



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Campus + Community Planning**

# UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes  
2006



## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, January 11, 2006

**Time:** 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Stan Hamilton  
John Metras  
Al Poettcker  
Joe Stott

**Members absent:** Jim Taylor

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Jorge Marques, Manager Energy; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder).

**Presenters:** Matthew Carter, Hanson Ng, and Graeme Silvera, UBC Properties Trust; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Gord Horsman, Hugh Tangye, and Kim Maust, Bastion Development; Jim Green, writer; Brian Palmquist, ECO-design.ca; and Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust.

**Guests:** T. Potter, parent of child in Huckleberry Daycare; and Darcelle Cottons, UBC Childcare.

---

#### 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 December 7, 2005 Meeting

The DP Board approved the December 7, 2005 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 DP05027: East Campus 6 Townhouses

Lisa Colby updated the Board with changes made to the proposed project on Site 6 in the East Campus Neighbourhood and presented the recommendations in the staff report.

Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust summarised the major changes for this project, including the reduction of the parkade, enhancement of landscape design and open space, addition of drop off parking for Huckleberry Daycare and Berwick Centre, and relocation of parking for Spirit Park Apartments.

*The Board discussed the following:*

- Huckleberry daycare is open year round, Monday to Friday. The upgrade for the Huckleberry Daycare to current fire code standards requires minimal changes, so disruptions will be limited and can be completed outside of operating hours.
- Reduction in parkade allows money and space for other uses.
- One Board member congratulated applicant on the changes made to the project and the compromise reached with the neighbours of the project.

*Comments/Questions from the Audience:*

- One audience member thanked staff and applicant for the reduction of the footprint.

**The following motions were moved and seconded:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize Director of Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 70-unit market rental townhouses detailed in the attached drawings (Attachments A and B), subject to the applicant completing the following:**
- 1. Partial extension to the reduced parkade proposal allowing a total of approximately 88 rather than 77 underground parking stalls.**
  - 2. Allocation of at least 14 underground stalls within the parkade for Spirit Park tenant parking to be comprised of 7 prior visitor stalls plus 7 additional. (Fifty additional street parking stalls will be provided on the street as close as possible to the apartments, along Osoyoos Crescent and the northern half of Thunderbird Boulevard extension.)**
  - 3. Revisions of the landscape/site plan to allow exterior pedestrian access for Spirit Park Apartment users to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, inclusion of an 8ft hedge along the Berwick fence, and allowance, if practical, for bike storage for Huckleberry Daycare users.**
  - 4. Upgrade Huckleberry Daycare to current fire code standards to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning prior to BP issuance for EC6.**
  - 5. Resolution of stormwater management issues to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, prior to BP issuance.**
  - 6. Obtaining an access easement guaranteeing continued vehicular and pedestrian entry drive access onto Site 6, prior to BP issuance.**
- B. That the Development Permit Board support relocation of the EC6 project's on-site visitor parking onto the Wesbrook street frontage, allowing these underground stalls to instead be allocated to Spirit Park Apartment tenant use.**

**CARRIED (unanimously, Al Poettcker abstained)**

#### **4.0 DP03055: David Strangway Building – Lifestyle Photo Signage for Shoppers**

Lisa C. introduced the David Strangway Building – Lifestyle Photo Signage for Shoppers, provided a brief history of the project, and presented the recommendations in the staff report. Graeme Silvera from UBC Properties Trust presented the photos of the existing Lifestyle Photo Signage for the Shoppers on Campus and suggested images to replace the existing photos.

*The Board discussed the following:*

- Lifestyle Photo Signage went up by mistake.
- Review possibility of new material, other than photos for a more dynamic solution in breezeway.
- The depth between the studded wall and glass is 4", not enough room to have display cases.
- The purpose of the breezeway maintains an historical linkage. The breezeway needs more animation.
- Images should be about campus life.
- Consider other options for the breezeway, for example metal spandrels instead of glass.
- Possibly enclose the space with the elevator and lobby as one. Fire access will have to be reviewed.
- Could aluminium fences be replaced with tempered glass? There is a safety and vandalism concern with tempered glass.
- University Boulevard design details are under review.

- Impark sign on Wesbrook Mall is very dominant. Sign will be reduced in scale.
- UBC logo on lantern feature barely reads compared to Shoppers signage on the corner.
- Board members expressed concern over the lack of completion on elements at grade of David Strangway Building.
- Blocked windows on Wesbrook Mall are for privacy of a clinic in Shoppers. More animation could be added here too.

**The following motions were moved and seconded:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board require generic Lifestyle photo signage currently in windows to be removed once replacement treatment is determined to satisfaction of the Director of Planning, and following review by the Advisory Urban Design Panel; and**
- B. That the Development Permit Board urges timely completion of public realm elements for the David Strangway Building, noting the poor public image being conveyed currently on-site.**

**CARRIED (unanimously, Al Poettcker abstained)**

### **5.0 ENQ 514: Theological Site G2 Pre-Application – Information Only**

Lisa C. provided a brief background of the project and presented the staff report for information. There were no staff recommendations. Gord Horsman of Bastion Development entered mid-way through discussions, introduced his team, and outlined his thoughts for a café, commercial storage, and definition of lock-off suites for the 80-unit building on Site G2 of the Theological Neighbourhood. There will be at least 36 non-market units, within the 80 rental units, including some with furnished suites and lock-off suites. Applicant is working with the Vancouver Resource Centre to design fully accessible units.

*The Board discussed the following:*

- A coffee shop is envisioned in the Theological Neighbourhood Plan Section 2.3.3 (b) and Illustrative Plan P-11, even though not identified separately on the Future Land Use Plan, and staff felt a Neighbourhood Plan amendment would not be required to include a coffee shop in this location.
- Commercial storage in this building is a significant change. Staff are unsure whether this would require an amendment to the Theological Neighbourhood Plan or could be approved on a staff level as a minor urban design adjustment. DP Board does not support the addition of a commercial storage on this site.
- The Theological Neighbourhood Plan has always required a set number of non-market units to be distributed throughout the overall Theological Neighbourhood. The Theological landowners opted for a strategy to defer and assign the majority of that rental and non-market obligation to Site G2. It is not the DP Board's mandate to involve itself with economic consequences or reduced marketability of Site G2 resulting from this strategy. The applicant and Theological Neighbourhood should now make whatever mutual economic or site pricing arrangements that are necessary to deliver a project on Site G2 that honours the non-market and rental obligation in place, and should do so without expecting concessions from the DP Board on other OCP/TNP land-use and design requirements in order to enhance project viability.
- Secondary suites are not part of the unit count and they are required to be legally attached to a unit.
- There is no intention to strata the building and the whole building is rental.
- If there are land use exchanges between Site A and G2, this would require an Amendment to the Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design Guidelines and Development Requirements only.
- Comparison of non-market housing with the City of Vancouver.

## **6.0 Other Business**

None

## **7.0 Adjournment**

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

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma*



## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, March 8, 2006

**Time:** 5:00 – 6:30 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Joe Stott (Chair)  
Stan Hamilton  
John Metras  
Al Poettcker

**Members absent:** Harold Kalke  
Jim Taylor

**Staff:** Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Freda Pagani, Sustainability Director and Acting University Architect, Jorge Marques, Energy Manager; and Khim Tan, Division Secretary (Recorder)

**Presenters:** Tom Miller, VP Development, Intracorp; Colleen Dixon, IBI/HB; David Roppel, Intracorp; Robert Brown, Resource Rethinking Building Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates

**Guests:** John Tompkins, V6T Community News and Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust

---

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

In the absence of the Chair and the Vice-Chair, the Development Permit Board appointed the Director of Planning, Joe Stott, as Chair to preside over the business of the DP Board Meeting. Chair called meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. DP Board approved Agenda as circulated.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the January 11, 2006 Meeting

DP Board approved January 11, 2006 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 REAP Presentation

Freda Pagani provided a brief introduction and background to the REAP (Residential Environmental Assessment Program) green building guidelines, followed by Jorge Marques who presented the REAP checklist, mandatory credits and optional design credits, performance levels, and implementation process.

REAP provides a framework to encourage and measure sustainable building practices for market-based and staff/faculty/student residential developments at UBC. REAP is based on the LEED™ green building rating system and is in keeping with UBC's sustainability practices.

Results of pilot phase include positive feedback from developers; ease of use; provides framework for sustainability requirements; energy modeling for Adera's Legacy Project; most categories performed well above mandatory level.

Questions/Comments/Feedback:

- Energy Modelling: High efficiency boilers and heating systems not scoring high; better payback for geothermal heating compared to individual gas metering. Offer better credits and incentives; prescribe use of certain boilers on checklist to set standards.
- Use of local construction materials easily achievable? Yes, same standards as LEED™.
- Does this lead developers to certain types of architecture? Does it direct developers towards one type of building material over another (concrete vs. wood)? No, codes, building height, etc. more likely to dictate materials used.
- Use of LEED™ or REAP in mix-use buildings on South Campus? Possible to add checklist component to REAP for commercial component of mixed-use buildings; case by case determination and height consideration: use LEED™ if building is taller than 4 storeys.

Members thanked Sustainability Office staff for the informative presentation and update on this innovative UBC program.

#### **4.0 DP05025: Theological Lot 51 – St. Andrews Site**

Lisa C. introduced the application for Theological Lot 51 – St. Andrews Site and presented recommendations in the Staff Report circulated within agenda package. Lisa noted that Recommendation A2 was no longer required because revised parking plans have been received since the report was written.

Lisa described the height variance to Development Handbook being requested (from 70 ft. to 72 ft.), and further noted proposed relaxations to Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design and Development Requirements. Lisa advised that the UBC Advisory Urban Design Panel and Theological Neighbourhood Group supported proposal. Lisa advised an objection was received through public process from one neighbour, strata chair of Chancellor House, who expressed opposition to the setback relaxation, particularly 5 feet 6 inches relaxation on the east section of the north façade. Chancellor House residents felt liveability of new units could be compromised. Respectfully, staff supported the project as proposed and outlined the reasoning.

Tom Miller, VP Development, Intracorp, introduced his team. A presentation was made on Theological Lot 51 – St. Andrews Site project. Intracorp has met with AUDP several times and has completed extensive consultation process.

Intracorp is committed to employing standards as set by REAP pilot phase, meeting at least bronze performance level (including smart glass, storm water collection and pump, individual gas metering, low flush toilets, 3<sup>rd</sup> party energy consumption monitoring system).

Intracorp's recent survey of its own projects in the Theological Neighbourhood shows approximately 50% of residents are linked to UBC (work-study) in normal market setting/price point. Recent Hampton Place survey shows 35% link to UBC work-study and Chancellor House survey shows 39% link. Work-study need not be based on UBC work only, but could also be otherwise campus-related.

*The Board discussed the following:*

- Glass handrails have been a concern on campus recently: how ends of handrails are fastened to wall; if handrails move, perceived to be unsafe.
- Architect advised of experience with glass handrails and will ensure handrails are safe and non-moving.
- Do not use same white colour scheme as Argyll Building.
- Ensure disclosure statement includes reference to nearby future developments: St. Andrews Highrise, 53m Curtis Building.

**The following motions were moved and seconded:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board direct the Director, Campus and Community Planning, to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 39-unit apartment building, subject to the applicant completing the following:
- No excavation or construction shall occur prior to April 28 2006;
  - Demonstration prior to Occupancy Permit that leases allow Strata Corp. to retain right to reassign handicap parking stalls as needed in those cases where handicap stalls are permanently assigned to a residential unit.
- B. That Section 3.6 of the Development Handbook be varied to allow the following:
- Relaxation of the height from 70ft. to 72 ft. (69.9ft. to 71.7 ft.).

**CARRIED (unanimously)**

**5.0 Other Business**

None

**6.0 Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Khim Tan*





# THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus and Community Planning  
www.planning.ubc.ca

## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, June 14, 2006

**Time:** 5:00 – 6:30 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Stan Hamilton  
John Metras  
Al Poettcker  
Joe Stott  
Jim Taylor

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

**Presenters:** Matthew Carter, Paul Young, Hanson Ng, Jennifer Craig, and Zena Mills, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates; Gordon Horsman, Hugh Tangye, and Kim Maust, Bastion; James Hancock, Gwyn Vose, and Sergio Jaramillo, IBI/HB Architects.

**Guests:** John Tompkins, V6T Community News; Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust; and 5 members of the public.

---

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

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

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the March 8, 2006 Meeting

DP Board approved March 8, 2006 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 Development Handbook Update

Director of Planning provided a brief background to the latest updates made to the Development Handbook to include the regulations section for the South Campus Neighbourhood and other edits.

Members were each provided a consolidated copy for their records.

#### 4.0 DP06001: South Campus Site SC3B - Keenleyside

Lisa C. introduced the application for the co-development apartment project on Site SC3B in the South Campus Neighbourhood and presented the recommendations in the Staff Report circulated within the agenda package.

Matthew Carter of UBC Properties Trust introduced the project team and summarised the details for this co-development project, including the context, requested variances, and sustainability measures. Ray Letkeman of Raymond Letkeman Architects presented the architectural details and character of the apartment building. Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, provided the neighbourhood context, storm water management details, and landscape plan for this project.

*The Board discussed the following:*

- No new correspondence from neighbours or the public has been received.
- Design of UNOS will be a separate application.
- The trellis at the front of the building is a wood structure landscape feature and does not affect the building in any way.
- One member expressed a concern with the on-street visitor parking in relation to the proximity to the commercial village. The applicant responded that there is a surplus of parking in existing co-development projects and parking will be adequate for the commercial village, so this should not be a concern.
- Over-size vehicles are not accommodated in parkades or on campus. One member requested space be accommodated somewhere on campus.
- Context and timeline for servicing of the South Campus neighbourhood will be done in Phases, beginning with Wesbrook Mall and the area to the east.
- Trees will be cleared on individual sites to try to save trees where possible.
- One member commented that the efficiency of bringing in a sawmill was not a sustainable measure. Applicant advised that concerns have been raised from residents along SW Marine Drive with regards to truck traffic and milling the wood on-site eliminated some of this traffic.
- Buildings will be built with the best effort to achieve a natural drainage system.
- One member recommended water and electricity meters should be added as a demand side sustainability measurement. Applicant responded that the pay-off for geothermal is much better than hot water metering.
- Developer is contributing \$200 per unit towards the Cooperative Auto Network (CAN) to ensure alternative transportation is available.
- There will be base level lighting (~50%) in the parkade all the time plus motion-censored lighting to improve efficiency.
- GTM Consulting is a traffic management company hired by UBC Properties Trust.
- One member commented on the suite layouts – rooms with no windows are intended to be dens for home offices and one of the bathrooms should have shower and bathtub to improve efficiency.
- Easements will be registered along public walkways. UBC Properties Trust will develop UNOS.

*The Public made the following comments:*

- One member of the public asked why the building was addressed from Bernie Avenue, when the intention of the South Campus Working Group (SCWG) was to have the pedestrian green street as the primary network. The applicant responded that addressing from green streets could not be legally done. The green streets will not be built for emergency vehicular access, as they would have to be 6 metres wide.
- Retention of conifers noted as a priority from the SCWG.
- The senior's centre will be 6 storeys, the commercial village will have a 5-storey building component, there are the 5 high-rise sites, and everything else can only be a maximum of 4 storeys.
- One member commented the geothermal and metering was a good idea. Also the rainwater management concept is good, but they requested more details. They also suggested adding green roofs to the project, but the chair responded that green roofs are generally not supported as their intention is to slow waterflow and the stormwater management is already designed to do this, so it would be redundant. Roof maintenance is difficult with green roofs.

- One member of the public commented on the lack of affordability on campus for faculty and staff and that the density is too high on campus. The applicant responded that this project is a co-development so it is targeted to faculty and staff and there is currently a waiting list of ~300 people for this project. The chair responded that the density should be higher to preserve more natural land.

**The following motions were moved and seconded:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 72-unit Co-development apartment building detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment B), subject to the applicant completing the following:
1. An easement shall be registered protecting public pedestrian access to the north-south walkway connection on the west end of the project.
  2. Infrastructure Permits are required for all related off-site road construction and tree clearing in the neighbourhood.
  3. Detailed design of the adjacent park is to be considered a separate application and submitted for approval by Campus and Community Planning.
- B. That the following variances to the Development Handbook be approved:
1. S.SC2.5.a Front yard setback shall be relaxed from 3.0 m to 1.75m to permit the proposed free-standing trellis feature for this proposal.
  2. S. SC2.5.e Maximum Height shall be relaxed from 4 storeys and 14 m to 4 storeys and 14.9 m for this proposal as shown in Attachment B.

**CARRIED (unanimously, Al Poettcker abstained)**

B. The Board requested staff provide an information report on the cost comparison of the implementation of cold water metering.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

*The Board had an in camera session for 20 minutes.*

**5.0 DP06012: Theological Site A - Coast**

Item was deferred to next meeting, given materials were not received in advance as required and members required more time to properly review the materials.

**6.0 DP06013: Theological Site G2 - Westpoint**

Item was deferred to next meeting, given its relationship to the Site A proposal.

**7.0 Other Business**

The Chair thanked all the Members for the Development Permit Board for continuing to serve another two years.

**8.0 Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma*



## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, July 19, 2006

**Time:** 5:00 – 8.15 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Stan Hamilton  
Al Poettcker  
Joe Stott

**Regrets:** John Metras  
Jim Taylor

**Staff:** Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services, Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner (Recorder); Jorge Marques, Sustainability Office

**Presenters:** Gordon Horsman, Hugh Tangye and Kim Maust of Bastion; Gwyn Vose and Sergio Jaramillo of IBI/HB Architects; and Michael Patterson of Perry & Associates.

**Guests:** Roger Moors, VST Properties Trust; Paul Young, UBCPT; Jeff Friedrich, AMS; Ken Fraser, Vancouver Resource Society; John Tompkins, V6T News; and 4 members of the public.

---

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

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

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the June 14, 2006 Meeting

DP Board approved June 14, 2006 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 DP06013: Site G2 Theological Neighbourhood – Westpoint and DP06012: Site A Theological Neighbourhood – Coast

Lisa C introduced the location and general nature and applicant for both projects on the agenda. DP06012: Site A - Coast and DP06013: Site G2 - Westpoint will be considered together as both projects are inter-related on several layers. The DP Board were provided with the Staff Reports and recommendations supporting both projects. The Westpoint (Site G2) rental project is a pre-requisite to development of Site A due to its expected contribution to outstanding rental and non-market housing targets in the Theological Neighbourhood. Coast (Site A) is a 76-unit market housing project. Lisa C introduced Gordon Horsman of Bastion to describe each project in more detail.

##### DP06013: Site G2 - Westpoint

Gordon Horsman of Bastion introduced the Westpoint rental project and summarised the details for the project including the context, parking, easement issues, variances requested and design and materials used. 36 units must be non-market. A spreadsheet was handed out to DP Board members explaining subsidies and average weighted discounts that can be applied to the development. 12 of these 36 units to be leased to the Vancouver Resource Society (VRS); 8 to be leased to students as quad units; 16 to be leased as fully furnished apartments available on short to medium term for visiting staff, faculty and students at unfurnished rates. The applicant expects \$2.30 to \$2.10 rate per square foot. VRS would bring this down further to 80% discount to end-user from market rate. Bastion stated the need to

update each suite and common area is at a capital cost of \$120,000. The quads would be offered at 10% discount compared to average market rent in building, with a capital cost of improving these suites of \$10,000 per suite. The furnished suites are offered at unfurnished rents, a 28% discount from market rates. The development discount of 18%, supplemented by VRS additional discount and cost of special suite improvements results in total a 41% discount to market rates for the end user. All of this results in a 12% revenue loss for Bastion. The applicant states that there are various examples in government where a 10% threshold qualifies as non-market.

Sergio Jaramillo of IBI/HB introduced the drawings and explained the design concept.

Ken Fraser of VRS was introduced and responded to questions regarding the VRS mandate and operations. VRS have entered into preliminary talks with Bastion regarding the lease of 12 of the 36 units. These 12 units are to be wheelchair accessible and apply the 24-hour attendant care model and on-call care service for residents. Good demand from students and others. VRS typically secure real estate by owning, renting or leasing property and apply to provincial government to provide funding.

*The DP Board discussed the following with regard to Site G2 - Westpoint:*

### **Design**

- Q. Is the 15% slope on the parking ramp visible/safe to the sidewalk and street users?
- A. Applicant advised this slope is not too extreme and that there will be a transition area at top of ramp. The applicant also advised that a portion of the ramp will be open to weather and will be heat-traced.
  
- Q. The issue of variances requested for Site G2 was raised. Applicant explained the variances.

### **Legal/Financial**

- Q. Was the applicant looking at an easement arrangement for parking under VST lands?
- A. The applicant advised that a draft is prepared and can be ready in short notice.
  
- Q. Would CAC fees be paid?
- A. Applicant requests that CAC's be waived for non-market units similar to UBC PT assessment practice by UBC.

### **Non-Market Housing Strategy – General**

- C. The DP Board commented that a complicated arrangement is proposed, i.e., 3 categories of rental units within 1 building. Concerns that it will be difficult to administer. DP Board also concerned that non-market unit discount should not benchmark to own building.
- A. Applicant responded and stated that this is common and that there are many examples in Vancouver where properties are benchmarked to own buildings. It is more difficult to benchmark to a series of other buildings.

### **Handicap Cap Units**

- Q. How far along are discussions with VRS?
- A. Applicant advised that they have had a number of talks and are prepared to offer a 10-year agreement with VRS.
  
- Q. What would/could happen at end of the 10-year term?
- A. Applicant advised they have discussed this with Ken Fraser. Ken advised they are typically involved in projects for the long term. They cannot simply shut projects down once operating and therefore always look for something long term. Explained that no VRS suites have ever been reversed to date.
  
- Q. Would VRS suites be attractive to UBC campus users? How many campus versus non-campus residents are expected in the program?
- A. Applicant advised that no research exists but that demand for the model exists in terms of offering better access to education for special needs persons. VRS haven't operated in an educational setting before but are confident that demand exists. Currently working with SFU downtown for similar arrangements.

- Q. VRS appears to be a good opportunity. Suggestion by one DP Board member to embed in the lease the assumed subsidy coming from VRS and apply this discount across the units. Concern that if the deal with VRS disappears, would the subsidy still be there?
- Q. DP Board commented that it would be difficult to monitor three different groups from a rent point of view. Has the applicant considered an aggregate discount? Suggestion by the DP Board that if this could be monitored on aggregate then community would still get the subsidy (non-market) if VRS leaves the arrangement. The applicant would have to compensate or find an alternate program similar to VRS throughout the 99 years.
- A. The applicant expressed concern at guaranteeing government funded subsidies – not sure their financing could support this approach.
- Q. How does VRS normally secure long-term tenure?
- A. Ken Fraser answered that in most cases they purchase units but they have been trying rental programmes in Bastion buildings recently. If a rental project was to be sold and their lease was not renewed then they would consider purchasing newly stratified units. Ken explained that their security of tenure is not confirmed.
- C. DP Board suggested that Bastion should set a guaranteed rate for VRS so that if the project sells then VRS would not be stuck with higher rates.
- Q. One DP Board member asked if Bastion would offer a 99-year option to VRS?
- A. The Chair noted that the Development Permit Board cannot be concerned with the economics of a deal although the DP Board respects the challenge of constructing a non-combustible, non-market building. Chair reminded applicant that it is the role of the DP Board to vet a project on the basis of the best fit within UBC.

#### **Furnished suites at unfurnished rates**

- Q. One DP Board member queried the applicant's assumed \$4,500 per year costs for furnishing suites to be rented at non-furnished market-rates. The DP Board member had a problem with furnished suites arrangement as proposed.
- A. The applicant felt there was a market here for visiting faculty or students. Comparable rates were taken from downtown examples.

#### **Stratification of Secondary Suites**

- Q. How does the applicant propose to handle the stratification of market units in terms of the secondary suites? Suggested that to eliminate concerns regarding the landlord/tenant act the applicant should include the secondary suite in the strata lot.
- A. Real estate taxes were identified as a concern with stratification. One member suggested that perhaps UBC PT and Bastion should jointly apply to taxation authority for a different assessment for strata titled rental units.
- Q. Would secondary suite tenants in non-strata rental units have usual protection under Landlord Tenant Act?
- C. Applicant stated that the Landlord Tenant Act still applies in the situation of a sub-landlord arrangement.

#### **Housing Targets**

- C. One DP Board member noted that in terms of the number of ground oriented units, the project is not in strict compliance with the OCP objectives. The DP Board member stressed that the DP Board has to justify the project to the UBC Board of Governors and intern to the GVRD. Another DP Board member pointed out that the number of rental units is deficient and this neighbourhood would have to compensate for this. DP Board stated that if the economics of the project don't work then the DP Board is not the place to seek concessions. Applicant would need to approach VST for any concessions.
- C. Roger Moors of VST stated that there are no market housing sites left in the Theological Neighbourhood. Lisa C also pointed out that there are limited options left other than the subject Sites A and G2 if the DP Board wants the rental deficiency addressed. Other remaining sites in the neighbourhood other than the 8-unit St. Marks duplex site, are designated Institutional in

the Neighbourhood Plan and an amendment would be required to accommodate market rental units.

- Q. DP Board member asked Lisa C about transfer of units as a density issue. If within a college does it require a vote?
- A. Lisa responded yes and that the neighbourhood groups would normally meet and vote and have done so in this case.
- Q. One DP Board member also asked Lisa C if the DP Board is required to vote on the address issue of 14 rental units initially expected on Site A.
- A. Lisa C responded no. The allocation of the 14 units is an inter-neighbourhood issue. The November 2005 status report to the DP Board presented the anticipated location of the rest of the units but potential for adjustments was still there as long as totals were respected by neighbourhood build-out and changes adequately justified at each DP stage.

### **Site A – Coast**

Gordon Horsman of Bastion introduced Gwyn Vose, architect to discuss the project. A massing model of the project was displayed. Gwyn presented the drawings and summarised the design of the project, as well as the context, materials and colours selected. He explained additional elements added since the project was seen by the AUDP including the incorporation of historic elements of old building being demolished (inside the new courtyard). Michael Patterson of Perry & Associates Landscape Design explained the landscape design for the project.

Gordon Horsman of Bastion discussed the variances requested, the requirements of the AUDP and the impact on neighbouring developments.

*The DP Board discussed the following with regard to Site A – Coast:*

### **Design**

- Q. Is the development below the permitted height envelope for the OCP/Neighbourhood Plans?
- A. It is well below the permitted angle envelope from the Iona Building as outlined in the OCP/Neighbourhood Plan.
- Q. Are there 5 or 6 storeys?
- A. There are 5 storeys plus basement level below. Lisa C clarified that according to the definitions in the Development Handbook and Theological Neighbourhood Plan, it is not a requirement to count the storeys above the parkade, i.e., counting from grade is acceptable. Lisa continued that as per Appendix F in the *Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design & Development Requirements*, one must count from the parkade even if it is a basement below grade. The Theological Neighbourhood Group supported the design proposal for this Site A project. The height requirements, in terms of feet permitted must be enforced or varied by the DP Board where breaches occur. The OCP requirements for height have also been met, i.e., from grade.
- Q. One DP Board member said the OCP requires new projects to respect the character and massing of existing adjacent development. Did the AUDP address the issue of this in terms of the proposed duplexes?
- A. The applicant responded that an alternative more traditional duplex design was considered but involved larger massing for the same floorspace. The contemporary design was preferred by the AUDP.
- Q. Must the design be all white and grey?
- A. The applicant responded that in fact other colours have been chosen, i.e., warm tones such as taupe and chocolate browns which work well with granite.
- Q. Is the design palette for the Mews the same as on the Mews elsewhere, e.g. pavers, lighting etc.?
- A. The applicant responded no. Pattern matches other paved surfaces in front of the Iona Building.

- Q. The DP Board stated that it is very important to connect the design element in the precinct, i.e., it should be the same.
- A. Lisa C. noted staff had understood this had been changed to be consistent. If not already done, this change is added to recommendations in the Staff report.
- Q. Is the wood to be protected?
- A. Applicant responded that it is not a true wood product. It is bonded to aluminium.
- Q. Will the exposed concrete be painted? DP Board would prefer metal cladding.
- A. Yes. A coating is needed on concrete and if it is a problem could use other panelling. There are other examples of painted concrete within the neighbourhood.
- Q. How many parking spaces proposed for duplexes?
- A. 2 spaces each - maximum permitted.
- Q. What is the proposed access for visitor parking?
- A. Visitors access parkade via intercom and visitor parking is reserved in the 1<sup>st</sup> set of stalls in the parkade which then lead to the lobbies.
- Q. The DP Board commented that complaints have been received regarding a lack of parking in the neighbourhood. Does the proposed parking exceed the amount permitted in other developments?
- A. Lisa C responded that this project exactly meets the minimum visitor parking requirements.
- Q. Has the relief from the elevator penthouse been addressed as requested by Intracorp?
- A. Applicant advised yes – by means of a side mounted elevator to reduce the height.

### **Sustainability**

- Q. What are the significant sustainability elements in both Site A and Site G2?
- A. The various sustainable measures were explained. Project will achieve at least bronze level in new REAP program. Jorge Marques, Sustainability Office, added that some extra sustainable elements have been added to the project since he last saw it, e.g., individual water metering and therefore should achieve a silver level.
- Q. Will grass be irrigated?
- A. Sustainable irrigation methods (valve and spray adjustments) are proposed to reduce waste.

### **Legal/Financial**

- Q. What is the ownership structure?
- A. Applicant advised probably one strata corporation.
- Q. If there is more than one strata on Site A, how does the mews get monitored? Issue of cars parked behind Chancellor House is a problem.
- A. Unlike Chancellor House, there will not be drop-off spaces designed in the Mews. The applicant doesn't want cars on the Mews and this can be dealt with through landscaping.
- Q. How are the duplexes to be addressed? The address needs to be consistent to development to the east.
- A. Applicant responded that UBC is responsible for addressing new developments. Assumed that all will have 'Chancellor' address.

### *The public made the following comments:*

- Q. One member of the public is concerned about possible external noise issues and wanted to know how building design would mitigate exterior noise and what appeal mechanism existed for noise complaints.
- A. One DP Board member advised that with the exception of fraternities and the odd party, there have been very few complaints from Hawthorn Place, for example.
- A. The applicant advised that the project has been designed and oriented to mitigate noise. For Site G2, Bastion will be managing and enforcing reasonable noise levels within that rental



building. They could provide the member of public with details of the SCT rating for windows for his information, if they wished.

- One member of the public expressed concerns regarding the following:
  - Q. The number of visitor parking spaces within the neighbourhood.
  - A. DP Board responded that visitor parking needs to be regulated and signed. Overall, there is a challenge to reduce the number of cars in UBC. This number has decreased by 20% since 1997. DP Board pointed out that Chancellor House is congested but not when compared to the City of Vancouver.
  
  - Q. The number of variances that are being granted to new developments, and asked why they were not forwarded to the Strata Council as an agenda item for approval. Commented that some variances decrease setbacks and give impression that the neighbourhood is being overdeveloped.
  - A. One DP Board member noted that this neighbourhood is not too dense and added that the lack of height makes the neighbourhood look more dense than higher structures on the same footprints. Height was limited in the neighbourhood due to public opposition and appropriate relationship to the Ion Building.
  - A. It was responded that this is not a requirement to individually notify neighbours; only postings are needed. However, Lisa C clarified that strata council of Chancellor House was apprised of the project, drawings were post on the website and an Open House was held. The project has evolved during this time, so the variances have also changed slightly. Lisa C added that staff do not typically support variances unless those are design benefit tradeoffs and not just to allow more density.
  
  - Q. Whether there will be a screen of the ramp exit from the parkade to shield apartments from car headlights at night.
  - A. VST and Staff advised that this issue can be addressed in park design for the chapel.

*The DP Board held an in camera session for 10 minutes.*

Lisa Colby gave an overview of the two projects presented at meeting, and outlined recommendations in staff report that would allow each project to move forward.

Regarding **Site G2 - DP 06013: Westpoint** rental project in the Theological Neighbourhood, the DP Board considered all staff recommendations from the June 14th, 2006 report and all were supported and endorsed except for Recommendations A.3 and A.4, which were replaced with new resolutions formulated by the Board at the meeting, and listed in Resolution E.

**The following motions were moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for Site G2:**

**A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 86-unit rental apartment building on Site G2 detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following:**

1. Completion of an underground parking easement from VST to accommodate the proposed parking beyond the north and east lot lines.
2. Provision of wording in resident leases prior to full Building Permit issuance for this project, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, that ensures an effective mechanism for re-allocating handicap stalls as required from a unit without a handicap tenant to other units in valid need of a handicap stall in exchange for their regular stall.
3. *(This staff recommendation not considered – see new conditions in Resolution E below).*
4. *(This staff recommendation not considered – see new conditions in Resolution E below).*
5. Compliance with the standards noted in the sustainability program proposed, or substitutions of equivalent value to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.

**B. That Section TN5.5 of the Development Handbook be varied as follows:**

1. Relaxation of front (south) setback from 4.5 m(15 ft) to 3.8 m(12.5 ft).

**C. That the Development Permit Board acknowledge relaxations to Section 3.6 of the *Theological Neighbourhood Site Specific Design and Development Requirements (TN SSDDR)* supported by the Theological Neighbourhood Group, as follows:**

1. Relaxation of south setback from 4.5 m (15 ft) to 3.8 m (12.5 ft).
2. Relaxation of the rear (north) setback from 6.1 m (20 ft) to 5.3 m (17.5 ft).
3. Relaxation of west setback along 45-degree angle by 6 ft to accommodate plaza and café design.
4. Relaxation of maximum height on NW corner from 65 ft to 66 ft.

**D. That the Development Permit Board support the following density transfers as permitted under Section 2.3.6 of the Theological Neighbourhood Plan.**

1. Transfer of 7000 sq. ft. surplus floorspace from Site G2 to Site A to reduce the massing of G2.
2. Transfer of 6 rental units from Site A to Site G2 to allow a total of 86 units instead of 80 units.

**E. That the Development Permit Board add the following conditions to be fulfilled by the applicant prior to Development Permit issuance in addition to all conditions listed in Resolution A:**

1. A revised non-market housing strategy must be submitted and shall include:
    - a. Establishment of an acceptable benchmark for non-market rates for student/faculty quad units. Other non-market student housing examples on campus must be considered as appropriate benchmarks for non-market rents.
    - b. Establishment of a 99-year rent discount guarantee for handicap units whether through the Vancouver Resource Society or any subsequent similar program.
    - c. Replacement of the furnished-suite program component into a more straightforward guaranteed non-market rate linked to a benchmark similar to the approach for the quad-units.
  2. Commitment to strata title for each rental unit containing a secondary suite.
  3. Revision of drawings and proposal for Site A and or Site G2 to indicate all outstanding housing targets have been met for the neighbourhood, excluding eight future planned duplexes and eight secondary suites for the St. Marks site.
- OR
- Submission of an alternate acceptable strategy endorsed by the Theological Neighbourhood Group for satisfying all outstanding neighbourhood housing targets elsewhere within the neighbourhood.

Regarding **Site A - DP 06012: Coast** Market residential project in the Theological Neighbourhood, the DP Board considered all staff recommendations from the July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2006 report (A, B, and C), except that Recommendation A.2 was slightly modified and Recommendations A.5 and A.6 were replaced with new resolutions formulated by the DP Board at the meeting, and listed in Resolution D.

**The following motions were moved and seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for Site A:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed Site A 76-unit housing complex detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following:**

2. Registration of applicable easements for public access, emergency access and utilities purposes as shown on Plan P-14A in Appendix F of the Theological Neighbourhood Agreement (Site Specific Design & Development Requirements).
3. Inclusion of reference for new homebuyers in the disclosure statement that the site to the west of Site A is designated for institutional development in the OCP and UBC could develop this site, possibly blocking views. In addition, this reference shall be added to Schedule A of the Strata Corporation by laws, prior to full BP issuance.
4. Inclusion of wording in resident leases to satisfaction of Director of Planning, allowing the strata corporation to reassign handicap parking stalls as required from units with no handicap residents to a unit in need.
5. Registration of a restrictive covenant or similar legal agreement to satisfaction of the Director of Planning, that no trees, structure or equipment shall be permitted more than 1.2 m (4 ft) above the fifth-floor rooftop in designated locations.
6. *(This staff recommendation not considered – see new conditions in resolution D below).*
7. *(This staff recommendation not considered – see new conditions in resolution D below).*

**B. That the following sections of the UBC Development Handbook be varied for the duplex portion of the proposal to allow:**

1. Relaxation of TN1.5 (c) south (rear) setback from 7.5 m (24.6 ft) to:
  - a. 5.2 m (17 ft) for Duplexes 1 and 2
  - b. 4.3 m (14 ft) for Duplexes 3 and 5
  - c. 3.8 m (12.5 ft) for Duplexes 8, 9, 10 and 11

**C. That the following sections of the UBC Development Handbook be varied for the apartment portion of the proposal to allow:**

1. Relaxation of TN3.5 (b) east side yard setback on Lot 12 from 10.7m (35 ft) to 9.9m (32.5 ft).
2. Relaxation of TN3.5 (d) Maximum Height from 5 storeys and 15.2 m (50 ft) to allow projection of:
  - a. 1.4m (4.75 ft) on the north face of the east block apartment building as shown on Drwg DP8.02.
  - b. 0.6 m (2 ft) at Iona Drive and 2.6 m (8.7 ft) on the north face of the west block apartment building (see DP8.03).
3. Relaxation of Section 7.3 for the projection of balconies into setbacks as follows:
  - a. East apartment building, east side yard: Allow balcony projection (southeast unit) 1.2 m (4 ft) into setback rather than the 0.8 m (2.6 ft) typically permitted.

**D. The Development Permit Board adds the following conditions to be fulfilled by the applicant prior to Development Permit issuance in addition to all conditions listed in Resolution A:**

1. A revised non-market housing strategy must be submitted on related application for Site G2 and shall include:
  - a. Establishment of an acceptable benchmark for non-market rates for student/faculty quad units. Other non-market student housing examples on campus must be considered as appropriate benchmarks for non-market rents.
  - b. Establishment of a 99-year rent discount guarantee for handicap units whether through the Vancouver Resource Society or any subsequent similar program.
  - c. Replacement of the furnished-suite program component into a more straightforward guaranteed non-market rate linked to a benchmark similar to the approach for the quad-units.

2. Commitment to strata title each rental unit containing a secondary suite in related application on Site G2.
3. Revision of drawings and proposal for Site A and or G2 to indicate all outstanding housing targets have been met for the neighbourhood, excluding eight future planned duplexes and eight secondary suites for the St. Marks site.

OR

Submission of an alternate acceptable strategy endorsed by the Theological Neighbourhood Group for satisfying all outstanding neighbourhood housing targets elsewhere within the neighbourhood.

4. Revision of the landscape plan to ensure treatment of the Mews is consistent with the rest of the Mews east of the site through to Wesbrook Mall, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, prior to full BP issuance.

#### **4.0 Other Business**

The Chair of the Development Permit Board offered the following closing statement:

- The DP Board thanks and acknowledge Staff's diligence and thoughtfulness in their administration and presentation of this application.
- The Theological Neighbourhood has been effectively and we believe delightfully and sensitively transformed. This was done with a continued focus on UBC's obligations and representations to the Campus communities, our Neighbours and Neighbourhoods and particularly the requirements of the GVRD.
- The DP Board have seen and heard a number of applications and have witnessed the construction of a series of excellent projects, which, in context have transformed this precinct into a showcase for planning, land use and historic reference and presentation.
- This application, which consists of 2 buildings, needed to provide use and form that brings this precinct close to compliance with the housing forms, use and ratios set out in the 'Neighbourhood Plan'. In this context, this DP Board, through staff, was and is focused on meeting UBC's obligations while ensuring an enduring and viable 'fit' with the existing built form throughout this precinct and its UBC Neighbours as well as our neighbours to the east.
- We appreciate the applicants and their team's efforts to address the relevant issues inherent to these last 2 sites.

Joe Stott, member of the DP Board, introduced Caroline Eldridge, a new land use planner staff member with Campus and Community Planning.

A DP Board member questioned the inclusion of prices on advertising on Chancellor Boulevard and whether it is legal to do so prior to project approval and if not, that the applicant revise the sign.

The Chair asked that the issue of oversized vehicles be added to the agenda for the next meeting.

#### **5.0 Water Metering Report**

The issue of the informational water metering report for future campus development was deferred until the August meeting.

#### **6.0 Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm

*Minutes submitted by Caroline Eldridge*



## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, August 9, 2006

**Time:** 5:15 – 8:00 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
Stan Hamilton  
John Metras  
Al Poettcker  
Joe Stott

**Regrets:** Jim Taylor

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner (Recorder); Jorge Marques, Sustainability Office; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters:** Darren Chung and Norm Couttie, Adera; Dale Staples, Integra Architecture Inc.; Michael Patterson of Perry & Associates; and Gordon Horsman, Hugh Tangye and Kim Maust of Bastion.

**Guests:** Roger Moors and Bud Phillips, VST Properties Trust; Hanson Ng, UBCPT; John Tompkins, V6T News; and 4 members of the public.

---

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

Chair called meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. Lisa C. informed the DP Board that the Agenda Item 3.2 Water Metering Report will be deferred to the September 13, 2006 meeting.

Agenda item 3.1 (Sites A and G2) was moved to the end of the August 9 Agenda.

DP Board approved Agenda as revised.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the July 19, 2006 Meeting

DP Board approved July 19, 2006 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 Business Arising

##### 3.1 Water Metering Report

Although the water metering report was deferred until the next meeting, Al Poettcker of UBC Properties Trust requested Norm Couttie (Adera) to report briefly on the water metering issue that recently came to light in their Mid Campus Reflections project where individual water metering had been installed. A fund was provided by Adera to run the program for the first few years, but the strata has since decided that the program will not be continued once the original funds run out. The meters are read once per year and a bonus is given to the more water-efficient occupants. Norm Couttie advised that this is unfortunately the attitude of strata corporations and in an energy modelling workshop implemented for Legacy, it was therefore determined that money would be better spent elsewhere than on individual water metering.

The chair commented that water metering should be written into the Strata Act, to ensure implementation, as it's more difficult to amend.

#### 4.0 DP06015: South Campus Site SC2G – Pathways

Lisa C. introduced the staff report, with the recommendations and requested variances, for the proposed apartment building on Site SC2G, called Pathways, in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Darren Chung, Adera, introduced the project and provided the context and sustainability features for the project. Dale Staples, Integra Architecture, presented the architectural details and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the green street design and landscape plan for the project.

*The DP Board discussed the following with regards to Site SCG2 - Pathways:*

##### Architecture

- Largest projection of the height variance is in the southeast corner of the East building. The 2m variance is a result of the sloped site, with the maximum height calculated from the parallel of the sloped plain, and the steel structure of the building which adds 0.3 m (1') per floor. No variance would be required if roof was peaked.
- The caps on the roofs have been reduced as suggested by the AUDP commentary. One member felt they were still too large and should be reduced.
- There is no precedent for adopting the west coast modern architectural style from a single storey building to a 4-storey apartment building.
- Materials consist of stone, shingle, hardiplank, hardipanel, cement composite siding.
- Address will be from Birney Avenue and wayfinding will be from both the green street and road.
- The streetscape is consistent with the larger precinct, and not unique just for this project. There will be an overall infrastructure permit defining widths of roads, green streets and sidewalks consistent with the South Campus Neighbourhood Plan.
- Floor of unit on the southeast corner of the East building is 2.5 ft from the ground level.
- The Chair was concerned with long-term rainscreen of the building.
- The Chair commented that the location of elevators in each building is awkward; suggestion to reconsider the layout.
- Shower stalls in addition to bathtubs were suggested for all the units.

##### Landscape

- Retaining wall is clad in stone. Also concrete pillars are clad in stone.
- Sidewalk on site will be concrete or pavers.
- 2 trees are being retained on site, where the parkade is being built around, also 2 trees on the green street are being retained.

##### Equivalency

- Equivalency for fire access is 15 m. Applicant is still negotiating with the Vancouver Fire and Rescue Service Protection Manager on the solution for the equivalency. Current proposal is for the annunciator panel to be located in the water feature wall, 15 m from the sidewalk. Alternatives include moving entrance to the southern end of each building or to build a fire lane at the entrance and remove the water feature wall from the design.

##### Sustainability

- DP Board members commend applicant on REAP submission and encourage applicant to reach the Gold level if possible.
- Individual hot water and gas metering is important for energy and economic savings.
- Neighbourhood geo-exchange is still under review by UBC Properties Trust. Currently monitoring drill holes to determine flow. Domestic hot water heating can be achieved on a site-by-site basis.

##### Public Easement

- There is no public easement along the pedestrian walkway between the two buildings connecting Birney Avenue with the green street. AUDP have commented in the past that the South Campus Neighbourhood should have a finer-grained network.
- One member was concerned with the rights of the property owner.

- Campus & Community Planning staff recommended a public access easement be registered on the path if there was a desire for this connection to remain. Strata corporations otherwise often choose to erect gates in spite of original design intent – Lot 10, Mid Campus was an example.

**The following motions were moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for Site SC2G (note A.2 is supplementary to recommendation of staff report):**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director of Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 109-unit apartment building detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following:
1. Resolution of storm water management issues to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning prior to BP issuance.
  2. Resolution of the equivalency issue for the fire access for the two buildings on Site SCG2 prior to BP issuance to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or the project must return to the Development Permit Board for further consideration.
- B. That the following variances to the Development Handbook be approved:
1. Section SC2.5 a): The minimum front yard setback of 3.0 m is relaxed to allow:
    - 1.21 m balcony projection instead of a 1.0 m as permitted, and
    - 1.12 m roof projection instead of a 0.8 m as permitted.
  2. Section SC2.5 c): The minimum rear yard setback of 3.0 m is relaxed to allow:
    - 1.30 m balcony projection instead of a 1.0 m as permitted, and
    - 1.10 m proposed roof projection instead of a 0.8 m as permitted.
  3. Section SC 2.5 e) maximum building height of 14 m (45' 11") is relaxed to allow a height of 16m (52' 6").

**The following motion was moved, seconded and DENIED for Site SCG2:**

That a public pedestrian access easement be registered on the walkway between the two main buildings prior to occupancy permit issuance.

*The DP Board held an in camera session for 25 minutes.*

**5.0 Theological Sites A and G2 Update**

Lisa C. introduced a staff memorandum dated August 9, 2006 and provided an update on the three outstanding conditions from the July 19, 2006 Development Permit Board Meeting, namely the neighbourhood housing targets, strata titling any rental units also containing secondary suites, and the submission of an acceptable revised non-market housing strategy.

*The DP Board discussed the following with regards to Sites A and G2:*

**Neighbourhood Housing Targets**

- Applicant is in compliance with the GVRD housing targets.
- UBC Properties Trust is considering a request to supply the 9 market rental units elsewhere on campus but will have to review at a future date. If that agreement fails to materialize, the 9 market rental units will be supplied from Site A's existing unit supply.

**Strata Title for Site G2**

- The units with secondary suites should be strata-titled in order not to confuse density counts and to reinforce the secondary units status as a responsibility of the primary unit.

- The applicant advised that they obtained a legal opinion confirming that the Landlord Tenant Act is enforced through to the sub-lease level protecting secondary units even if not in a strata-titled larger unit.

#### Non-Market Housing Strategy

- The 10% discount below market rate factors is considered acceptable in this situation only due to the site's location, and its concrete structure (more costly to build) compared to other wood-framed rental buildings in the west side of Vancouver and UBC. This is also a standard that BC Housing accepts for non-market purposes.
- Provision for the above framework should be provided in the ground lease and details would be in the policy document.

#### **The following motions were moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for Site G2:**

- A. That all neighbourhood housing targets for Sites A and G2 must be met on-site, but up to a maximum of 9 market rental units from Site A may be compensated for from elsewhere on campus, subject to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.
- B. That the applicant strata-title all Site G2 rental units containing secondary suites plus, if they wish, the remaining rental units within that rental building, but that the applicant provide a covenant on all strata units guaranteeing the following for 99 years:
  - continued rental status of all units, and
  - that sale of these strata units will be bound together so that only one owner can purchase the entire bundle, unless otherwise approved by UBC.
- C. Regarding non-market units, two benchmark rates shall be set:
  - (i) The applicant will work with a consultant to establish a market rental benchmark for all non-market units except quad units, based on average 1 and 2 bedroom rates in 6 rental buildings west of Arbutus Street. The six selected buildings shall be mutually acceptable to UBC and the applicant. All non-market units except quad units shall be rented at 10% below this benchmark price.
  - (ii). The applicant will agree to a different rental benchmark rate for quad-format non-market units, to be defined to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning as based on similar format quad-units elsewhere on campus. Quad units shall be rented to only UBC faculty, students, or staff. No additional discount below the benchmark rate is required in this case, given land has been supplied at zero cost in the case of these comparison campus buildings on campus. UBC Properties Trust's rental housing project Fraser Hall in East Campus, Marine Drive Residence and/or Somerset House have been suggested as options to consider in determining the market benchmark price for quad-units.

#### **6.0 Other Business**

None

#### **7.0 Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma*





## UBC Development Permit Board

### MINUTES

**Date:** Wednesday, November 8, 2006

**Time:** 5:15 – 7:30 p.m.

**Venue:** Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall, Cedar Room

**Members present:** Harold Kalke (Chair)  
John Metras  
Al Poettcker  
Joe Stott  
Jim Taylor

**Regrets:** Stan Hamilton

**Staff:** Nancy Knight, AVP Planning; Lisa Colby, Manager Development Services; Caroline Eldridge, Land Use Planner (Recorder); Jorge Marques, Sustainability Office; and Rachel Wiersma, Planning Assistant (Recorder)

**Presenters:** Mark Whitehead and Mark Anthony, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership; Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallemberg; Robert Brown, Resource Rethinking Building Inc.; Gary Wong, ASPAC Developments; Paul Lebofsky and Victor Kuan, Matrix Architecture and Planning Inc.; Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects.

**Guests:** Paul Young and Matthew Carter, UBC Properties Trust; John Tompkins, V6T News; and 4 members of the public.

---

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

Chair called meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

Agenda item 3.1 (water metering report) was moved to the end of the November 8 Agenda.

DP Board approved Agenda as revised.

#### 2.0 Approval of Minutes from the August 9, 2006 Meeting

DP Board approved August 9, 2006 minutes as circulated.

#### 3.0 Development Handbook Update

Lisa Colby provided an update to the Development Handbook to the regulations section for the South Campus Neighbourhood as sections of the Development Handbook were in need of adjustment to accommodate current and future development in the South Campus Northeast Sub-Area, fully consistent with the intent of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.

#### 4.0 Development Permit Applications

##### 4.1 DP06023: South Campus Lot 1 Highrise – The Wesbrook

Lisa C. introduced the staff report, with the recommendations and requested variance, for the proposed highrise and townhouses on Lot 1, called The Wesbrook, in the South Campus Neighbourhood.

Mark Whitehead, Musson Cattell Mackey Partnership, introduced the project and provided the context, architectural details and sustainability features for the project. Chris Phillips, Phillips Farevaag Smallerberg, presented the landscape plan and stormwater details for the project.

*The DP Board discussed the following:*

#### Architecture

- The limestone from this particular quarry is harder so it has a lower rate of water retention.
- The limestone will be cut into slabs, 40 mm thick, 2 ft x 3 ft.
- One member expressed concern with noise from the emergency generator vent adjacent to the driveway ramp. There is a tree buffer between the senior's residences. The driveway for the senior's residence is across the driveway for The Westbrook.
- Fans should be removed from intakes and exhausts to attenuate sound.
- Punched windows will be seen from Westbrook Mall.
- There are privacy railings on the ground floor to create a visual separation for security.
- Cooling tower for building is on the top.

#### Landscape

- UBC Properties Trust is in charge of the streetscape and green street design.

#### Accessibility

- One member commented that the curb lane should be consistent and ensure the curb letdowns between driveways are accessible.
- Back terraces of townhouses are accessible.

#### Sustainability

- One member commended applicant on achieving REAP Silver.
- Budget limitation to achieving Gold, but not all details have been finalised yet.
- Trees cut down will be milled on site and wood will be reused in street furniture.
- Low conductivity of soil as material is too granular, so cannot have a closed loop system for a ground source heat pump. Reviewing the options to have an open loop system instead.

#### Public Easement

- Landscape is designed to allow public access through site.
- Fire access to the townhouses is the same route, so cannot be closed off.
- Visitors also will use this route as townhouses are addressed off Berton Ave.
- One member commented that the easement is the best solution but hard to implement.
- Staff recommend an easement as it is the strongest form of commitment.
- Strata corporations could change accessibility through site.
- AUDP recommended a more porous design through public walkways.
- Joe Stott commented that easements are in place throughout the Theological Neighbourhood.
- Ensure a mechanism is in place to notify consumers and strata.

*The Public made the following comments:*

- C. The intention of the south Campus Working Group was to create a plan of a 'Village IN a forest'. More trees should be saved.
- A. Very difficult to save trees with the parkade structure.
- Q. Will stalactites form with this limestone?
- A. The applicant was not aware of seeing an evidence of stalactites on other buildings.
- Q. Is there additional parking on-site?
- A. Required visitor stalls are provided on site on the surface. Street parking is also available for residents and visitors.
- Q. Is there wording to notify residents regarding the adjacent research facilities? Concerned that the residents will be scared of type of research going on adjacent to residential neighbourhood.
- A. No.

- C. Landscaping consists mostly of deciduous trees; more coniferous should be incorporated into design.

**The following motions were moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for the South Campus Lot 1 Highrise:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 62-unit residential tower and 7 townhomes detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following:
1. Incorporation of wording in the ground lease and disclosure statement guaranteeing continuous unrestricted and un-gated public pedestrian access along the eastern pathway crossing the site between Berton Avenue and the green street.
  2. Resolution of storm water management issues to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning prior to Building Permit issuance.
  3. Compliance with the standards noted in the Sustainability program proposed, or substitutions of equivalent value to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.
  4. Commitment to use "Kasota Rose" as the limestone specified for this project.
  5. That no tree clearing takes place until a Development Permit is issued.
  6. Incorporation of wording in the ground lease and disclosure statement allowing the strata corporation to reassign handicap stalls to residents with legitimate needs as required throughout the tenancy of the project.
- B. That the following variances to the Development Handbook be approved:
- S. SC3.5 (b) side yard setback for the west side of the townhouse shall be relaxed from 2.5 m to 2.2 m to permit an above-ground level projection on the west facade.

**In addition, the following motion was moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously):**

**Staff explore a policy and advise accordingly whether or not an easement is required for each site in the South Campus Northeast sub-area.**

#### **4.2 DP06025: St. Marks Duplexes**

Lisa C. introduced the staff report for the 8 duplexes on the St. Marks site on the corner of Wesbrook Mall and Chancellor Boulevard in the Theological Neighbourhood. Lisa C. summarized the recommendations, explained the background for the hammerhead, and the requested setback variance. Lisa C. introduced Paul Lebofsky, Matrix Architecture and Planning, to present the architectural details and materials for the project and Lena Chorobik, Viewpoint Landscape Architects, to present the landscape plan details.

*The DP Board discussed the following:*

##### Overall

- There will be a party wall for each individual unit, so a separate legal for each duplex.
- Easement is only along Chancellor Mews.

##### Architecture

- Basement suites are a good size and have their own private entrance.
- One member commented the stucco was a good choice.
- There is rain-screen on the stucco.
- One member commented that 3 of the 4 duplexes had a great design.
- One member commented that the rear slope of the roof is quite severe on the corner duplex.
- One member had a concern with the east elevation.

##### Landscape

- Landscaping along Chancellor Boulevard is very minimal. Could landscaping be augmented?

- One member expressed concern with the amount of UNOS designated in the Theological Neighbourhood.
- Chancellor Mews should have same urban design all the way through from Theology Mall to Wesbrook Mall.

#### Transportation

- Chancellor Blvd and Wesbrook Mall intersection may be reconfigured with a roundabout or the intersection is squared off. This intersection is in the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation. The extra land would become park space, similar to the situation at SW Marine Drive and West Mall.
- One member commented that having no hammerhead would be the best solution.
- One member commented that 1 visitor-parking stall is not sufficient.
- One member commented that the hammerhead solution should be finalised now and not left for a future date.

#### Sustainability

- REAP submission is not acceptable and encourage applicant to achieve Silver.

#### **The following motions were moved, seconded and CARRIED (unanimously) for the St. Marks Duplexes:**

- A. That the Development Permit Board authorize the Director, Campus and Community Planning to issue a Development Permit for the proposed 4 duplex residences (8 units) detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the applicant completing the following:
1. Provision of an easement to accommodate public, service vehicle and fire truck access along Chancellor Mews.
  2. Revision of the REAP submission to demonstrate a Silver ranking prior to Development Permit issuance.
  3. Resolution of storm water management plans to the satisfaction of the Director of Campus and Community Planning prior to Building Permit issuance.
  4. Revision of the landscape plan to satisfaction of Director of Planning addressing points listed on page 6 in this report, prior to Development Permit issuance.
  5. Deferral of tree clearing on-site until protective tree fencing is in place for off-site trees at risk, and a Development Permit has been issued.
  6. Installation of all on-site proposed landscape, as well as off-site landscape for UNOS and open space area adjacent to Wesbrook Mall, to be complete prior to occupancy permit.
  7. Installation of hammerhead turn-around on St. Marks UNOS area as illustrated in Attachment A prior to Occupancy Permit, unless
    - a. alternative landscape and vehicle turn-around plans,
    - b. bonding to construct the hammerhead at a future date, and
    - c. legal paperwork are arranged
 all to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, while negotiations are pursued to improve the Chancellor /Wesbrook intersection, and perhaps ultimately eliminating the need for a turn-around on ST. Marks UNOS.
  8. Installation of the Mews paving and lighting to standards noted in Attachment A, prior to occupancy permit.
- B. That the following variances to the Development Handbook be approved for this project only:
1. S. TN1.5 (c) Rear Yard: The minimum 7.5 m (24.6 ft) rear yard shall be relaxed to 0.6 m (2 ft) to mimic the permitted 0.6m accessory building setback.
  2. S. TN1.5 (b) Side Yard: The minimum side yard of 1.8 m (6 ft) shall be relaxed by 1.8 m (6 ft) for east side corner of the garage of Building 1 and by 1.1 m (3.5 ft) for the west side corner of the garage of Building 4.

## **5.0 Business Arising**

### **5.1 Water Metering Report**

Lisa C. introduced the information report on individual water metering for residential projects at UBC.

*The DP Board discussed the following:*

- Expected increase in water pricing by the GVRD in the next year, may be more incentive to install water metering.
- Water metering is not mandatory in REAP. Most water usage from car washing and irrigation. REAP approach is to have hard-wired systems in building to reduce water usage.
- One member commented that REAP mandatory points could be revisited to make more effective and push envelope.

## **6.0 Other Business**

None

## **7.0 Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 7:30 pm

*Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma*