistent.

Q: What is the roof material on the duplexes?

A: Metal on the middle units, and cedar shingle on the outer units. The materials were changed in reaction to the AUDP request for increased variation of the townhouses on each end through the use of materials and windows. Shingles cannot be used on the middle duplex units because of the low roof pitch.

Q: Why is there a predominant use of exposed concrete? Has brick been considered? The precinct is to portray a religious overtone, while concrete is more institutional.

A: The concrete will have the same texture and colour so as to mimic and be complimentary to granite. The OCP requires flat roofs and terraces. This material will give a sense of permanence and ensure durability. There is a special method used by tradesmen to achieve this look of the concrete and it is not cheaper than using brick. The building envelope was a main concern.

Q: Can the applicant please explain the height limits of the townhouses?

A: The envelopes and height limits as set out in the NP and according to UEL recommendations have been met.

Q: Has an attempt been made to meet with the neighbours prior to construction?

A: A mail-drop to all UEL residents giving notification of the proposal and inviting them to a public open house has been completed. There were eight people that came out and met with the design team and staff.

General Comments:

- The parking issue at grade must be resolved. How do we wisely use the street for visitor parking? The street parking provisions are part of the NP and set by the GVRD.
- Theology Mall is a public street and will either have metered or permitted parking.
- UBC is empowered to manage the roads and does not want visitors to park across the street in the UEL. A policy for parking management is needed.

- All of the proponents of projects in the Theological precinct have met extensively around the issue of consistency of design within the neighbourhood. There has been unanimous approval in the Theological precinct for this project.
- The maximum building envelopes as shown will probably not be filled. In the future, the building footprints should be indicated as building envelope maximums with consideration to density provisions and preserving the view corridors for future developments.

*There were no questions from the public present.*

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit be issued for the proposed Theological Lots 14-20 residential development, subject to:

- a) That prior to the issuance of the development permit it be confirmed by the applicant that all required easements on this property will be implemented through the strata plan including those for the following:
  - i. Sanitary sewer easement to run parallel to Chancellor Boulevard within Lots 14 to 19.
  - ii. B.C. Hydro easement including accommodation for Telus and IT Services to run parallel to Chancellor Boulevard just south of the above mentioned sanitary sewer easement.
  - iii. Easement along lane south of Chancellor townhouses for handicapped access to the VST Chapel.
  - iv. Easements on Theology Mall and Iona Drive frontages for sidewalks and streetlights.
  - v. Easement along west property line of Lot 20 adjacent to VST Building for Chancellor Building drainage system.
  
- b) That variances be granted to:
  - i. Reduce the width of aisles serving the underground parking spaces to 6.60 metres whereas the Development Handbook requires an aisle width of 7.5 metres for 90 degree parking.
  - ii. And to reduce the length of designated small car parking spaces to 4.57 metres whereas the Development Handbook requires a length of 4.6 metres for small car spaces.
  - iii. And to reduce the width of parking spaces to 2.5 metres whereas the Development Handbook requires a width of 2.6 metres.
  - iv. And to reduce the length of standard parking spaces to 5.45 metres whereas the Development Handbook requires a length of 5.5 metres.
  
- d) The Staff providing direction to the Applicant with rationalization of the urban design of the Mews and Theology Mall (sidewalks, boulevards, landscaping, lighting, and hard surfaces for the Mews) as well as the pedestrian linkages between these buildings and other areas within and surrounding this precinct.
  
- e) Confirmation that parking provided in this project, including surface parking, does not exceed the limits set out in the OCP.
  
- f) Both the apartment building and the duplexes being reviewed in the context of the OCP, CCP and the Neighbourhood Plan, with specific reference to "design", including height, character and materials.

**Action:** Staff to inform other Development Permit applicants that the Development Handbook standards for parking aisle widths is being reviewed.

#### **4.0 DA 02032/03033 Carey Theological Multi-Purpose Building & Townhouses**

Judy McLeod explained the changes to the materials that were revisited after the previous meeting of the Board. The metal roofing on the Multi-Use Building will be changed to mid gray asphalt shingles to provide a more residential character, there will be no exterior painted concrete on either project, and the windows of the townhouses will be finished in a light wood tone. The Board is referred to the photographs and renderings provided by the applicant.

The Board received a staff report on this matter for information.

*The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.*



## Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, May 21, 2003

**Time:** 5:00 – 7 p.m.

**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Maple Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke, Chair  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
Fred Pritchard  
Michael Goldberg

**Regrets:** David Barnes

**Presenters & Staff:** Judy McLeod, Campus & Community Planning  
Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Recording Secretary  
Thomas Llewellyn, University Architect/Landscape Architect  
Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust  
Dale Staples, Architect, Integra Architecture Inc.  
Michael Patteson, Landscape Architect, Kim Perry and Associates

***No members of the campus and greater community were in attendance.***

---

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting of February 20, 2003 were reviewed. The Board asked Staff whether Intracorp had addressed the issue of the mews for visitor parking. Judy McLeod confirmed that visitor parking would be elsewhere and that Intracorp will be submitting a written explanation of all parking on this site.

The Chair explained that only agenda item number one would be reviewed at this meeting. The second agenda item, as it is for a temporary permit, will be referred back to Campus & Community Planning for issuance of a Development Permit. This part of the session would be replaced by an *in camera* session between the Board and relevant Staff on process issues.

#### **1.0 DA 03009 Mid Campus Lot 4 Faculty and Staff Housing**

Judy McLeod explained to the Board that a second report was necessary for this application as a number of minor variances from the *UBC Development Handbook* were received in the last few days. Planning has reviewed the variances in detail and accepts the rationale for the changes, which the applicant will describe. A Public Information Meeting was held for the project on April 11 and the plans are posted on the Campus & Community Planning website. Planning recommends the project for approval.

Dale Staples described the site layout, context and form of the proposed project. The building aims to achieve a balance between residential character and the institutional nature of its surroundings. The building materials would be brick, hardy-plank and shingle-shingle, with a duroid shingle roof. Dale outlined the variances that are being requested and provided the rationale for each one.

Michael Patteson described the landscape plan for the project. The plantings will be layered so as to increase in height towards the building. Hedging will provide some privacy between units. Brick will be used for retaining walls. There is the potential for adding more street furniture, such as benches.

*Board member questions and applicant responses:*

- Q: Is the amount of height variance being requested equivalent to the slope of the site?
- A: The site slopes 4.88 m (16') from northeast to southwest. The variance from the base plane in absolute numbers seems large; however, the perceived height along the greenway and from the street would not be as significant. Meeting the height restriction is achievable. If the site is lowered, it would impact the liveability of units on the east and north sides because they would be below street level. If a flat roof form were selected, it would be very different in character from the previous phases of faculty and staff housing on adjacent sites.
- Q: Would the building be designed to perform in terms of envelope durability without the variance for projection of eaves?
- A: Yes. The deeper eaves are an additional measure and they add to the residential character of the building.
- Q: What is the special case for this project that makes a variance for the reduction of the width of bike stalls by one-third reasonable? Most bikes have handlebars that are at least 50 cm (20") wide. The University has made a commitment to reducing motor vehicle use and encouraging bicycles. This variance seems contrary to the University's mandate. Can the width be increased so as not to require a variance?
- A: The variance would provide for a larger number of bike stalls and additional locker storage space. The width can be increased to agree with the *Development Handbook*. This would require the number parking stalls to be reduced, or an increase in the size of the underground.
- Q: Do we have existing problems with bike storage space size and allocation in the existing faculty and staff housing?
- A: *[Thomas Llewellyn, UBC resident]* There is an issue with the size of stalls. The bike room in phase one of the staff/faculty housing is always full. If there are varying sizes for stalls, it does not solve the problem because you can't make people with narrower bikes park only in the narrower stalls. *[Fred Pritchard, UBC resident]* The number of bikes per capita in campus housing is very large and increasing. Bicycle parking on campus is well used and currently oversubscribed. There is a need for sufficient and usable bike storage.
- Q: The issue of security in bike and storage rooms for apartments is a serious concern given the experience at Hampton Place and the problem with theft from similar storage systems city-wide. This is a significant issue for the University and a proactive approach should be taken. The University should not accept the status quo when a continuing issue exists. A solution to the problem of security should be generated to set an example. The proposed storage and bike system does not work.
- A: The use of swipe cards and card readers for building entry and access would be used. Changing the hardware in these systems is an option; however, residents find that some aspects of this make it less accessible. A security consultant will be retained for the project.
- Comment:* It was suggested that there be no access to bikes and storage from the underground parkade. Use glass or other durable, transparent materials to increase visibility so that people are not emboldened. Have only a storage elevator with a card reader for access from the main floor.
- Q: Will the character and colour of bricks used be consistent with adjacent buildings?
- A: The intent is for the colour to be slightly different, but the colour and character consistent
- Q: What is the project doing in terms of sustainability?
- A: A list of green building guidelines that are being followed has been submitted. Eight units will operate on a test-basis for heat recovery using the building ventilation system.
- Q: What measures are being taken to enhance air circulation to mitigate solar heat gain?
- A: The Building Code now requires a continuous fan, or fan on a timer, for ventilate moist air from bathrooms. Fresh air vents will also be provided in each unit.
- Q: What has been done to address outdoor social space since the project was last reviewed by the Advisory Urban Design Panel?
- A: A patio has been added at the centre of the landscape scheme on the southwest portion of the site for residents to congregate.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That the Development Permit be issued with the following variances:

- i. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for stairs that project 2.4 m into the required front yards on Thunderbird Boulevard whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that projections should not exceed 0.8 m into required yards.

- ii. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for a balcony and parkade that project 1.85 m into the required yard on the west side whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that projections should not exceed 0.8 m into required yards.
- iii. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for bay windows on all sides that are 5.08 m wide whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that cantilevered projections should not exceed 3.0 m in width.
- iv. That the finished grade along Hawthorn Lane, Thunderbird Boulevard and the greenway may exceed 1.0m in height, whereas the Development Handbook requires that finished grade be less than 1.0 metre higher than base plane.
- v. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for building heights that are 16.88 m on the south elevation, 15.04 m on the east elevation, 18.76 m on the west elevation and 17.34 m on the north elevation, whereas the Development Handbook (Policy MC2) states that the maximum height is not to exceed 14.0 m.
- vi. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for overhangs that project 1.04 m on all sides, whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that such architectural features shall not project more than 0.8 m.
- vii. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for bicycle parking spaces that are 0.4 m in width, whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.6) requires 0.6 m in width.

And, that prior to issuance of a Development Permit, the applicant provides Campus and Community Planning Staff with a satisfactory solution to bicycle storage and lockers, and the security of the overall building.

*The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m. The applicant and guests left the room and an in camera session with the Board and Staff was held.*

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*





## Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, July 2, 2003

**Time:** 5:00 p.m.

**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
Fred Pritchard

**Regrets:** David Barnes  
Michael Goldberg

**Presenters:** Jas Sahota, UBC Properties Trust  
Dale Staples, Architect, Integra Architecture Inc.  
Jan Timmer, Jan H. Timmer Architecture, Ltd.  
Kim Perry, Kim Perry and Associates Inc.  
Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill and Associates  
Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust

**Staff:** Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Joe Stott, Campus & Community Planning  
Thor Kuhlmann, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Campus & Community Planning (Recording Secretary)

**Members of the public:** Bruce Stuart

---

#### **Agenda Item 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair**

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m.

*Agenda Item "2.0 Business Arising" was moved to the end of the meeting.*

#### **Agenda Item 3.0 DA 03019 - Vancouver School of Theology Student Housing Building**

*On March 27, 2003 Vancouver School of Theology Properties Trust submitted an application to develop a 38 unit four-storey Student Housing Apartment Building for the Vancouver School of Theology southwest of the Iona Building, 6012 Iona Drive.*

Jim Carruthers introduced the design team presenters: Jan Timmer, Architect of Jan H. Timmer Architecture, Ltd. and Kim Perry, Landscape Architect, R. Kim Perry & Associates Inc. Jan Timmer referred to the overall concept plan for the Vancouver School of Theology neighbourhood and described the resultant design response in this project. Kim Perry presented the landscape plan and its connection to adjacent sites.

*Board member questions and applicant responses:*

Q: What is the relationship of the driveway to Military Road?

A: The ramp that connects to the underground parking starts well within VST property. Two existing parking stalls along Military Road would be removed.

Q: In light of the OCP and Neighbourhood Plan guidelines, and other projects that are minimizing or eliminating vehicular parking, how many stalls would be provided?

A: There would be 21 stalls and 18 are required. There are provisions for alternative fuel vehicle stalls.

Q: Can a sprinkling system for the lawn be installed until the vegetation is well established? Hand sprinkling when roof rainwater reuse is not possible and is too expensive.

A: This would be contrary to sustainable building guidelines; however, it is a possibility.

Q: If the building reverts to UBC ownership, will the easements be in favour of the other owners?

A: Yes. The easements required for servicing access are for VST only.

Q: Is the Applicant aware that there is often difficulty obtaining Home Warranty Insurance with use of stucco?

A: This is a stigma that stucco carries. What is significant is proper rain screening, then stucco as a covering is effective.

Q: How does the roof system refer to the Iona Building?

A: The steep sloping roof and rhythm of the peaks respond to St. Andrew's and Iona, respectively. The preferred material is metal for reasons of durability and reflectance qualities.

Q: Will the G2 building be built by the same applicant and has the design been coordinated? The Committee is concerned about the integrity of the Neighbourhood Plan and maintaining credibility in light of commitments to neighbours for unifying elements and consistency of materials. This Committee should not be commenting on design; however, until the message that fit and integration of design is demonstrated in proposals, it will be a topic.

A: It will likely be the same applicant. The building will be different in shape, but sympathetic materials will be used so that there is the same feel, particularly at ground level.

Q: What are the materials for the railings on the lower level? Why are wood railings used on the upper level and how high are they (do they block views)? Will the wood stain the stucco?

A: Lower railings necessary for safety because of a 6-foot drop-off are wrought iron. Wood railings on some of the balconies are intended to add warmth as a residential building and to provide privacy to the bedrooms from the taller adjacent building that will be built in the future. Hardi-plank is being used where 'wood' would contact with stucco to prevent leaching stains.

*The Board took a recess for an In Camera Discussion. Upon reconvening they reported their decision. The Board informed the applicant that the physical form and the technical elements are compliant with development regulations. However, the qualitative elements are not consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan, including the materials proposed for the project. The Board declines to approve this project at this time. The Board is available briefly for questions.*

*The Applicant had the following questions and the Board responded:*

Q: The Applicant would like clarification of fit for the materials. The Neighbourhood Plan requires use of sympathetic materials. The lower level of the building is granite to respond to the Iona Building and the upper levels are consistent with St. Andrews. An effort was made to distinguish the building as residential rather than institutional. There is no difficulty in changing the roof material; however, metal is more sustainable.

A: We feel that this application does not comply enough with the Neighbourhood Plan. It must demonstrate fit. The Board's concerns are for consistency, durability and maintenance costs.

Q: Do we redesign the whole building? This will cost us 12 months because of the timing of students arriving on campus.

A: No. The Board is prepared to try to try to meet later in July to accommodate the applicant.

**Agenda Item 4.0      DA 03022 - Iona Building Revitalization**

*The Iona Building currently exists and is located at 6000 Iona Drive. The proposal is for restoration and additions to the exterior, and a complete rebuilding of the interior, which will upgrade the building to higher building code and seismic standards.*

Jim Carruthers introduced Keith Hemphill, Architect, Rositch Hemphill Architects. Keith Hemphill described the extent of works to structurally upgrade the Iona Building and bring it into compliance with various codes. The interior will be stripped and several necessary additions made to the exterior.

*Board member questions and applicant responses:*

Q: What percent of the Code would be met in terms of the seismic upgrade?

A: The upgrade will make the structure 75% compliant. One result is that it will make the whole of the tower useable.

Q: What materials have been explored for exterior refinishing? Where did the granite come from originally? Will cultured stone weather differently over time?

A: The design team is currently searching worldwide for a cultured stone pattern that matches what exists. The weight of adding more real granite is an issue. The stone came from Vancouver Island and was paid for by Mr. Van Dusen. Cultured stone responds similarly to granite and it would be unlikely that it would colour differently.

Q: Will the program for the interior impact the external realm in terms of traffic, parking, etc.?

A: There will be less residential use than what exists and an increase in office space.

Q: Where will parking be provided?

A: Adjacent to the building on the south side where there is existing parking.

Board Comment: There is an important obligation for the neighbourhood to retain this building and the project also had to meet an economic feasibility test. The applicant is to be congratulated for the work that has been undertaken with the client.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That the Development Permit be issued for renovation and additions to the Iona Building.

**Agenda Item 5.0      Update on Development Permits with “Prior to” Conditions**

The Board received a staff report on DA 03009 (Lot 4 Mid Campus Faculty/Staff Housing) and DA 03010 (Theological Lots 14-20 Residential Development – Chancellor House) noting that the prior to conditions had been met and that the Director will issue Development Permits for these projects. The Chair thanked staff for the written report.

**Agenda Item 2.0 Business Arising**

**2.1 Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the May 21, 2003 were approved.

**2.2 Development Permit Board Meeting Protocol**

The Board received a staff report proposing a Development Permit Board Meeting Protocol as a supplement to the Development Permit Board's Terms of Reference. The Board revised the Protocol by deleting the words "ten-minute" in reference to the recess period cited in clause 3 of the protocol. The Board then approved the protocol as amended.

**2.3 Structure and Content of Report Matrices**

The Board also received a draft matrix provided by staff as a first step in standardizing the matrices for project reviews. The Board listed several suggestions that the staff will incorporate in a second version to be used on a trial basis. This is a work in progress and modifications will be incorporated in the standard matrix as the Board and staff gain experience with it through future meetings.

**Other Business**

*General question from member of the public:*

Q: Can the Board please clarify the roles of other advisory committees in relation to this Board?

A: All other committees technically and programmatically review the applications. Their assessment is provided to this Board for input into a decision. The Development Permit Board is the final approval stage.

**Agenda Item 6.0 Next Meeting Date**

The Board will meet next on July 28,, 2003 at 5 p.m. pending quorum.

**Agenda Item 7.0 Adjournment**

The chair adjourned the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*



## Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Monday, July 28, 2003  
**Time:** 5:00 p.m.  
**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
David Barnes

**Regrets:** Fred Pritchard  
Michael Goldberg

**Presenters/Guests:** Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust  
David Roche, UBC Properties Trust  
Kim Perry, BCSLA, Kim Perry and Associates Inc.  
Ray Letkeman, MAIBC, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.  
Jason Letkeman, MAIBC, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.  
Jan Timmer, Jan H. Timmer Architecture, Ltd.  
Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust  
Basil Davis,

**Staff:** Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Joe Stott, Campus & Community Planning  
Thor Kuhlmann, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Campus & Community Planning (Recording Secretary)

#### Members of the public:

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

#### 2.0 Business Arising

##### 2.1 Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the July 2, 2003 meeting were approved as circulated.

#### 3.0 DA 03025 Lot 5 Mid-Campus Townhouses

Jim Carruthers introduced the project and Matthew Carter, the project manager. Jason Letkeman described the project in detail. The proposal is for a 10-unit, 3-storey townhouse development with underground parking on the south side of Hawthorne Lane. Each of the 10 townhouse units would comprise three bedrooms and a self-contained fourth bedroom / office / secondary suite space on the lower floor. South-facing patios will overlook the new neighbourhood park. The unit sizes range from 2,100 ft<sup>2</sup> to 2,300 ft<sup>2</sup> (195 m<sup>2</sup> to 213.67 m<sup>2</sup>).

Parking would be provided through 13 spaces under each homes' rear yard with direct access to each unit, and an additional 9 stalls on the surface on Hawthorne Lane and Road B. Kim Perry explained the landscape plan that focuses on semi-private rear patios and connections to neighbourhood open space.

Al Poettcker explained that this is the first market project that would be available for purchase by faculty and staff as a co-development. The self-contained suite is an option that could function as a mortgage-helper. The suites are permitted by fewer parking spaces underground. Surface parking on Hawthorn Lane and Road B will make up the balance (9 spaces). The land lease is 99 years.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

Q: What is immediately east of the project?

A: Lot 12 Mid Campus is to the east and is designated for townhousing or apartments at a density of 1.6 FSR (CCP, 2000). A development application has been submitted for a four-storey apartment in two buildings with 80 units.

Q: What is the rationale for the current point of access to covered parking? How will on-street parking be managed?

A: The point of access is also the lowest point of elevation on the site. The location is most sensitive to the building architecture and allows it respond to adjacent housing developments. On-street parking in Mid Campus must provide for resident parking only, visitor parking and community centre parking. The intended allocation will be implemented using a combination of metered spaces and permit spaces. There will be seven permitted on-street spaces for residents connected to this project. The University Neighbourhoods Association (UNA) is a potential service-provider for parking functions and they are currently drafting a parking bylaw for residents of the area.

Q: Will landscape lighting for the project connect to the adjacent park?

A: Lanterns would be located at the rear entrance of each patio facing the park. This will provide for visibility at points of entrance and light a pathway into the park.

Q: How is wheelchair accessibility being addressed in this project?

A: Two factors limit the extent of accessibility that can be accommodated: (1) the extent of the slope on the site and, (2) the townhouse form, which by its nature is compact and multi-level with stairs. The westernmost unit will have at-grade access from the street and there will be the option for the buyer of making the interior accessible also. Current City of Vancouver accessibility standards would be met.

Q: Please describe how the garbage and recycling area will function.

A: There will be one 4' x 8' x 5' garbage bin, four recycling bins in this covered area. Access for residents is from the inside using individual keys.

Q: Are there concrete firewalls between units?

A: There will not be concrete separations. However, one-hour separations are required. The parkade is a concrete structure.

Q: What is the potential for implementing the secondary suites in each unit?

A: The self-contained space is adaptable and use as a secondary suite is one option.

Board Comment: The Board would prefer that all ten units have secondary suites installed to fulfill commitments to provide for more cost-effective housing.

Q: Will the landscaping on top of the parkade be implemented as part of the development, including the built-in planters? How will these be maintained?

A: Yes. Maintenance will be the responsibility of the strata that is formed.

Q: There appears to be a gap in the rock-faced parkade wall. How much would be rock-faced versus exposed concrete?

A: There will be no visible exposed concrete, as the gap at the parkade wall face will be hidden by plantings.

Q: Will landscaping be disturbed along the park edge and will it be restored?

A: Any changes to the park landscape from construction would be re-instated.

- Q: The Advisory Urban Design Panel had mixed feelings about the stucco finish on this project. Where is the stucco located?
- A: There was a negative perception of stucco from faculty and staff feedback and from the AUDP. The stucco areas have been switched to either shingle or siding.
- Q: Do the materials fit with the existing adjacent housing?
- A: The area is predominantly brick and siding, so the fit has been enhanced with the change of materials. Lot 7 is stone and shingle, so these will be the same.
- Q: Why has the maximum allowable FSR not been met?
- A: The Average FSR for the area is 1.5; FSR 1.2 would be achieved. Under the performance zoning that governs the area, the maximum allowable FSR must be achieved on a neighbourhood level. This project is at the low end because others have exceeded the site FSR elsewhere.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried. The Committee noted, for the record, that Al Poettcker did not participate in voting:**

That a Development Permit for the 10-unit townhouse proposal by UBC Properties Trust, on UBC Mid Campus Lot 5 be issued with the following variances granted:

- i. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for the building projecting 1.33 m into the required east side and south rear yards (due to a diagonal property line at this location), whereas the Development Handbook (Policy MC 2.5) states that both the minimum side and rear yards are 3.0 m; and
- ii. That the provisions of the Development Handbook be varied to provide for the garbage enclosure projecting 3.0 m into the required west yard whereas the Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that projections should not exceed 0.8 m into required yards.

In conclusion, the Board Chairman stated that the applicant is to be congratulated on a project solution that is consistent with the objectives, guidelines and parameters of the OCP, CCP, neighbourhood plan and the University's Planning Principles. Moreover, he stated, the design gives attention to the issues of durability, security and fit. We particularly want to note our support for the inclusion of the secondary suites in the project.

#### **4.0 Revised Submission of Tabled Application**

##### **4.1 DA 03019 Vancouver School of Theology Student Housing**

Jim Carruthers introduced Jan Timmer, the architect for the four-storey, 38-unit student housing apartment building for the Vancouver School of Theology. The Board had heard this project at the July 2 meeting and had concerns for the consistency of the project with the overall precinct.

Jan Timmer presented the changes to the building design and materials that provide for a 'quieter' building in terms of architectural style and strengthening of the horizontal lines. Roger Moors explained how stone from existing retaining walls would be reused on the building.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

- Q: Will the stairways on the east elevation be stone?
- A: They are now full concrete with a stone base to anchor the stairs, and railings will be glass.
- Q: Have the wood trim elements been separated from the stucco to prevent staining?
- A: Wood elements are kept away from the stucco and properly flashed.
- Q: Have there been any functional changes to the interior programming?

A: There are no changes. In terms of showers, family suites are provided with both a shower and a bath.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

That a Development Permit be issued for Theological Lot 48 Vancouver School of Theology Student Housing given that all required easements and reciprocal property agreements on this property will be implemented as detailed in the July 2, 2003 report to the Board. The project has now met with all technical and programmatic requirements and the Board's previous issues with the project have been resolved.

**Other Business**

The reformatted matrix received Board approval. The Board Chair indicated that the structure and content of the matrices for the current reports prepared by Staff are a welcome improvement. Placing everything on one page is a much better format.

**5.0 Next Meeting Date**

The Board will meet next on Wednesday, August 20 to hear any proposals to be brought forward.

**6.0 Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*





## UBC Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, August 20, 2003  
**Time:** 5:00 –6:45 p.m.  
**Venue:** The Ponderosa Building, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
David Barnes  
Fred Pritchard

**Regrets:** Michael Goldberg

**Presenters/Guests:** Norm Couttie, Adera Equities Inc.  
Darren Chung, Adera Equities Inc.  
Ward McAllister, Ledingham McAllister  
Jonathon Losee, Jonathon Losee Ltd.  
Duane Siegrist, Integra Architecture Inc.  
Matthew Carter, Project Manager, UBC Properties Trust

**Staff:** Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Joe Stott, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Campus & Community Planning (Recording Secretary)

**Members of the public:**

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m. Mr. Kalke remarked that just before the meeting he had walked through the Mid-Campus neighbourhood and once again gained an appreciation that the UBC campus is a remarkable place and that the stewardship of the UBC campus at this period of rapid growth only reinforces the importance of good decision-making at the Development Permit Board.

#### 2.0 Business Arising

##### 2.1 Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the July 28, 2003 meeting were approved as circulated.

#### 3.0 DA 03035 Lot 12 Mid Campus Residential Development

Jim Carruthers introduced Norm Couttie, who introduced the consultant team, then gave an overview of the project. Norm C described the site context and vision for the site. The name "Journey" is based on the concept of life journeys and the location of the development as being

on the edge of campus, but not too far. The building materials will be high quality and durable and include granite and hardi board.

Duane Siegrist, Architect described the project further. Ground floor units will all have at-grade orientation. The main external material would be hardi-panel with cut stone elements. There would be 88 resident parking spaces, 8 visitor spaces and 3 disabled parking spaces provided in underground parking. The parking access will have two security gates and natural lighting from the 2-storey lobby of the building. He explained access and contextual relationships. The building is designed to create a feeling of openness and to respond to an active community. The building will have large overhangs and balconies, lots of glass, and post and beams for a residential feel and a strong horizontal emphasis. Stone base would anchor provide a strong base. The project has similarities to the Rivers Reach Project in Richmond by Integra. There are plans for a roof garden and composting.

Jonathon Losee presented the landscape concept. To connect with Rhododendron Woods in the ground plane, conifers would be planted at each end of the site. The swale along Main Mall would have bridges for access to ground floor units. A stone retaining wall will front the property along "Road B." A water feature is planned for the central lobby area.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

Q: Please explain the structural elements involved with the roof garden. Will it be durable?

A: The roof deck would be a separate structure suspended separate from and above the actual roof.

Q: What is the life expectancy of the exposed posts and beams?

A: The posts and beams are treated with a clear stain and weather well from experience with other projects. Wood posts will not sit on concrete or in water. The expectation is that they will last for the life of the building.

Q: Has the swale along Main Mall been designed for drainage?

A: The swale is already existing and about four to six inches deep. Catch basins will control drainage so that water will not accumulate above grade. The swale is being retained as a landscape opportunity.

Q: How will the water feature in the lobby be designed and will there be any humidity control?

A: The water feature would be about 30 cm wide with a continuous liner and circulation pumps. Its continuation through the lobby may just be visual, with rocks. The applicant has installed these in projects previously without difficulty. A humidity control device has been considered.

**Board Comment:**

In one Board members' opinion the design is good, but not in the University context. The building does not respond well to what exists or contribute to the residential character of the neighbourhood. Of particular concern is the character of the building and lack of proper fit with the emerging character defined by the neighbouring buildings. The post and beam elements dominate the design. The building is in a very prominent location and should work harder to relate to previously approved residential developments rather than make a stand-alone statement.

Q: Has the impact of the location of the parking access considered the neighbours?

A: The site of the parking entrance was selected based on the slope of the site, to allow for a low side entry, rather than a ramp. Access from any point along Road B would affect neighbours on Lot 8. In addition, entry off the south end could be considered.

Q: What is the rationale for the reduction in parking from the maximum (from 122 to 96)? The Board is concerned that on-street parking will become an issue.

A: The number of spaces supports OCP goals, has been proven to sell in the market from the applicant's experience and the cost of a two-level parkade would be an issue.

Q: Are the tandem stalls acceptable for residential use?

A: People buying these units are choosing a lifestyle that involves more transit and alternative-vehicle modes of transportation. Tandem stalls have been successfully implemented in many of the applicant's projects.

Q: Ground-oriented units are critical to UBC commitments for housing. Would the applicant consider more than sliding doors for these entrances to illustrate that these could be used as the principle entrance.

A: The applicant can revisit this.

Q: Will there be any exposed concrete on the façade?

A: No.

Q: This is a compact community where green spaces are important deserve to be green. Will the applicant consider installing irrigation to maintain the landscape in the first few years until it takes?

A: This can be done.

Board Comment:

Buyers into this project should be informed beforehand that the first two floor will not have a view in the long run because of adjacent development, and the Main Way is a principle corridor for students and other campus users and is very noisy, particularly during large events in the stadium.

Q: Has the landscape been finalized on the north side of the site?

A: No.

Board Comment:

The Board would like the applicant to work with Staff to achieve landscape integration with the community centre that will be built on the north side.

Q: Other than the roof garden, what green building features will the project have?

A: Low flow and low voltage technology.

Board Comment:

Dual-flush toilets and a common hot water tank tied into a solar panel on the roof are encouraged. Green building measures will benefit the project marketing.

Q: Has the impact of noise associated with garbage and recycling been considered for the closest units?

A: This can be reviewed with the parking access.

Q: Does the applicant consider "contemporary" and "west coast" styles to be the same?

A: We understand post and beam to be traditional west coast style.

Q: What is being done to ensure this is not a leaky building?

A: The applicant described the details of the rain screen system.

Board Comment:

The Board noted on potential weakness of the proposed rain screen and encouraged use of a galvanized 'z' bar as part of the solution.

Q: The project provides greater affordability with the wood structural elements. Will the interior finishing also be affordable?

A: The commitment of the applicant is to provide building specifications at least to the level of quality of the Promontory development.

Q: Will real stone or cultured stone be used?

A: Cultured stone would be used.

Q: What finish will be used for the soffits, on balconies and in the two-storey entrance?

A: Charcoal grey aluminium that mimics painted wood will be used in balcony and overhang areas. The treatment of the lobby area will be different

Board Comment:

There is some concern about the length of the two buildings and the way they will read being joined in the middle at only the upper two storeys.

Applicant Response:

Once the neighbourhood is built up as per the Neighbourhood Plan, there is no way to look back at the whole length of the building from the ground and there will also be large trees along the long edges. The experience at pedestrian level is to provide for a break in the built form that invites people in.

Q: Will the units on the northwest and southwest corners be ground-oriented?

A: The northwest corner is not in the current plans. The units on the southwest require stairs for ground-orientation.

The Board recessed for an 'in-camera' discussion of the project. When the Board resumed the public portion of their deliberation, **the following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

**That a Development Permit for the Lot 12 Mid Campus application is approved including the following variances; approval is subject to the following conditions being met and resubmitted for the consideration of the Board:**

**Variations:**

- i. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of cantilevered projected balconies on the north (diagonal) elevation to be 6.24 m. whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal length of any one projection shall not exceed 3.0 m.
- ii. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the cantilevered balconies on the north (diagonal) elevation to project 3.42 m whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that cantilevered projections may project up to 0.6 m into a side yard greater than 1.2 m.
- iii. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the parkade on the south elevation to project 3.1 m whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* permits a maximum of 1.0 m for a required yard less than 6.0 m.

**Conditions:**

- i. Access pathways to at grade units on Main Mall including secure swing doors into suites;
- ii. Provision of a rationale for, including drawings, of the Main Mall interface and review the proposed solution with the Mainway consultant;

- iii. Review of the number of parking spaces with the intent to increase on-site parking so as not to rely on street parking for occupants' vehicles and review the proposed solution with UBC Properties Trust and UBC Staff;
- iv. Provision of landscape sprinklering; and
- v. Assurance from the applicant that project disclosure statements advise about parking and student use of the Mainway.

#### **4.0 Next Meeting Date**

The Board is scheduled to meet next on Wednesday, September 17 to hear any applications ready to come forward.

#### **5.0 Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*



## UBC Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, December 10, 2003  
**Time:** 5:00 – 7:40 p.m.  
**Venue:** The Peter Wall Institute, 6331 Crescent Road

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Jim Taylor  
Al Poettcker  
David Barnes  
Fred Pritchard

**Regrets:** Michael Goldberg

**Presenters/Guests:** Norm Couttie, Adera Equities Inc.  
Darren Chung, Adera Equities Inc.  
Jonathon Losee, Jonathon Losee Ltd.  
Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.  
Matthew Carter, Project Manager, UBC Properties Trust

**Staff:** Jim Carruthers, Campus & Community Planning  
Joe Stott, Campus & Community Planning  
Karly Henney, Campus & Community Planning (Recording Secretary)

**Members of the public:** Charlene Morton, Hawthorn Lane Resident  
Daniel Vokey, Hawthorn Lane Resident  
John Tompkins, V6T News, Hampton Place Resident

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

#### Agenda Item No. 3.0 DA 03035 Lot 12 Mid Campus Residential Development

Jim Carruthers explained that the Board had considered the project at the August 20 meeting and gave preliminary approval of the project with the requested variances. However, a development permit was not to be issued until the applicant met specific conditions to the satisfaction of the Board. The present meeting was for the Board to hear how the applicant had addressed the conditions. Jim C introduced Norm Couttie who explained the changes made to the application that included:

- The addition of swinging patio doors;
- Redesign of the relationship of the project to Main Mall;
- Improvements to the parkade entrance;
- Increase in the number of parking stalls from 94 to 123 (ratio of stalls to residents of 1.46); and a
- Disclosure statement clarifying that residents should not rely on street parking.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

Board Comments: One member indicated they were satisfied with the changes made by the applicant. A second member said that the staff report was helpful and clarified the issues.

Q: Will there be any measures to mitigate the impact of noise from the dual security gates at the parkade entrance on residents?

A: A type of insulation that has been successful in our other projects will be applied.

Board Comment: Expansion of the parkade into the east elevation does not affect the frontage on Main Mall or the large trees adjacent Main Mall. The UBC Properties' arborist, Kim Perry (Landscape Architect for the Main Way Project), and Jonathan Losee (Landscape Architect) are all satisfied that the expansion of the underground parkade will not impact the trees. Many of the parking spaces that were added are tandem stalls. This format requires less excavation, to the extent that cost to the buyer is not increased significantly. There are fewer tandem stalls than in a typical suburban development. Residents often use the extra stall for storage and are satisfied with security.

Board Comment: The changes indicated by the applicant significantly improve the development, particularly along Main Mall. The improvements to the parking satisfy what was asked of the applicant. Double units of parking that are allocated at the time of purchase will have to be rolled over to subsequent owners.

Q: Will the homeowner's manual include information on and guidelines for parking?

A: Our homeowner's manuals do not usually contain parking information, but we can include it.

Q: In terms of addressing, will units in the project be located by building name, or street address?

Board Comment: There is currently a hiatus between projects in Mid Campus and Canada Post. The project will be officially addressed to the street and the building name is determined by the developer, primarily for marketing purposes.

Q: Where did the name *Journey* come from for the project?

A: The name *Journey* is based on the concept of life journeys and the location of the development as being on the edge of campus, but not too far.

Board Comment: In Hampton Place, the residents refer to each component of the project by building name, which is based on a theme. Is this a better way to refer to residential buildings in an area?

Board Follow-Up: Applying an official name has to be done through a University naming committee. It is problematic to establish a theme for naming in a neighbourhood. Hawthorne, is a recognized name in the neighbourhood, which commemorates the contributions to UBC by a married couple with this last name.

Board Comment: The applicant is to be congratulated on their initiative to reduce water consumption through rainwater retention. Legislation can be an obstacle to design because of safety concerns relating to exposed flowing water versus piping.

**The following motion was moved, seconded and carried:**

**That a Development Permit application for the Lot 12 Mid Campus is approved including variances; with the applicant having met the following requirements to the satisfaction of the Board:**

- i. Access pathways to at grade units on Main Mall including secure swing doors into suites;
- ii. Provision of a rationale for, including drawings, of the Main Mall interface and review the proposed solution with the main way consultant;
- iii. Review of the number of parking spaces with the intent to increase on-site parking so as not to rely on street parking for occupants' vehicles and review the proposed solution with UBC Properties Trust and UBC Staff;
- iv. Provision of landscape sprinklering; and
- v. Assurance from the applicant that project disclosure statements advise about parking and student use of the Main way.

#### **Agenda Item 2.0 Business Arising**

##### **2.1 Review of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the August 20 meeting were approved as circulated.

#### **Agenda Item 4.0 Next Meeting Date**

The Board is scheduled to meet next on Wednesday, October 15 pending any applications being ready to come forward.

#### **Agenda Item 5.0 Adjournment**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*



# Development Permit Board

Minutes of the Informal Dinner Meeting  
October 30, 2002, 6:00 p.m., Kirin Restaurant

---

**Attendees:** **Harold Kalke**, Non-UBC Representative, Chair  
**Jim Taylor**, UBC Resident  
**David Barnes**, Member of UBC Administration  
**Dr. Michael Goldberg**, Member of General UBC Academic Community  
**Al Poettcker**, President of UBC Properties Trust  
**Fred Pritchard**, Director of Campus & Community Planning

## Minutes:

- List Development Permit Board and all contact info to each of the DP Board members (attached).
- Minutes of each DPB meeting will be on C&CP web page ([www.planning.ubc.ca](http://www.planning.ubc.ca)) within a reasonable time from date of last DPB meeting.
- Extensive discussion regarding the DPB Terms of Reference; Fred Pritchard to revise in consultation with Jim Taylor and Harold Kalke (amended TOR attached).



# THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

## UBC Development Permit Board

### Minutes

**Date:** Wednesday, December 10, 2003

**Time:** 5:00 – 7:40 p.m.

**Venue:** The Peter Wall Institute, 6331 Crescent Road, Large Conference Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair); Jim Taylor; Al Poettcker; Fred Pritchard

**Regrets:** Michael Goldberg; David Barnes

**Staff:** Joe Stott, Associate Director community & Land Use Planning; Jim Carruthers, Manager Development Services; Freda Pagani, Sustainability Director and Acting University Architect; Karly Henney, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters/Guests:** Mark Anderson; Roger Moors; Greg Morfitt; Ray Letkeman; Tom Miller; Paul Becker; Melissa Green; Don Andrew; Doug Ramsay; Matthew Carter; Michael Paterson; Jason Letkeman; Dave Roche; Water Francel

**Members of the public:** John Tompkins; Edith Anderson; Shelagh Dodd; Kate Levi; Rochelle G.; G. Todd; M. Smorden

---

#### 1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

#### 2.0 Business Arising

##### i. Approval of September 17 Minutes

The Board approved the minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 DA 03042: Theological Lots 43 & 47 Residential Development

Jim Carruthers stated the development application that was before the Board and introduced the applicant.

Tom Miller, Vice President, Intracorp Developments, showed the context for the project using a model of the Theological Neighbourhood. The application proposes two buildings, referred to as “bookends,” on sites east and west of the Iona Building. Smaller units on the base levels would provide greater affordability. Pending approval, construction on Lot 47 would begin in April or May of 2004 and during the summer on Lot 43, with a 12–14 month construction period to completion.

Michael Paterson, Landscape Architect, Kim Perry & Associates, described dominant pedestrian circulation routes for the neighbourhood, the influence of the central Iona Commons and the resultant design response.

Doug Ramsay, Architect, Ramsay Worden Architects, explained the architectural design response. The elevations facing the Iona Building respond to it with a granite façade and punched windows in the same rhythm. “Boxiness” of the 6.5-storey building height is mitigated with terracing and design features that break it down. Elevations facing away from the Iona Building respond to the surrounding neighbourhood.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

Q: Can the landscape architect provide a review of the macro-level features of the landscape design.

A: The applicant showed the location of spaces designated ‘UNOS’ (Useable Neighbourhood Open Space) that are part of the larger public realm. The Iona Commons is an important plaza/open area to allow views to the prominent Iona Building. Southeast of the Iona Building there is a mature stand of trees that will be retained (Iona Woods) and a labyrinth that will be restored. The woonerfs (living streets) are important neighbourhood features that have a network of pathways connected to them to facilitate public access routes.

Q/Comment: The applicant responded well to AUDP direction and received unanimous approval upon coming back to the panel. The tender documents did not require the applicant to meet any accessibility standards; however the applicant has done so voluntarily. The Board would like to see completion of the woonerfs prior to occupancy of the buildings as a condition of the development permit. Can the applicant please explain parking for the project.

A: There are two levels of underground parking in each building with access off of Iona Drive. There is a direct connection between lower units and parking on the lower level. The second level of parking is for upper floor units. There are 84 stalls provided for each 42 units and the maximum allowed is 86 spaces.

Q: Is the applicant aware that a second parking space for each unit must be sold separately?

A: Yes.

Q: Has the applicant considered CPTED principles in the design of the stairwells leading down to the parkade from outside?

A: Parkade entries are not screened and there is overlook from units above and ground floor patios. The stairwells have a low wall around them and trellis on the top. Security is at the bottom of the stairs.

Q: How does Lot 43 relate to the Carey Theological College Multi-Use Building that was approved to the east?

A: There is about 60 to 70 feet between the buildings spanned with parking for Carey. Integration of traffic and parking has been considered and there will be a public thoroughway between.

Q: Why does the sidewalk on Lot 47 adjacent St. Andrews require an easement agreement?

A: The easement allows the sidewalk to be used as a public thoroughway.

Q: Is it possible to redesign the parkades to eliminate the 90-degree turn as you enter off the ramp?

A: The premise is that parking is only for users of the residences who will become familiar with the turns required. The driveway aisle is 4 feet wider than required.

Q: Both buildings are below the OCP height limit requirement. What was the rationale for more building bulk rather than height?

A: The height of the building is a good compromise between the Official Community Plan and Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design Requirements that provide two different guidelines.

Q: What was the response to the DRC’s evaluation that heating for the project should be more sustainable?

A: The applicant has committed to BC Hydro's Green Power program for the first two years. Gas fireplaces will have thermostats and timers. Gas will provide 40% of the heat load for the building.

Q: What will the address be in relation to Chancellor Boulevard since the project is completely within the Theological Neighbourhood.

A: Addressing off of Iona Drive is anticipated.

*The Board asked the public gallery for comments on the application.*

There was concern that new development in this neighbourhood will contribute to an increase in traffic along Wesbrook Mall. The Board explained that an increase in traffic entering Military Road is due to a reduction in traffic on Student Union Boulevard. Both roads primarily serve the Gage Towers residents and are not through roads. When Gage Towers were built, Wesbrook Mall was widened by UBC to manage University traffic, and Western Parkway was assigned to the UEL. Since the inception of U-Pass, car commuter trips to UBC have decreased by 5,400 per day. Another person asked how the project would be accessed. The applicant said primarily off of Chancellor Boulevard, onto Theology Mall and then via Iona Drive.

**The following motion was moved (Fred Pritchard), seconded (Jim Taylor) and carried (unanimous):**

That a Development Permit be issued for Theological Lots 43 & 47 Residential Development;  
That prior to the issuance of the development permit it be confirmed by the applicant that all required easements on this property will be implemented through the strata plan including those for the following:

- i. Sidewalk on west side of Lot 47 located on the "Woonerf" to be provided by way of easement on the St. Andrew's property; and,

That the woonerf be completed prior to occupancy of the buildings.

#### **4.0 DA 03046: Theological Lot 41 Carey Townhouses - Request for Direction**

Joe Stott presented the project to the Board and explained that the report for this application is unique due to peculiar circumstances. The report is a request for direction from the Board. Joe Stott explained the history of the site and that a previous development application was approved, but did not go forward. The current applicant is new and withdrew their application to the Board for decision based on confounding difficulties with the site and non-support from the AUDP. Joe Stott provided the Board with a memo from staff that provides the history of the site, background of the application and four questions that the applicant would like to receive clarification on to inform design.

*The Board received the December 10 memorandum from staff Re: Additional Items for December 10 Development Permit Board Agenda.*

The Board stated that it is not in a position to respond to the questions posed by the applicant because it has no mandate to do so. To respond or establish rules without a design could lead to the applicant adhering to these, yet produce an unacceptable result. The solution on each site is unique and the design needs to respond to use and demonstrate integration.

Joe Stott reiterated that staff, on behalf of the applicant, is not requesting a decision. Staff is requesting guidance, within all of the other guidelines and with the benefit of neighbourhood and public feedback to date, to instruct the applicant on a new design.

The Board noted that in a municipality, the conditions of a development permit that lapses or is withdrawn do not apply to future applicants. Municipalities, such as the City of Vancouver, make calculations for a site, such as setbacks and FSR, after a dedication. An exception would be legal non-conforming zoning.

Joe Stott explained that the applicant is seeking to agree to amended calculations and would like direction on the relaxation of other setbacks only affecting Carey Theological College.

The Board questioned whether a previous setback of 29 feet should indicate that this project should have the same setback. Jim Carruthers approached the Board with the Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design Guidelines that showed the road widening from the 1960's. The Board asked if the neighbourhood plan had specific setback requirements. Whether the Site Specific Design Guidelines are an appendix to the neighbourhood plan or not was in question. The Board thought that a 20 foot setback would apply and relaxations in the rear yard depend on context. The SSDG indicate a 20 foot setback on Wesbrook. The Board also noted AUDP advice for the current applicant that might conflict with the decision and interpretation by the Board on the previous application.

## **5.0 DA 03050 Mid Campus Lots 17/20 Townhouses (Consolidated)**

Jim Carruthers described the development application that was before the Board and introduced the applicant.

Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, introduced the architect for the project, Jason Letkeman of Raymond Letkeman Architects, and the landscape architect, Michael Paterson of Kim Perry & Associates.

Matthew Carter described the context for the 61-unit townhouse co-development project, that the unit-types targeted affordability and that the design responded to focus group sessions done for Phase I. Matthew also gave details on parking and access, ground-orientation, accessibility and sustainability initiatives, including purchase of a vehicle for the project for car-sharing managed by CAN Auto.

Jason Letkeman described the architectural character. Massing and form comply with Neighbourhood Plan and *Development Handbook* criteria. The materials and style are intended to complement the buildings in the existing neighbourhood. Michael Paterson gave an overview of the Mid Campus neighbourhood greenway network and neighbourhood useable open space.

*The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:*

Q: Can the applicant please explain requested variances.

A: The majority of variances relate to unit entryways. Stairs along Road D and East Mall project into the setback. The end unit at the intersection of these two roads is within the setback line.

Q: What is the material of the entry columns?

A: The columns are structural and will be wood.

Q: Can you describe the accessibility of units in the project?

A: Twelve units are visitable, which is felt to be reasonable for the stacked townhouse form. The grade change from north to south along East Mall is approximately 2 m.

Q: The amount of accessibility requested by the Development Review Committee is 15-17 units.

A: That was set as a target and the applicant is committed to make as many of the lower 26 units as possible accessible.

Q: Can you provide the price points for the units?

A: The purchase price including GST will range from \$380K to 650K, which provides greater affordability than Phase I.

Q: Can the applicant please clarify the grade change and the building separation.

A: The applicant approached the panel with elevation drawings to describe the grade and building spacing.

Board Comment: The Board commends the applicant on purchase of a car-share vehicle for the project. Private developers on campus should be required to do the same.

Board Comment: The Board understands that for the first phase of faculty/staff housing many more people participated than there were units to accommodate so it went to lottery. The university has since asked UBC Properties to move ahead with this, the second phase as aggressively as possible, which would be as soon as the servicing is complete.

Board Comment: The University is undertaking a study of East Mall that would convert it to two lanes for vehicles and provide more space for bicycles and pedestrians. There may also be a stadium located across East Mall from the project, which would provide proximity to athletic events.

Q: Will balconies have electrical and gas outlets?

A: Yes.

Q: How will drainage and condensation from the upper level units be handled?

A: Drainage has been considered and will flow externally to the outside via the soffit.

Q: Will balconies be wood or metal? The concern is the impact on lower level units, which the applicant is asked to consider.

Q: The AUDP's feeling that the architecture for the project is too uniform and predictable is appreciated. What colour scheme is proposed?

A: Red brick, green accent finishing and cedar shingles throughout.

University Architect (Acting): The AUDP was divided in how it felt about the project. Some thought it was skilfully handled, while others thought that the density and unity was uninspiring and recalled British rowhousing. This latter concern was generalized to all applications coming forward and a request to address the issue on a macro level.

Applicant: Providing some differentiation is being contemplated.

Board: Is it possible to select complimentary brick colours and trim for different buildings in this project? The AUDP demonstrates due diligence and provides good comments and the Board should make the changes. Applicants should respond to their evaluation prior to coming to the Board.

Applicant: The applicant doesn't want changes for differentiation to appear artificial. The brick should be consistent with variation in the trim. That the buildings are in the same family of architecture brings them together and subtle changes should be used for variation, which is demonstrated by the different building type for Building 5.

Q: What has been done to make heating more sustainable?

A: Efficient gas fireplaces will provide central heating and each unit is metered separately. If more than three appliances are gas-powered the gas provider will do this.

Q: What does it mean that the applicant is 'considering' geothermal heating/cooling?

A: The option of geothermal energy is being investigated, but the lowest price point will be the decision factor for affordability. The applicant is looking into a grounded system with a heat pump to each unit.

Board Comment: The Board commends the applicant on the attention to livability for this project.

**The following motion was moved (Fred Pritchard), seconded (Jim Taylor) and carried (Al Poettcker abstained. The vote was unanimous):**

That a Development Permit be issued for Mid Campus Lots 17/20 (Consolidated); and,  
That the following variances to the *UBC Development Handbook* be allowed:

- i. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of the uncovered stairs on Buildings 1 and 2 fronting East Mall to project 1.75 m. whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal length of projection shall not exceed 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.
- ii. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the balcony projection / roof eave for Building 1 units E1/F2 into the setback fronting the neighbourhood park to project 2.0 m whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that cantilevered projections may project up to 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.
- iii. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of the uncovered stairs on Building 3 fronting Road D to project 1.75 m. whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal length of projection shall not exceed 0.8 m into a side yard greater than 2.1 m.
- iv. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of the uncovered stairs on Building 4 fronting the neighbourhood park to project 1.75 m. whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal length of projection shall not exceed 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.
- v. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of the uncovered stairs on Building 5 fronting Road D to project 2.0m. whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal length of projection shall not exceed 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.
- vi. That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the roof eave projection for Building 5 unit 61 into the setback fronting the intersection of Road C and neighbourhood park to project 1.2 m whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that cantilevered projections may project up to 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.

Board Comment :Post-occupancy surveys and statistical follow-up on sustainability and livability measures in projects, particularly for Mid Campus developments, should be undertaken. This would provide proof that what is being implemented is ‘good development’ and can be used to persuade future developers to take the same actions.

## **6.0 Next Meeting Date**

The next scheduled meeting is Wednesday, January 21, 2004.

## **7.0 Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.*