



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes
2004



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2004

Time: 5:00 – 7:30 p.m.

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

Members present: Jim Taylor (Vice Chair); Al Poettcker; Michael Goldberg; David Barnes

Regrets: Harold Kalke (Chair); Fred Pritchard

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: Don Andrew, Creekside Architects; Melissa Green, Creekside Architects; Greg Morfitt, Wesbrook Projects Ltd.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates Landscape Architects; Mark Anderson, Carey Theological College; Roger Moors, VST Properties; John O'Donnell, Ledingham McAllister; Ron Rule, Ron Rule Consultants; Ward McAllister, Ledingham McAllister; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; David Roche, UBC Properties

Members of the public: Tieg Martin; John Tompkins, V6T News; Charlie Lorenzen, Aqua-Thermal; Tom Tiedje, UEL Resident

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair

The Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2.0 Business Arising

2.1 Approval of December 10, 2003 Minutes

The Board approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DA 03046: Theological Lot 41 Townhouses

Joe Stott introduced and provided background on the application. On February 20, 2003 the Development Permit Board approved DP 02032 for this site. Subsequently, the owner decided not to proceed with that earlier approved permit. The proposal presented was submitted by the new applicant on October 31, 2003, and subsequently revised on January 2, 2004 in response to Staff and AUDP requests for a modified proposal. This proposal was unanimously supported on January 15 by the AUDP. Joe S directed the Board's attention to Appendix A in the report. The application complies with all UBC plans and guidelines with the exception of a requested relaxation of the rear yard setback, which Planning supports. Joe S introduced Don Andrew of Creekside Architects to present the application.

Don Andrew explained that the applicant for clarification of specific items provided the context photographs and schematic drawings tabled at the meeting. Don A gave the following information: a description of the context for the project; Wesbrook Mall was rededicated and the lot size decreased; the top floor of the project conforms with the *UBC Development Handbook* definition of “storey, half”; the FSR is 1.125 and below the maximum allowable of 1.2; and, the front yard setback (25’9”, or 7.9 m) is in excess of what is required to meet community expectations.

The Board asked who would be affected the most by the proposed relaxation of the rear yard setback. Don A said that it would be Carey Theological College who, along with the Theological Neighbourhood Planning Group, support the proposal.

Don A described the building design and layout. The units fronting Wesbrook Mall would have garden space on the roof terraces, and the rear units would have garden space at grade on patios. Significant design decisions were to push the half storey to the rear of the building and provide a flat roof form with terraces on the Wesbrook Mall side. This keeps the building well within the height envelope. The second was the decision on roof forms for the west façade: the applicant retained the Mansard look. The building materials would be brick and rainscreen stucco. The building will employ heat recovery ventilation and addresses acoustics from Wesbrook Mall traffic. The AUDP gave unanimous support to the project the second time. The public at the public meeting raised concern about overlook from the project across to the UEL. The building in this application is a minimum of 168’ (51 m) from the UEL houses across Wesbrook and Western Parkway. The height of the proposed building on the Wesbrook side is two storeys with nine units with terraces that would be occupied intermittently, which is an improvement from the previous application in terms of requests from UEL neighbours.

Michael Patterson described the landscape program. He showed where walkways were located for movement through the site that correspond to current campus pedestrian routes. The patios on the west side are accessible, and six of the units are visitable. Public social space is accessible and the outdoor lighting will be consistent with the neighbourhood.

The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:

Q: What will be the height of the street trees along Wesbrook Mall in front of the project?

A: The plans call for 8’ calliper size, which will be 15’ – 20’ initially and 30’ – 40’ at maturity.

Board Comments: Reflecting on the history of the application, the response that the applicant has come up with is good and meets the University’s requirements with a favourable resolution for the community. In particular, the Board appreciates the setback response and the creative design solution to density requirements and provision of affordable units for the Theological Neighbourhood. The Board would like to stress the importance of attention to acoustics for this project and a high quality of construction with attention to details.

Q: What does the applicant propose for acoustic insulation for the units?

A: The building will exceed building code requirements for acoustics. The wall that forms a spine down the centre of the building that separates adjacent units will be a solid double wall and ventilation will consider noise.

Q: There is a big difference in the size of terraces from unit-to-unit. Has making the terrace sizes more equitable been considered?

A: The decks off the ground floor units are for entertainment purposes, while the roof terraces are off the master bedrooms, so the intent is different.

Q: Will metering be separate for each unit?

A: Yes.

Q: Will there be any rainwater collection methods?

A: The project will have drip irrigation, but the applicant would like to subscribe to a rainwater collection system for this.

Q: Do all units have a door to the outside?

A: Yes. Some have one stair down. There is no requirement for egress.

Q: Will the roof technology be solid to prevent leaks, especially for patios?

A: A 2-ply SVS product will be used for roofing. The roof terraces will have a waterproof system that includes neoprene pedestal blocks below pavers.

Q: Will the units have electric or gas heating?

A: Primarily electric; smaller units will be gas.

Q: Why are there nine storage units in the underground for 23 units?

A: The mechanical and electrical systems are not resolved and will take up some of this space. The larger units have in-suite storage.

Q: Has the traffic and noise especially from passers-by for unit number five been considered?

A: The feeling was that it is akin to an apartment unit with people going past, but pushing the door back is a consideration.

Q: What is the total number of units that are completely accessible?

A: Two units are completely accessible and six units are visitable. The stacked townhouse form is an obstacle to full accessibility, but bedrooms are located upstairs so that important amenities are visitable.

Q: The neighbourhood plan requires that new buildings respond to the Iona Building, the dominant iconic feature in the Theological precinct. How does this building respond to this requirement?

A: The proposal favours the concept of the University Town with its urban street form, while picking up on elements from the surrounding neighbourhood.

Q: What is being done to address the issue of security for the bike storage?

A: The bike storage is communal within the underground garage. However, it is a small enclosed space so that the door to storage visible from anywhere. The parking area will be painted white, well lit, and the only exit is through the main garage entrance. The applicant is considering an internal camera system that is relayed to each suite and each suite would have entry phones.

Q: Has the applicant considered plexi-glass windows into the storage and bright lighting so that people can see into the storage area?

A: A camera system is the best deterrent and we used semi-transparent fencing rather than a concrete wall in other projects with success. Steel frame windows in the concrete wall are a possibility.

Q: Is the reason for prescribing 8' calliper trees on Wesbrook Mall instead of something larger due to cost?

A: The size of the roots balls of the larger trees prevents this as an option. The smaller trees will also grow at a faster rate once planted than going larger initially.

Board Comment: The use of granite, as demonstrated by the Iona Building in this neighbourhood, is a main feature of the University, which has been picked up on by the other projects in this precinct. Adding granite to the project should be discussed with Campus & Community Planning so that this is not the only new building without it.

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

Public Comment: I live across the street from the project and I am very pleased with the proposed setback and size of this proposal. I would prefer if the roof terraces on the Wesbrook side were eliminated for reasons of overlook to the UEL.

Board Response: The proposal is nine feet under the height requirement, is shorter than the previous scheme approved and the terraces are not spaces that are permanently occupied. This proposal would seem like a good trade-off to a building with 10 feet of additional height – or three storeys – that are permanently occupied.

The following motion was moved, seconded, and carried (unanimous):

That a Development Permit for the 23 unit townhouse proposal by Wesbrook Projects Ltd. on Theological Neighbourhood Lot 41 as shown on the drawings dated January 12 and 14, 2004 be issued;

That the Development Permit be issued with the following variances:

- i. Provisions of the *UBC Development Handbook* be relaxed in order to vary the rear yard setback of 7.5 m (25') to allow a setback of 6.1m (20');
- ii. The portion of the site occupied by the roadworks on Wesbrook Mall be legally dedicated;

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 that for the sidewalk area on the east side of Lot 41 adjacent to Wesbrook Mall; and,

That approval is subject to the Acting Director being satisfied on:

- i. Security of the bicycle storage, including closed circuit cameras, and provision of a “see-through area” on the northerly wall in the underground parkade to the bicycle storage that is well-lit;
- ii. The street trees for the project along Wesbrook Mall being a minimum of 15' (4.6 m) at the time of installation;
- iii. The front wall along Wesbrook Mall (the planter wall) being granite to respond to the Iona Building and the Theological Neighbourhood.

4.0 DA 03051 Mid Campus Lot 10 Townhouses

Joe Stott introduced the project and explained that this project involved discussion about the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan. The proponent requests a land exchange from the park to the northwest of the legally dedicated site to the trail on the south edge of the site that leads to Rhododendron Wood. The purpose is to improve the connection to the woods and to offset the project from the 18-storey tower on the adjacent lot to the south. The land exchange was supported by the AUDP. Approval of this project is recommended subject to setback relaxations for proposed design elements and two very significant provisions: (1) adjustments to the public park and open space designated in the Mid-Campus plan do not require an amendment to the Mid-Campus Neighbourhood Plan and can be accomplished through easements and other adjustments to legally defined parcels; and, (2) the Usable Neighbourhood Open space System (UNOS) resulting from the land exchange will not compromise the objectives of the Mid-Campus Neighbourhood Plan.

John O'Donnell introduced the design team (Keith Hemphill, Ron Rule, Jeff Chong and Ward McAllister) and thanked Campus & Community Planning and UBC Properties for their assistance with this application. Tender was selected based on number of units, secondary suites, and purchase price. The scheme is targeted towards UEL and west side homebuyers with provisions for more affordable housing for faculty and staff in the “cassidas.” The project looked to the successful Sanderingham project in Hampton Place as an example for UBC.

Keith Hemphill explained opportunities and constraints for the site and the surrounding context. The units are oriented to mitigate shadowing from the tower to the south. There is an internal driveway system and an effort has been made to downplay the car. The project proposes 18 townhouse units with full basements that are oriented to face the street on West Mall and the new roadsides to emphasize the pedestrian entrance to the homes. The project will be made of high quality materials including a wood roof, stone and granite. Green building measures include water efficient landscaping and sediment erosion control. The purpose of the land exchange is to strengthen the trail from West Mall to the woods and to mitigate the adjacent tower and grade separation.

Ron Rule described the landscape design. There is emphasis on creating a campus and pedestrian friendly orientation of the project. The trail will have a five percent slope so that it is accessible and units will have a direct visual connection to it.

The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:

Q: How many secondary suites re basement level?

A: All secondary suites are on the upper levels, above garages with separate entrances.

Board Comment: The trade-off between the park and trail is a good one.

Q: Can you please clarify the number and breakdown of parking stalls.

A: There are a total of 36 stalls, two of which are for visitors.

Board Comment: UBC Properties selected this scheme because it would provide the minimum number of units to meet the unit cap in the neighbourhood plan, while providing the maximum benefit to the University, including smaller rental units for faculty and staff. The applicant is to be complimented on the West Mall elevation, which is an excellent response to difficult site considerations.

Q: what consideration has been given to the security of the independent “cassidas?”

A: Entry is from a semi-public space with gates to provide visual cues and definition.

The Board requested to see the shadow drawings. Shadows do cross the Lot 10 site from the tower and the proponent indicated how the units were oriented to look away from the tower.

Q: What is the size of the units?

A: Approximately 2,700 square feet plus the basement.

Board Comment: Residents may encounter issues with not enough parking.

Applicant: The proposal is responding to 36 stalls as the required maximum.

Board Comment: The Board is encouraged to see developers responding to inclusion of secondary suites.

Q: What does the driveway access exit across from on the new road? The concern is nuisance light from cars into adjacent units.

A: *Referring to the context plan.* The exit is offset from the development on the north side of the new road and egress faces the linear park.

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimous):

That a Development for the 18-unit townhouse proposal by Ledingham McAllister Homes Limited, on Mid Campus Lot 10, be issued;

That the Development Permit Board supports the following determinations by UBC Campus and Community Planning:

- a) That the adjustments to the public park and open space designated in the Mid Campus plan to accommodate the 18 unit proposal do not require an amendment to the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan and can be accomplished through easements and other adjustments to legally defined parcels; and,
- b) That the Usable Neighbourhood Open space System (UNOS) resulting from the land exchange proposed to accommodate the 18 unit proposal will not compromise the objectives of the Mid Campus Neighbourhood Plan;

That the Development Permit be issued with the following variances:

- a. That the provisions of the agreement between the applicant and UBC Properties Trust be varied to provide for the following relaxations of setbacks:
 - i. Front (West Mall) setback of 4.57 m (15') be relaxed to 3.5 m (11'6");
 - ii. Rear (east) setback of 6.1 m (20') be relaxed to 4.57 m (15'); and,
 - iii. Side yard (north) setback of 4.57 m (15') be relaxed to 1.52 m (5');
- b. That the provisions of the *UBC Development Handbook* be varied to provide for a relaxation of allowable projections for the roof eave for Buildings A, B, C, D, F, G, H and I into the required yard setbacks to project 1.2 m whereas the UBC Development Handbook (Policy 7.3) states that eaves may project up to 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.

5.0 Other Business

5.1 UBC Development Permit Board Terms of Reference – Quorum

This item was deferred.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Karly Henney.



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, April 14, 2004
Time: 5:00 – 7:45 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Regrets: Michael Goldberg

Staff: Joe Stott, Associate Director Community & Land Use Planning; Jim Carruthers and Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Walter Francl, Walter Francl Architect Inc.; Mark Anderson, Carey Theological College; Paul Becker, Carey Theological College; Graeme Silvera, UBC Properties; David Roche, UBC Properties; Joe Redmond, UBC Properties; Eric Stedman, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates Landscape Architects; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Jason Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.

Members of the public: M. Goldberger, UEL Resident; J. Loewen, UEL Resident; T. Tiedje, UEL Resident

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

The Board approved the Agenda as circulated. Upon the impending retirement of Jim Carruthers, the Board thanked Jim C. for all his hard work over the years. The Board also welcomed Lisa Colby, his replacement, and Rachel Wiersma, the new Planning Assistant.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the January 21, 2004 Meeting

The Board approved the minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 02032: Carey College Multi-Use Building Amendment

Joe Stott introduced the application to amend DP 02032 and provided the background for the application. The Director of Planning issued the Development Permit DP 02032 on May 23, 2003 for this site. Joe S. directed the Board's attention to the proposed amendment and approved drawings attached to the report. The requested amendment for the Carey College Multi-Use Building is to alter the multiple pitched roofs to a more rectilinear building form and to substitute

the concrete masonry units on the ground floor elevations with granite masonry. Joe S. introduced Walter Francl of Walter Francl Architect Inc. to present the details for the application.

Walter Francl explained the rationale behind the change in the roof and masonry treatment on the ground floor. The roof for the Carey Multi-Use Building was originally designed with dormers and peaked roofs to reflect the Iona Building. This type of roof entailed a complicated drainage structure for the roof. The gables were decorative and not continued on the inside. The cost saved from changing the roof will be spent elsewhere, such as changing the masonry on the ground floor from concrete to granite.

Joe S. added that both the Theological Neighbourhood Planning Group and the developer of the adjacent Lot 41 townhouses gave letters supporting the proposed changes.

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

Board Comments: When the project was first presented, the peaked roofs were designed to reflect the character of the Iona Building because of the visual impact of the building as it is visible from the street. The Board agrees the proposed gutters crossing the windows are not desirable.

Q: What are the budget implications for using granite compared with the change in the roof?

A: The change with the roof and the replacement of the granite are substitutable.

Q: Why were the original gables false?

A: The attic space would have been used for mechanical installations.

Q. The motion from Item 3.0 Carey College Multi-Use Building – DA 02032 of the Development Permit Board meeting on February 20, 2003 was discussed, specifically, the second condition that the roof materials and detailing be consistent with the Iona Building. Why is the roof metal?

A. Because the roof colour was the only requirement for this building; there were no previous requirements for materials. The roof material will be a dull grey metal with a shallow slope.

Q: Where is the granite being sourced? The neighbourhood should be consistent throughout.

A: Currently the granite is from Fox Island. For the Library and Chemistry Buildings, the granite was from Texada Island.

The following motion was moved, seconded, and carried (unanimous):

That the Development Permit Board approves the proposed amendment to the Development Permit, as shown on the attached drawings;

That staff will determine the source of the granite for the five buildings in the theological neighbourhood, and, if possible, coordinate the use of stone to be consistent throughout the neighbourhood.

Action: Contact Roger Moors, VST Properties, to verify the source of the granite.

4.0 DA 03055: UBC Dentistry Building

Joe Stott introduced the project and explained that this is the first development site to be developed under the new University Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed Dentistry Building will be located on the southwest corner of University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall. Staff provided a recommendation that the Development Permit Board direct the Associate Director, Community & Land Use Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed Dentistry Mixed-Use Building

by UBC Properties Trust. Joe S. introduced Eric Stedman, from Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden Architects to present the details of the application.

Eric Stedman explained the use for the Dentistry Mixed-Use Building project, which totals 119,000 sq. ft. The ground level use will be retail, level 2 use will be the Dentistry clinic, which is connected to the MacDonald Building, and levels 3 to 5 uses will be institutional offices. To the rear of the building, parking will be below grade and covered at grade. On University Boulevard, the new bus ramp will emerge in front of the proposed Dentistry Building, with a proposed greenway along University Boulevard.

There will be a dedicated driveway for this building, expanding the existing loading and garbage pick-up areas from the rear. On University Boulevard, the buildings will be setback above the 2nd level in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan. The 1st level will have a continuous canopy over the retail space. There will be mullions, with a 7-inch depth, on the University Boulevard exposure. The building will be built to a Silver LEED™ standard. Eric S. introduced Michael Patterson, from Perry & Associates Landscape Architects to present the landscaping for this project.

Michael Patterson outlined the areas where pavers were to be installed. The University Boulevard setback roof area façade will have planters. The Douglas fir on University Boulevard will need to be replaced, owing to underground servicing requirements.

Comments from the Advisory Urban Design Panel are included with the report.

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

Q: How was the number of parking stalls determined?

A: The number of stalls is based on 2 stalls per business, which is outlined in the Development Handbook.

Q: How will people be accommodated?

A: Faculty and staff are expected to use the existing parkades, such as the Health Sciences Parkade, or use transit. Surveys of the current Dentistry clients show they are already using transit; limited parking exists at present. There are dedicated parking stalls for retail.

Q: What does it mean by 4-16 stall bicycle racks?

A: There are 4 separate banks, each with 16 stalls, for a total of 64 stalls available for bicycles.

Q: What kind of security is available for bicycles?

A: The bicycle racks will be placed in a prominent, high pedestrian traffic location.

Q: Is a second level of bicycle security available for Faculty and Staff?

A: Bicycle storage, such as bike lockers, could be a possible addition in an area, such as the covered parking area.

Q: Is parallel parking available on the street?

A: None is available on the University Boulevard face of the building because of the right turn lane on University Boulevard to Wesbrook Mall.

Q: Is the underground parking gated?

A: No, this was not previously considered. The parking is for the public on an hourly basis.

Board Comment: Wayfinding is very important to incorporate into the design, providing good signage and easy access for people from parking to areas of the building.

Q. There are procedural concerns over the removal of the Douglas fir and this was not reflected on the plans provided to the Board.

A. There is an effort to retain as many of the existing trees as possible, but it was not guaranteed. This Douglas fir needed to be removed because of the road realignment and the sewer/drainage being installed.

Q. What is the setback distance between Level 2 and 3?

A. 2 metres.

Q. How high is the rail? There are concerns with the maintenance of the landscaping.

A. The rail is guard height and access to the area will be for maintenance only. Precast planters will be used, which are easier for maintenance and reduce drainage problems.

Q. There are no landscaped roof details. Why isn't there a feature patio?

A. The emissions from the fume hoods on the Freidman Building don't allow for this.

Board Comments: There are concerns with the relationship between the Dentistry building and the cube element facing Wesbrook Mall. There is not enough strength in the corner block to support the entrance to campus.

Board Comments: The deep mullions restrict the view to looking through the windows. The depth of the mullions should be reduced and the number of mullions should be reconsidered to find a balance between shading and view.

Q. What is the rationale behind the setback between the 2nd and 3rd floors?

A. The street wall height at grade is set at 2, possibly 3, storeys, mandated in the University Boulevard Neighbourhood Plan.

Q. What is the access from the parking lot to the retail area?

A. There is a ramp from Wesbrook Mall, which has 1/15 slope with intermediate landings. A short section of railing may be required along the ramp.

Q. Are there plans to expand the Dentistry program? The flexibility to expand in the future should be kept in the plan.

A. There are no plans at this point to expand. There are no physical space restrictions to expanding, but there would also be expanded mechanical requirements.

Board Comments: There are concerns with the durability of the building and keeping maintenance low, also about ensuring accessibility and safety, window cleaning and other maintenance. Restaurants require adequate air exchange, filtration and venting, and awareness of noise pollution from mechanical equipment.

A. Roof anchors will be installed for window cleaning.

Q. Will there be a further shift of the road from what is shown on the current plans?

A. No.

Q. Concerns about the cube element on the Wesbrook façade.

A. The cube element will have wood ceilings and specialized glazing and lighting. The UBC shield will be etched into glass and illuminated, so it will have a transparent look and be clearly visible.

Q. Can the heat from this building be used as an energy source for the pool?

A. No, this will be done on the north side of University Boulevard.

The Board took a recess at 6:35 p.m. for in camera deliberations and reconvened at 6:55 p.m.

Board Comments: There are concerns with the canopy, signage and lighting for the retail space. The canopy is very uniform and lacks individual character and flexibility for the future, when there is a change in tenants. There needs to be a balance between continuity and

individuality. Part of the Public Realm Architectural Competition for University Boulevard will create a new entrance to UBC, which won't be announced until as late as January 2005. Alternatives for the cube element need to be presented to the Board with specific details to decide on the design of this feature.

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously, Note: Al Poettcker abstained):

That the Development Permit Board approve a Development Permit for the proposed Dentistry Mixed-Use Building by UBC Properties Trust, on the southwest corner of University Boulevard and Wesbrook Mall, subject to the Development Permit Board receiving and considering the following:

1. Review design options for the cube element on the Wesbrook Mall side of the building. The cube element should also be reviewed as part of the Public Realm Architectural Competition for University Boulevard.
2. A redesign for the mullions on the north façade to improve balance between the view and light while preserving the university architectural character.
3. Provisions for canopy and signage design to be consistent with any forthcoming design guidelines developed as a result of the Public Realm Architectural Competition for University Boulevard.

The Development Permit Board recognizes the timing constraints with this application. The Applicant should attempt to address the above points and the application should be brought back to the next Development Permit Board meeting for further review.

5.0 DP 03050: Mid Campus Lots 17 & 20 Townhouses Amendment

Joe Stott introduced the application to amend DP 03050 and explained the project background. The Development Permit DP 03050 was issued on December 19, 2003 for this site. The requested amendment for the Mid Campus Lots 17 & 20 Townhouses is to relocate the underground parking garage entrance from East Mall to Eagles Drive. The amended parking entry location would require an easement of 425 sq. ft. in total area, over the portion of Lot 18 (park space) to accommodate a driveway. To balance the reduction in park space, an easement of identical shape and size would be needed elsewhere. Joe S. introduced Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust to present the application.

Matthew Carter introduced the project's architect Jason Letkeman from Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. and the landscape architect Michael Patterson from Perry & Associates Landscape Architects.

There are a number of reasons for this proposed change to the parking entry, as outlined in the report. The Eagles Drive location is a safer. The access to East Mall takes vehicular traffic across a sidewalk, a bike lane, and a row of street parking stalls and then directly onto a relatively busy road. The Eagles Drive location has less elevation change than the East Mall location. This is also safer as it improves driver/pedestrian visibility when a vehicle is emerging from the parking garage onto the street. The East Mall access permits only a 'right-in, right-out' traffic movement. The change increases the amount of parking stalls provided within the underground parking garage by 28 stalls, thereby alleviating future pressure for street parking in the neighbourhood. These additional stalls could alternatively be used for storage space.

The proposed driveway on Eagles Drive would encroach onto Lot 18, by 425 sq. ft. for driveway pavement and landscaping. The two alternatives to compensate for the encroachment area are to use 425 sq. ft. on Lot 19 or to designate 455 sq. ft. on the east corner of Lot 20 as open space.

Michael P. discussed the designation of the open space and the landscaping involved from the implications of the new driveway location. If the east corner of Lot 20 were designated as open/park space, this would enhance the pedestrian crossing at this location, across East Mall to the fields. There would be a plaza with a feature planting at this location. Where the driveway was removed on East Mall, there would be an opportunity to create a larger patio for the two adjacent units. The visual 'streetscape' on East Mall would be improved by landscaping over the area that currently contains the parking entry ramp and would have a more continuous look.

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

Board Comments: The Board commends the change. The new location reduces potential for conflicts with the higher traffic volumes and having to do U-turns on East Mall. The additional parking is a positive addition. The Board is concerned with the potential of headlights from vehicles exiting the parkade, affecting the lot to the west of Eagles Drive.

Q: Does the reallocation of open space require approval from the GVRD?

A: For minor amendments it is not required, but they have been informed of this application.

Q: Have garbage and recycling been addressed?

A: The garbage bins are more centrally located and easier access. There will be a stall set aside for a tractor to take the garbage bins to the curb.

Q. There are concerns with acoustically accommodating the overhead door.

A. The overhead door will be further recessed from the original location because there is less change in elevation at the new location and suspended gaskets will be used to minimize vibrations from the door.

Q. Will there be a fence at the east corner of the lot?

A. Yes, the area to be transferred to a park will be fenced off from the units, so it will look like an extension of the open space.

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously, Note: Al Poettcker abstained):

That the amendment to the Development Permit DP 03050 be issued with the following conditions:

- That the Useable Neighbourhood Open Space System (UNOS) resulting from the land exchange proposed to accommodate the relocated driveway will not compromise the objectives of the Mid-Campus Neighbourhood Plan.
- That the applicant confirm all required easement or subdivision arrangements on this property are completed to ensure:
 - ❑ The 425 sq. ft. portion of the existing park (Lot 18) is dedicated for Lot 17 driveway purposes.
 - ❑ A compensating 425 sq. ft. area from the east corner of Lot 20 is dedicated to the park (Lot 18) for park purposes.
- That the provisions of the *Development Handbook* be varied to provide for the horizontal length of the parking structure to project 3.0 m. into the south-west yard (zero lot line) whereas the *Development Handbook (Policy 7.3)* states that the horizontal projection shall not exceed 0.8 m into a yard greater than 2.1 m.

6.0 Annual Report to the Development Permit Board

The Board received the Annual Report for information.

7.0 Other Business

7.1 Letter of Request

The chair received a letter from Michael Goldberg requesting the Development Permit Board meeting schedule be more flexible. The Board discussed the merits of the regular meeting schedule already established for 2004 and agreed to keep the schedule. The chair will write back to Prof. Goldberg.

7.2 Comment from the public

A comment sheet was received from a member of the public regarding DA 03046: Theological Lot 41 Townhouses. The Board will send a written response to this comment.

8.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, May 19, 2004
Time: 5:10 – 6:30 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Regrets: David Barnes

Staff: Joe Stott, Associate Director Campus & Community Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Linda Moore, Associate Director, External Affairs, University Town; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Graeme Silvera, UBC Properties; Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Joost Bakker, Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden; Paul Becker, Space Planning Consultant

Members of the public: John Tompkins, V6T News

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.
The Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the April 14, 2004 Meeting

The Board approved the minutes as circulated.

2.1 Granite Coordination in the Theological Neighbourhood

The Board received the Granite Coordination report for information. The granite will not be from the same source but all granite in the precinct will match.

3.0 DA 03055: UBC Dentistry Building – Update and Reconsideration

Paul Becker, Space Planning Consultant, noted the project meets the objectives of the Faculty of Dentistry and is supported.

Joe Stott, Associate Director Campus & Community Planning, introduced the staff report and recommendation and noted that the Board had considered this project at its April 14, 2004 meeting. The Board had given preliminary approval to the project at that meeting subject to receiving and considering revisions to the corner feature, the depth of the mullions, and further exploration of canopy and signage design. Joe S. introduced Joost Bakker of Hotson Bakker Boniface Haden to present the revisions for this project.

Mr. Bakker explained that the corner feature is considered integral to the architecture of the Dentistry Building. The proposed window mullions will be reduced in size from 8 to 6 inches. The scale and the depth of the mullions are important for the collegiate gothic character of the building. Two design scenarios for the canopy and signage were submitted with the report. Scenario 1 is a fixed glass canopy with signage below. Scenario 2 is a retractable canopy with individual signage above canopy. Mr. Bakker recommends a combination of the two scenarios, using a fixed glass canopy with individual tenant signage according to the general guidelines presented.

The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:

Corner Feature:

Q. Is it possible to submit the specifications of the steel for the corner architectural feature at a later date?

A. The steel is already tendered.

Q. How is the corner feature lit?

A. The feature will be lit independently from the back at night. The area could be arranged internally to prevent clutter and discourage the posting of papers against the glass, detracting from the view of this feature from the street.

Q. Is crest intended for the corner feature?

A. There hasn't been a final decision on whether or which crest will be used. It could be the Faculty of Dentistry or the UBC logo or crest. The feature is 14 feet high and protrudes 3 feet. There are 2 options for the logo on the glass. It could be sandblasted, so there is no colour, or it could be embedded into the glass (blue and gold colours). The entire surface of the glass could be etched so there is no view to the inside and light will still filter through.

Mullions:

The mullions are 6 inches by 2 ½ inches and are clipped onto the "I" sections from the outside. The inside piece will hold the glass, which reaches from floor to ceiling. The total depth is 12 inches, 6 inches on the inside and 6 inches on the outside.

Q. Is the change from 8 inches to 6 inches significant?

A. The mullions are used as a shading device and to increase energy efficiency in the building. The depth varies around the building, with the mullions in the recesses being shallower. The spandrels will be grey, matching the granite. It was felt that the mullions could not be reduced further without compromising the shading effect and the designed architectural relief.

Board Comment: The depth of the mullions is a concern because of view blockage. Measures also need to be taken to prevent birds roosting on the horizontal components.

Signage and Canopy:

Board Comment: There should be no signage on the upper floors.

Q: The functionality of the canopy for rain protection is important. What will be the height and width of the canopy?

A. There is a grade difference, so the canopy will be at the same level and a terrace will be built on the corner for a café. The width will be as wide as structurally possible.

Board Comment: Ensure signage does not take over from the individuality of retail spaces.

Board Comment: One member noted a concern with the role of the Development Permit Board in design issues and felt design details should be dealt with by the Advisory Urban Design Panel. Some members felt that the DP Board is the last approval stage and obvious design concerns should be raised within reason.

Linda Moore updated the Board on the status of the Architectural Competition for University Boulevard as it relates to the Dentistry Building. Ms. Moore suggested that the final resolution of the corner feature crest, signage, and canopies might be incorporated into the competition.

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously, Note: Al Poettcker abstained):

- A. That the Development Permit Board directs the Associate Director, Community & Land Use Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed Dentistry Mixed-Use Building by UBC Properties Trust, subject to the following conditions:

Drawings conditionally approved April 14, 2004, to be further amended as follows:

- (i) Dentistry Building corner feature at University Blvd. and Wesbrook Mall shall be recessed further into the building massing conforming to the May 10, 2004 submission by Hotson Bakker.

Applicant will work with staff on the glazing/etching of the glass and compliance of the crest with UBC's Visual Identity Policy;

- (ii) Window mullions for the building are to be reduced to a 6-inch depth and the profile refined as documented in the May 10, 2004 submission by Hotson Bakker;
- (iii) Main floor street-front canopy design is to be consistent with principles and scale of Option 1 of the Hotson Bakker May 10, 2004 submission; and
- (iv) Tenant street-front signage and storefront design shall be subject to the recommended general character guidelines outlined in the May 10, 2004 Hotson Bakker submission, which are to be incorporated into the Development Permit.

- B. Revised Plans illustrating all revisions noted above are to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Associate Director of Campus & Community Planning prior to issuance of the Building Permit.

Action: Staff to work on a signage policy with UBC Properties Trust.

4.0 Other Business

4.1 Correspondence

The Board received a draft table prepared for review of Unit Type Ratios for Theological and Mid-Campus Neighbourhoods for information. This item will be supported by a staff report at the Development Permit Board Meeting on June 16, 2004.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, June 23, 2004
Time: 5:15 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Regrets: Michael Goldberg

Staff: Joe Stott, Associate Director Campus & Community Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Norm Couttie, Adera Development; Darren Chung, Adera Development; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd.; Jane Durante, AUDP.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.
The Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the May 19, 2004 Meeting

There was a revision of the minutes from the May 19, 2004 meeting under *Item 3.0*, the last paragraph, regarding the Architectural Competition. The Board approved the revised minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 04005: Lot 14, Mid-Campus Residential Development

Joe Stott, Associate Director Campus & Community Planning, introduced the project for the Lot 14, Mid-Campus Residential Development. An on-table memo to accompany the staff report is provided to the Board. This memo is provided for clarification on the variances for this project, which included a revised Variance Diagram, dated June 18, 2004. The application was brought to the AUDP on May 20, 2004. It was not supported by the AUDP and the minutes from that meeting are attached to the staff report.

Joe S. described the site context for the application. There is a park to the north of Lot 14, which will be completed with the new community centre being built across Main Mall by Summer 2005. There is also a greenway on the east side and a greenspace the south, behind Forintec. Joe S. introduced Norm Couttie to present the application.

Norm C. explained the general site layout and topography of Lot 14. The front, main entrance into the proposed development will be in the centre of the building and at grade with Eagles Drive, for ease of accessibility. The parkade access is from Eagles Drive, on the southeast corner of the building.

The roof will be pitched along the edge, which will only be seen from a distance because of the large roof overhang, and flat in the centre. The theme for Reflections is "West Coast Classic." The architectural style of the building reads more as 2 buildings than 1 with the spandrel blocks and modified roof. The AUDP would prefer a more contemporary style.

The applicant is working with the UBC Sustainability Office to meet the requirements of the June 2004 draft sustainability checklist. The applicant expects to meet all 16 required items and 10 of the optional. They are also trying to increase the value of the checklist to quantify the designs through a cost comparable method.

The 80 proposed landscaping trees include the smaller species, such as Japanese and vine maples. The 6 London plane trees will be removed as they were topped for the hydrolines above, losing their symmetry and are not in a healthy condition to be preserved. The hydrolines will be removed by this fall and buried under Wesbrook Mall. Six new London Plane trees have been secured, which are 9-10 inches in diameter. These are much smaller in size and will take approximately 20 years to match the size of the existing trees.

The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:

- Q. What was the intent of the AUDP commentary regarding Main Mall?
- A. Jane Durante, chair of the AUDP responded. The architectural form and how the buildings conform are central to this discussion. The AUDP wanted to ensure Main Mall maintained its grandness and form from one end to the other. The rigid symmetry is a concern, as well as the style of architecture. If this proposed building was biaxial and broken in the centre, it would conform more to the style of Main Mall.
- C. A distinction between the conditions defined in the development permit compared to the sustainability checklist is required.
- C. All conditions defined in the development permit should be to the satisfaction of the Associate Director, Community & Land Use Planning, rather than other staff.
- C. Further to the AUDP's comments regarding contemporary design, Properties Trust has received feedback from students, faculty, and staff indicating a preference for more traditional design.
- C. There is a request for further details on:
- The landscape plan, including specific materials being used;
 - Management, maintenance, and liability of landscape, especially with regards to the reflecting pool;
 - Exterior building finishes;
 - Access to roof; and
 - Layout of electrical and mechanical equipment on roof.
- Q. Will the swale be blocked with the pond?
- A. A pipe will be installed under the paved area connecting the Main Mall walkway with the pond, so drainage will not be obstructed.
- Q. Why is the FSR 1.83 at this site when it is defined as 1.6 in the Neighbourhood Plan?
- A. FSR of 1.6 is an average for the site. A site can have an FSR from 1.2 to 2.0, as outlined in the CCP, as long as the overall neighbourhood average is maintained.
- Q. What is meant by the applicant's use of the term affordable housing?
- A. 'Affordability' is an OCP and CCP objective. For this case, the applicant used the term in the general sense of more reasonably affordable market housing.
- C. The sustainability measures need to be more defined.

The Development Permit Board moved and carried the motion for deferral of the application for the following reasons:

- 1. AUDP concerns to be addressed;**
- 2. Applicant to review and revisit issues raised at this meeting;**
- 3. Applicant to provide more information and details of finishes on drawings;**
- 4. Applicant to provide a more definitive description of sustainability measures proposed; and**
- 5. Applicant to try to minimize variances requested.**

4.0 Other Business

None

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2004
Time: 5:15 – 7:15 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
Michael Goldberg
Al Poettcker
Fred Pritchard

Regrets: Jim Taylor

Staff: Joe Stott, Associate Director Campus & Community Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Kevin Mahon, Adera Development; Darren Chung, Adera Development; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd.; Joe Redmond, UBC Properties; Joyce Drohan, AUDP; John Tompkins, V6T News.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.
The Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the June 23, 2004 Meeting

The Board approved the June 23, 2004 minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 04005: Reflections - Lot 14, Mid-Campus Residential Development – Update and Reconsideration

In speaking to the staff report circulated with the agenda, Joe Stott noted that the item is a resubmission of the proposal for Lot 14, Mid-Campus Residential Development proposal. The DP Board had considered this project at its June 23, 2004 meeting and deferred final consideration pending design revisions to address the DP Boards concerns.

Joe S. introduced Kevin Mahon, Adera Properties, to present the revised application.

Kevin M. then introduced the project team, Darren Chung, Dale Staples, and Jonathan Losee.

Dale S. cited the response to the concerns identified by the Development Permit Board on June 23, 2004. The building will be moved 18 inches to the North, to minimize the number of variances requested. The break between the buildings would be accentuated to address one of the concerns of the AUDP. The water feature would be located solely on Lot 14, without any encroachment onto Main Mall. There would be a direct pedestrian connection from Main Mall to

the proposed building. Symmetry of the building would be broken up by using different materials and finishes for each of the two parts.

Jonathan L. discussed the landscaping details proposed for this project. The landscaping would be more formalized than previous designs, with plantings similar to Journey, to tie the two projects together visually.

Kevin M. discussed the sustainability measures that would be incorporated in this project, meeting 14 of the 16 mandatory items and five optional items from the draft UBC Environmental Assessment Program. Some of the optional items include installing a central hot water system and metering consumption for individual units. A deep water well is also being installed for drainage and it could also serve for irrigation. The parkade walls will be prefabricated off-site to reduce onsite waste and efficient use of materials. Indoor air quality would be improved with the use of appropriate materials, such as sealants.

The DP Board Chairman invited comments from Joyce Drohan, AUDP representative, regarding this application.

Ms Drohan advised that it should be considered a privilege to develop along Main Mall for its generosity, formality, and dignity. There is a demand for quality in this project, which still needs to be addressed. A contemporary style would be more appropriate, as it would be more formal. The applicant has made a start on sustainability, but has not pushed the envelope far enough.

The Board had the following questions and the Applicant responded:

- Q. How are the retaining walls treated? Is there exposed concrete?
- A. Granite will be on the lower portions, with architectural concrete (well-vibrated, so there are no air pockets) between, which will be hidden behind plantings.
- Q. One DP Board member asked whether allowing this project to exceed the 1.6 average FSR of the Neighbourhood Plan will lead to insufficient FSR available for remaining sites in that category. This member also asked that future staff reports for housing proposals in this area contain an update on the status of FSR build-out and remaining potential.
- A. Staff responded that the FSR balance is being monitored and the remaining FSR for future development sites in this 1.6 FSR category within Mid-Campus is still healthy and reasonable. The FSR build out and balance remaining within the neighbourhood/precinct will be reported to the DP Board in future for information purposes on projects in this area.

The Board had the following comments:

- ❑ There was some concern regarding the potential appearance from Main Mall, if private, ground-oriented patios are not well maintained, or become storage spaces for private clutter and toys. There was also a wish to avoid the long-term appearance of too many formal pathways to Main Mall, one from each unit, yet durable walking surfaces would be needed to avoid hard-packed dirt trails being created across the grass. The applicant should address this design challenge.
- ❑ A document, *Green Building Technology Requirements*, is under development between UBC and the City of Vancouver, and completion is expected by this fall.
- ❑ It was felt that the entry door from Main Mall should have a stronger expression.
- ❑ One DP Board member commented that this project is taking good steps to meet UBC objectives and has worked hard at respecting context. It now has a stronger sense of community with its relationship to Main Mall, and has a good balance of materials and shapes. Separation between the buildings has been improved and it has a pleasing architectural style.

DP Board Decision:

The Chair acknowledged the applicant's efforts to redesign this project, particularly with respect to sustainability measures, and the \$20,000 contribution to the well-drain project.

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously):

That the Development Permit Board authorize the Acting Director, Campus and Community Planning, to issue a Development Permit for the proposed apartment project, as shown on the drawings (Attachment A) of the staff report, subject to:

- 1. The applicant reaching agreement to the satisfaction of the Acting Director of Planning on the following:**
 - a) Revision of the entryway off Main Mall;**
 - b) Ensuring that retaining walls along Main Mall are faced with granite or fronted with mature landscaping to obscure the concrete at time of planting;**
 - c) Provision of pathway connections to Main Mall in order to respect the principles of ground-oriented housing, but designing pathways so as not to render that landscape too 'busy' with direct paved pathway entries to each unit along Main Mall. (E.g. Applicant should explore loose gravel paths, combination/consolidation of 2 or three pathways into one as they approach Main Mall, etc. Applicant to consult with Kim Perry to discuss the pathway solutions that firm has recently developed to address a similar challenge elsewhere on campus);**
 - d) Revision of the roof design to result in a complete roof rather than a partial peaked roof around the perimeter. (Allowances are permitted for mechanical equipment);**
 - e) Redesign of the window detailing separating the 2 buildings;**
 - f) Ensuring that all lights on Main Mall are equipped with lighting shields – no light bulbs showing;**
 - g) That the applicant fulfil commitments regarding sustainability measures itemized in Attachment C of this report;**
 - h) That two parking stalls be reserved for car co-operative parking and that, subject to resolution of safety and security concerns to the satisfaction of the Acting Director, Campus & Community Planning, recharging outlets be provided for alternate fuel vehicles such as NEV (Neighbourhood Electric Vehicles) and NGV (Natural Gas Vehicles).**
- 2. That Section MC3.5 (f) of the Development Handbook (Maximum Site coverage 50%) be varied to permit site coverage of 50.25% for this project.**

4.0 Other Business

Joyce Drohan, who is a member of the Advisory Urban Design Panel (AUDP), asked whether she might pose two questions to the Development Permit Board on behalf of the AUDP.

Ms. Drohan asked the DP Board to consider whether, as a matter of protocol, a project should move forward for consideration by the DP Board, if it has not received design support from the AUDP. Ms. Drohan also requested clarification of an earlier DP Board member comment that design is not meant to be an issue at this stage of the Development Permit Board process. If design is not considered a relevant issue, AUDP members may reconsider the value of attending AUDP meetings to review projects.

The DP Board Chairman clarified that the Development Permit Board, which operates under the authority of the Development Permit Board Terms of Reference as set out by the Board of Governors, does not want to become involved in too much detailed design discussion. However,

being a last point of decision-making, the DP Board does retain the right and obligation to comment on any issues that cause them concern, which may in some cases involve design detail.

The Chairman also clarified that AUDP review and commentary is extremely important advice in the decision-making process for the Development Permit Board. However, since the AUDP is an advisory body, applicants are entitled to proceed to the DP Board for consideration after AUDP review, positive or negative. Applicants are expected to provide reasonable response and consideration regarding AUDP commentary, and the DP Board factors such response into their decision-making.

The Chairman is preparing a report for a one-year review for the September 2004 meeting of the Board of Governors as part of a regular reporting process to monitor and improve the development review. The AUDP comment will be reviewed within the scope of the DP Board annual report procedure.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, August 25, 2004
Time: 5:00 – 7:30 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Regrets: Jim Taylor
Michael Goldberg

Staff: Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, UBC Properties; Tom Miller, Intracorp Developments Ltd.; Douglas Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects; Allan Seppanen, Ramsay Worden Architects; Lena Chorobik, Wendy Grandin/Viewpoint Landscape Architects; and Jane Durante, AUDP.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
The Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the July 21, 2004 Meeting

The Board approved the July 21, 2004 minutes as circulated, with changes to *Section 4.0*.

3.0 DP 04007: Theological Lot 38 Apartment Building and Lots 21 through 28, Duplexes

Tom Miller from Intracorp Developments introduced the project on Theological Lots 21 to 28 and 38 and introduced the consultant team. These lots make up Site C in the Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design and Development Requirements. There are 8 duplexes proposed for Lots 21 to 28 and Lot 38 will have a 58-unit 4-storey woodframe apartment building including townhouses.

Doug Ramsay from Ramsay Worden Architects explained the proposal in detail in the context of Site C requirements outlined in the Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design and Development Requirements. There is a pond in the centre between the future building on Lot 37 and that proposed on Lot 38. There is a grade change of 20 feet across the site from Iona Drive to Chancellor Boulevard. Along the east side of Lot 38, between Lot 38 and St. Marks College, a major north-south pedestrian access will be created. A lot line adjustment is under negotiation between Lot 38 and St. Marks College to give more room to St. Marks around the west edge of its encroaching building footprint. A number of trees will be saved in this area. The design for Lot 38 is a wood frame building and will also include brick and hardy board accent panels. The duplexes will have a similar design vocabulary as VST and Chancellor Hall. Chancellor Mews will be designed for both cars and pedestrians, providing pedestrian entrances to the townhouse units and vehicular access to the duplexes and apartment building parkade.

Doug R. summarised five major items upon which the Advisory Urban Design Panel had commented:

- 1) Mirroring of duplexes

- 2) Woonerf
- 3) Apartment building materials
- 4) Sustainability
- 5) Pond

Lena Chorobik from Wendy Grandin/Viewpoint Landscape Architects discussed the landscape design. As many trees as possible will be preserved, especially ones along the pedestrian pathway between Lot 38 and St. Marks. The pond will be made of concrete, and shrubs will be planted to screen between decks.

The Board discussed the following:

Woonerf (Chancellor Mews)

- There was some concern over the practicability of the woonerf. Ensure garage doors are closed, cars are stored in garages, no parking along the Mews, and landscaping does not block children's play areas. Consider incorporating rules into the strata bylaw.
- Concern with width of woonerf.
- Is it consistent with the overall comprehensive road and woonerf design in the Theological Neighbourhood.

Pond

- The pond is a great asset if it is built properly. Sustainability approach with the pond is good. Ensure the pond has adequate length of warranty time.

Community Garden

- Ensure the edge on Chancellor Boulevard is a formally designed landscape edge buffer to prevent unsightly visual impact on Chancellor Boulevard.
- Applicant advised the gardens are intended only for non-ground oriented units on the Lot 38 apartment building.

Building

- Ground-oriented units should have swing doors, instead of sliding for security reasons.
- "Ground-oriented" as defined in the Development Handbook needs to be amended as it is open to interpretation.
- Space between apartment building and townhouses seems narrow - ensure safety, and suitable landscaping.
- Ensure durability of woodframe building.
- Applicant advised that mailing addresses for duplexes are on Chancellor Boulevard, townhomes are from the Mews, and the apartment building is from Iona Drive.
- Board members suggested the applicant consider converting some recreational rooms to secondary lock-offs in duplexes or townhouses. Applicant advised that this project does not include secondary suites as it is targeting a different market; also access and space are limited.

Parking

- Visitor parking is above grade. Signage will designate visitor parking stalls and will be enforced by the strata. No visitor parking stalls will be available for the duplexes.
- Ensure parking count meets requirements.
- Parkade exhaust venting onto Mews may be a concern; applicant should review.

Sustainability

- There was discussion concerning details and depth of the proposed green roof. Applicant advised that the green roof is on a wood structure and works structurally. This is still being reviewed with envelope consultant and under experimentation. There are concerns with the roof drying out in the summer months. Warranties are being researched. One board member suggested that applicant consider floating the green roof on top of the existing roof to ensure easy access if roof later needs repairing.
- Commentary was invited from the AUDP chair, Jane Durante. Jane D. noted that bookend units could be made more contemporary and less Tudor.

- One member noted that duplexes should be balanced so each unit reads as balanced and equal in the overall design and as two addresses. Currently the roofline makes one unit look like part of the other. Each unit should read clearly or one unit should read as the 'Manor House'.
- Review sustainability measures; consider metering hot water, central air exchange, prefab parkade, etc.

DP Board Decision:

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously):

- A. That the Development Permit Board directs the Acting Director, Campus & Community Planning, to issue a Development Permit for the proposed development as shown on the attached drawings (Attachment A).**
- B. That the applicant undertakes sustainability measures during construction of this project as outlined in the Green Features submission dated August 16, 2004 (also Attachment A) and to give consideration to further comments offered by the Development Permit Board in the discussion of this application.**
- C. That the applicant register a public access easement in favour of UBC along the east side walkway, south side walkway and woonerf between the duplexes and Lot 38 as a condition of this Development Permit.**
- D. That the following variances to the Development Handbook be approved:**
 - (i) Section TN 1.5 requiring a minimum rear setback for duplexes of 7.5 m (24.6 ft) be relaxed to 0.6 m (2 ft);**
 - (ii) Section TN 3.5 allowing a maximum height of four storeys or 15.2 m, to be increased by 0.65 m (2.1 ft) to allow four storeys and a maximum height of 15.95 m in the two locations as shown on Plan DP 3.02;**
 - (iii) Section TN 7.3 porch overhang and TN 3.5 interim side setback be relaxed to be consistent with Section 3.3 and Section 5.2 respectively of the Theological Neighbourhood Development and Design Requirements.**
- E. That the design of two bookend duplex buildings be revisited as per commentary at the Development Permit Board.**
- F. That the Development Handbook be amended to clarify that future interpretation of "ground-oriented" units only include patios on land accessing public space, rather than on ponds. Where possible, compensation should be provided on Lot 37 for those Lot 38 ground-oriented units that only provided outdoor access to ponds.**

Woonerf

The Board has request Campus & Community Planning to coordinate the overall design of the woonerf to be consistent on both the east and west side of Theology Mall. Details to include: curbs, street furniture, plantings, garbage pick-up, pavement patterns, and lighting.

4.0 Other Business

4.1 Revised Date for September meeting.

September meeting has been cancelled.

4.2 Theological Neighbourhood

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously):

- A. That to ensure build-out of the Theological Neighbourhood, that allows timely adjustment of housing initiatives in order to meet OCP live-work objectives, the Development Permit Board requests Campus & Community Planning to send letters to all five Theological Neighbourhood property owners to clarify the status of housing targets. The Development Permit Board requests that Campus & Community Planning direct all applications coming forward to show how these housing targets are being met.**

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, October 27, 2004
Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Regrets: Michael Goldberg

Staff: Joe Stott, Acting Director, C&CP, Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services;
Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

Presenters/Guests: Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc; Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates; Dave Roche, UBC Properties Trust; and John Tompkins, V6T News.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair welcomed and introduced John Metras, Director of Plant Operations, to the Development Permit Board (DP Board). The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The DP Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the August 25, 2004 Meeting

The Chair requested an update on items from the August 25, 2004 meetings.

- Item 3.0 - DP 04007: Staff have not had time to review the plans for the redesign of the bookends on Lots 21 to 28, as they were only received by staff a few days before this meeting. An update on DP 04007 will be provided at the December DP Board meeting. David Grigg, Associate Director, Infrastructure & Services Planning, is reviewing the design of the entire length of the woonerf and coordinating with the applicants.
- Item 4.2 A - Theological Neighbourhood live-work objectives: Meetings are underway with C&CP, UBC PT, and VST PT. The GVRD has also provided a template for outlining housing targets at UBC, which will be completed for the November GVRD-UBC Joint Committee meeting and provided at the December DP Board meeting.

The DP Board approved the August 25, 2004 minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP 04012: Hawthorn Place Community Centre

Lisa Colby presented the staff report to the panel and introduced Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the Hawthorn Place Community Centre. Matthew C. provided the context and background for the project. Sustainability measures based on the Draft Environmental Assessment Program, dated June 2004. Matthew C. introduced the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., and the landscape architect, Richard Stevenson, Stevenson & Associates to provide the details for this application.

Ray L. discussed the siting and architectural details of the community centre building. These details include expressing internal activities through glazing, roof form expresses former barn site, and granite is added to the base with shingle roofs and siding.

Richard S. introduced the landscape context and existing site for this project. Details of landscaping to include indoor and outdoor activities, public art, activities for children of all ages, basketball area, natural amphitheatre, and garden area extending from the café. The existing London Plane Trees will be maintained.

The Board discussed the following:

Community Centre Building

- Building expected to be completed in 9 months.
- One member disagreed with the applicant's statement recorded in the AUDP minutes from the Sept. 23, meeting: 'Daycare space is not going to be converted for evening use.' UBC Housing and Conferences have been retained as the operator and will determine the use of the space. This may have been a misunderstanding. The space needs to be flexible and try to incorporate evening use.
- The original cupola, removed during the demolition of the 'Old Horse Barn' has been stored in South Campus. A replica should be incorporated into the design, as the original is in poor shape.
- On-site composting can be joined with the in-vessel compost facility in South Campus.
- Garbage collection will be from Larkin Drive.
- There will be no restaurant fans, as the café will be a deli.
- The foyer will have an administration desk with it. The vestibule would be used for a lounge area with Internet connections.

Landscaping

- Construction noise is a concern if delayed from the completion of the building. UBC PT has an agreement to have all park space completed by August 2005. The deferral of the landscape design for this site should not be a concern.
- One member questioned the jurisdiction of the AUDP's involvement in the public realm of Mid Campus. Further study of the Main Mall landscape design principles will be coordinated by staff based upon input now received.
- Lighting along Main Mall is important to extend the use of the open space. Review the possibility of adding timers to lights to preserve energy.
- There's a concern with the basketball court being noisy and disruptive. Review the possibility to improve the existing facility at Totem Park instead of adding a new court here.
- Curve in sidewalk is for safety reasons to slow down cyclist. Review other alternatives to slow bike traffic. East sidewalk along Main Mall should be straight, west sidewalk heads south by the meadow.
- Play area is fenced in.
- Seating area on the terrace will have sun in the afternoon and the deli area has sun in the morning.

Sustainability

- Life cycle costs for the building have not been completed yet. Detailed quantifying of various sustainability measures not yet done.
- This application focused on the draft UBC EAP instead of LEED as it was found to be a better fit for the building.
- Review the possibility to incorporate the functional element of the cupola as a sustainability feature.
- Revisit adding a heat pump to reduce energy costs.
- Sustainability should include energy and water efficiency, liveability, durability, security, beauty, and accountability.

The DP Board congratulates the applicant on the design for this project.

DP Board Decision:

The following motion was moved, seconded and carried (unanimously):

- A. That the Development Permit Board directs the Acting Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the Hawthorn Place Community Centre as shown in the architectural plans attached to this report in Attachment A, subject to the following, to the satisfaction of the Acting Director, Campus & Community Planning:
 - 1) Removal of all references to specific internal uses in the building;
 - 2) Ensure installation of landscaping is complete by August 2005;
 - 3) Revisit the basketball court;
 - 4) Revisit the rational for the curve in the sidewalk; and
 - 5) Revisit the installation of the cupola on the barn.
- B. That the landscape labelled as 'Area 1' on the Landscape Plan (Attachment B of this report), plus all adjacent streetscape/landscape work on Thunderbird Boulevard and Larkin Drive, excluding the central pool feature east of the building, be approved as part of this Development Permit.
- C. That consideration of the remaining landscape design proposed for Lot 13 as shown on the Landscape Plan (Attachment B of this report) be deferred for a maximum of 6 months (April 30, 2005), pending the applicant's submission of a revised landscape plan. (*Note: Staff will contact the applicant within this time period with suggested modifications following completion of a study establishing design criteria and principles for this portion of Main Mall.*)
- D. That sustainability measures described in Attachment C be implemented as a condition of this Development Permit.
- E. That stormwater runoff from the community centre site be linked with the existing park drainage system to the southwest on Larkin Drive.

4.0 Other Business

None.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, November 24, 2004
Time: 5:00 – 6:15 p.m.
Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
John Metras
Al Poettcker
Fred Pritchard
Jim Taylor
Michael Goldberg

Staff: Joe Stott, Acting Director, C&CP; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: John O'Donnell and Ward McAllister, Ledingham McAllister; Keith Hemphill, Rostich Hemphill and Associates Architects; Matthew Carter and Paul Young, UBC Properties Trust; and Jane Durante, AUDP Chair.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The DP Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the October 27, 2004 Meeting

The DP Board approved the October 27, 2004 minutes as circulated.

3.0 Update on Housing Statistics for the Theological Neighbourhood

A staff report was submitted, transmitting the Theological Neighbourhood Group's (TNG) November 15, 2004 status report on how development is reaching the Official Community Plan's (OCP) housing targets within the Theological Neighbourhood (TN). At its August 25, 2004 meeting, the DP Board had requested such an update from the TNG.

The DP Board discussed whether additional types of housing that help achieve the objective of reducing commuter households should also be included in the work-study category for OCP target purposes:

- Retired professors and lecturers
- Graduate student housing
- Live/work (home businesses) not related to UBC.

The DP Board expressed support for staff's further exploration of these ideas with the GVRD in ongoing Neighbourhood Plan development. Board members further emphasized their commitment to reviewing all upcoming projects for compliance to housing targets and that regular target status reports continue to be supplied.

The DP Board expressed some concern over the sequencing of development such that target percentages of rental, non-market, ground-oriented, and work-study housing are not being met for the number of units built to date. On behalf of the TNG Mr. Moors and Mr. Phillips explained that their development plan for the neighbourhood does satisfy the targets although a disproportionate share of the market housing will be built first. The TNG noted that they have no choice but to adopt the current sequence of development in order to raise revenue to develop the non-market housing projects, but they are committed to honouring the TN plan and its targets.

DP Board Decision:

The following motion was moved and seconded:

That the Development Permit Board receive the staff report and thank the Theological Neighbourhood Group for the update.

CARRIED (unanimously)

4.0 DP03051: Mid Campus Lot 2 (formerly Lot 10), Somerset Townhouses DP Amendment Request

Lisa Colby presented the staff report to the DP Board, highlighting the various DP amendments being requested by the applicant including, of note, the proposal of 24 hour automated gates at the main entry. The staff report raised concerns regarding gated communities in University Town but under the circumstances and recommended the DP Board require any gates to be fixed open during daylight hours year-round, but noted other requested architectural amendments were supportable.

Lisa C. introduced John O'Donnell, Ledingham McAllister, to present the amendment to the application for the Lot 2 Somerset Townhomes in Mid Campus. John O'Donnell and Ward McAllister, Ledingham McAllister developer for the project explained why they wanted 24 hour automated gates and that marketing material back in June 2004 had led purchasers to believe gates would be provided. Sales may now be lost if gates are not provided.

The Board discussed the following:

- The Development Permit Board did not previously receive drawings with the gates and did not discuss this topic when the application was reviewed in the January 2004 meeting.
- There is a difference between a gated community and a development with gates.
- The development is private property, so there should be no through-access on the site.
- With the perspective of the location of this development next to the highrise, it is not unreasonable to have some form of a gate.
- CPTED is an important part of every development.
- The developer should not have advertised the project as an 'exclusive gated community' when gates were not permitted in the original Development Permit.
- There is no specific OCP policy to prohibiting gates.
- One member acknowledged the applicant for their work on the addition of the open space between Promontory and Somerset.
- This development is different from other Mid Campus developments as it is the only one with surface parking. This creates a perception issue with driveways compared with underground parking.
- One member noted that gated communities are negative to the branding of University Town.
- Secured parking and a gated development are two very different things. These houses have individual garages with automatic doors
- The Mid Campus Community is unique with the variety of housing from Faculty/Staff Rental to high-end townhomes in the same neighbourhood.

The DP Board Chairman invited comments from Jane Durante, AUDP Chair, regarding this application.

Ms. Durante summarised past comments from a previous AUDP meeting on this project. The AUDP (4-5 members) did not support a gated community. There was a philosophic objection to a gated project and the Panel firmly held that the gates would be inappropriate.

DP Board Decision:

Recommendations as outlined in the November 24, 2004 staff report were not supported.

The following motion was instead moved and seconded:

That the Development Permit Board directs the Acting Director of Campus and Community Planning to issue an amended permit DP03051 allowing all requested changes listed in the applicant's letter of October 14, 2004 and revised plans dated October 12, 2004.

CARRIED

5.0 Other Business

5.1 Change Date of December 22, 2004 Meeting

The December meeting will start at 4:30 on December 22, 2004.

5.2 Approval for the 2005 Meeting Schedule

The DP Board approved the Development Permit Board 2005 schedule as circulated.

6.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.



UBC Development Permit Board

Minutes

Date: Wednesday, December 22, 2004

Time: 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Venue: Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

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

Members absent: Michael Goldberg

Staff: Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

Presenters/Guests: Raymond Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Robert Brown, Laurin Thompson, and Barb Tully, UBC Properties Trust; and Jane Durante, AUDP Chair.

1.0 Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. The DP Board approved the Agenda as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the November 24, 2004 Meeting

The DP Board approved the November 24, 2004 minutes as circulated.

3.0 DP04022: East Campus Lot 5, Apartment Residences (EC5)

Lisa Colby presented the staff report to the DP Board. Lisa C. also presented the on-table memo dated December 21, 2004 to the DP Board that reviewed and updated the recommendations of the staff report with regards to the tenant parking.

Lisa C. introduced Barb Tully, UBC Properties Trust, to present the application for the Lot 5 Apartment Residences in East Campus. Barb T. provided the background for the project. Barb T. introduced the architect Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., and the landscape architect, Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, to provide the details for this application.

Ray L. discussed the security, layout of the units, and character of the apartment building. Michael P. introduced the landscape context with pedestrian movement around the site and details around the building.

The DP Board discussed the following:

Apartment Residences

- There is currently no policy in place to reserve these market rental units for UBC students although they are the market being targeted. Discussions are underway regarding priority for UBC students.

- While the application submitted indicates that UBC Properties Trust will manage this project, this may change. It has not been decided, whether it will be by UBC Properties Trust, a private company, or UBC Housing and Conferences.
- Garbage structure should be a covered and contained structure, having a similar design to the building and using the same materials.
- One member suggested adding a turn around for the garbage trucks, to prevent them from having to back onto Wesbrook Mall.
- One member suggested the garbage structure and shared parking should be coordinated with Site 6 and placing an easement over the area of the shared driveway.
- One member commented that there is a general lack of details in the plans.

Transportation

- It is recommended that bike racks be sheltered, but is not required. One member suggested changing access to the bike room to inside the building, instead of the separate entrance.
- Bicycle storage needs to be reviewed for a more integrated solution.
- One member suggested the CAN car option be retained as a fall back but that staff first explore alternative car-share arrangements which might be better tailored to UBC or this project in discussion with the UNA. The UNA is reviewing the possibility of creating a car cooperative for UBC as an alternative to CAN.
- The DP Board requests the applicant submit a letter from UBC Parking regarding their commitments for this project.

The DP Board had the following comments:

- One member suggested all furniture be built in to units, including closet organizers and extra storage space. The applicant should also review the layout of the bathroom to separate the shower from the water closet, and the common area.
- Further green initiatives are still being explored, for example sewage treatment on-site and solar panels on the roof. One member suggested adding a pH balance system for the water.
- The liveability of the space is small, with units around 1550 sq.ft.
- One member congratulated the applicant on their sustainability features.
- One member commented that parking should stay within the neighbourhood instead of crossing into the campus core.
- Street furniture details need to be identified.
- Additional storage should be added to units without the storage room.

The DP Board Chairman invited comments from Jane Durante, AUDP Chair, regarding this application.

Ms. Durante summarised the comments from a previous AUDP meeting on this project. The AUDP raised concerns with the quality of life and durability of the building for this project. AUDP comments included an outdoor amenity area including benches, pulling the front door space closer to the street, which has now been addressed, and discussed the addition of balconies.

DP Board Decision:

The following motion was moved and seconded:

- A. That the Development Permit Board directs the Acting Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 24-unit market rental building detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following to the satisfaction of the Acting Director, Campus and Community Planning:**
 - 1. Submission of a revised Landscape Plan to indicate 1 covered, 16-stall Class II CORA and 2 uncovered, 8-stall Class I bike storage racks in a convenient location on-site.**

2. Resolution of stormwater management details and continued exploration of on-site sewage treatment prior to BP issuance.
 3. Registration of an access easement in favour of Site 5 across Site 6 prior to BP issuance.
 4. Registration of a subdivision for Site 5 prior to BP issuance.
- B. That the following sections of the *East Campus Neighbourhood Plan* be relaxed:
1. Section 3.4.7 - to allow a recycling facility in a separate enclosure outside the principle building envelope, rather than within the building envelope (See Site Plan SK-1.1 in Attachment A).
 2. Section 4.5 - to allow a 2'1" bay window projection into the east setback, rather than the permitted maximum of 2' (See Plan SK1.1).
 3. Section 4.7 (the general *requirement* for off-street parking for new buildings) - to permit the alternative tenant parking strategy proposed.
- C. That public realm design and installation adjacent (along Wesbrook Mall and Thunderbird Boulevard) to this site including pathways, streetscape, and neighbourhood entry feature at Thunderbird Boulevard, be deferred to the servicing contract stage for this neighbourhood, but be returned for further DP Board discussion at that time.
- D. That a policy be in place for the applicant to use their best efforts to rent units only to UBC users during the academic school year.
- E. That a garbage and recycling building be designed to be located and shared with Site 6 and to include a registered easement for that purpose.
- F. That staff work with the University Neighbourhood Association to evaluate a more effective shared vehicle/traffic mitigation solution prior to September 2006 or building completion, or provide a CAN car as a fallback position if the former cannot be resolved.
- G. That the applicant include all furnishings in bedrooms and common areas of building.
- H. That the Development Permit Board support the applicant's objectives to operate the building as a private facility.

CARRIED (unanimously)

4.0 Other Business

None.

5.0 Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma.