1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. The Agenda was adopted as circulated. The Chair noted the membership changes on the Development Permit Board. The Chair acknowledged the service retiring member Al Poettcker brought to the Board and welcomed new members David Woodson and Nancy Knight.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the February 11, 2009 Meeting

The Minutes from the February 11, 2009 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Applications

3.1 DP 10002: South Campus New Secondary School

Karen Russell summarised the project and introduced Henry Ahking, Vancouver School Board, who provided the background for the school project and introduced Ron Hoffart and Peter Pratt, Graham Hoffart Mathiasen Architects and Amy Tsang, Perry + Associates. Ron Hoffart presented the detailed with architectural plans, including changes to the north elevation that were made in response to comments from the AUDP.

The following comments were made by the applicants in response to question from the DP Board:

Context
- Field is not part of the school application. It will be completed by UBC Properties Trust by the time the school opens. The field will be shared by the school and community.
- There’s no water or sewer line running under the gym on the south side.

Architecture
- Some of the existing dark glass will be retained. All instructional areas of the school will have transparent low-e glass. Some of the dark glass will be reused in the new addition on the south side.
- Tennis courts on the roof were reviewed but potential for balls to fly off roof was too great, so learning gardens were chosen.
Sustainability
- Vancouver School Board requires 50 bicycle stalls. 100 are proposed and another 50 are anticipated. There will also be a bike room in the basement of the school.
- The project is being designed to LEED Gold but will not be certified with the Canada Green Building Council.

Parking
- There is no parking being provided for students.
- The school will provide 54 surface spaces and 30 will be leased from Wesbrook Village, which has a total of 300 parking spaces for commercial uses and the future community centre (including both surface and parkade). There is a potential to expand the underground parkade to the west and south in the future if required.
- The west drop-off area fits 8-10 cars at the front door. The morning is busier as the afternoon the pick-up is more spread out. Save-on Foods side can also be used as a drop-off as there is very little traffic in the morning.

Gerry McGeough, University Architect, updated the DP Board with regards to the AUDP resolution. Changes to the design have been made and satisfactorily address the concerns AUDP raised.

The DP Board made the following comments on the proposal:

Context
- Ensure safety of students travelling to and from school after the school is first opened.
- Have UBC collaborate with the Vancouver School Board about shared learning opportunities. Also explore integrating UBC Farm programming to share learning and experiences.
- Cycling and walking to school should be encouraged as much as possible.
- Concern was expressed that the building is being built to LEED Gold standard but will not undergo the certification process.

Architecture
- Ensure there is a balance between the dark and transparent glass.
- Good integration of building with community.
- Consider other uses for school roof.

Parking
- One member was very concerned with the lack of parking in the neighbourhood. The school should provide adequate parking on-site.
- UBC is limiting parking on campus to encourage more sustainable transportation practice.
- Drop-off zone size concern with two peak times every day.
- Location of north entry along West 16th Avenue may encourage drop-off along W. 16th Ave. The avenue will be narrowed to 2 lanes from Wesbrook Mall to East Mall. Ensure landscaping measures are taken to discourage drop-off along W. 16th Ave.

The following motions for the New Secondary School in the South Campus Neighbourhood were moved, seconded and CARRIED:

A. That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the New Secondary School in South Campus as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:
   - That the applicants’ commitment to LEED Gold design be confirmed through certification by the Canada Green Building Council; and
   - Those roadway improvements along East Mall, Ross Drive and the East Mall/West 16th Avenue intersection are completed to coincide with the opening of the school and are designed to the satisfaction of UBC Campus and Community Planning.

B. That the Development Permit Board register its concerns regarding the parking resources in the South Campus Neighbourhood.
4.0 Other Business
None.

5.0 Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma
UBC Development Permit Board

MINUTES

Date: Thursday, June 10, 2010
Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Maple Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
                 David Woodson
                 Josh von Loon
                 Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Members absent: Stan Hamilton
                Jim Taylor

Staff: Karen Russell, Manager Development Services; Joe Stott, Director of Planning; and Rachel Wiersma (Recorder)

Presenters: Steve Forrest, Adera; Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects; and Jonathan Losee, Jonathan Losee Ltd. Landscape Architecture

Guests: 1 member of the public

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

Karen Russell introduced David Woodson as the UBC Administration member of the Development Permit Board. The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the March 25, 2010 Meeting

The Minutes from the March 25, 2010 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 New Application

3.1 DP 10017: South Campus Lot 30 (Ultima)

Steve Forrest, Adera, presented photos from the PCBC 2010 Gold Nugget Awards where Wesbrook Place tied for the Best Community Site Plan and Pacific won the Best Multi-Family Housing Project – 4 to 6 Stories. Ultima is Adera’s 7th project at UBC’s Vancouver campus.

Karen Russell summarised the project and the variances. Reference was made to a few corrections to the report including: site coverage is 54.5% (not 58.5%), and there are a total of 66 parking stalls for this project (not 72). Karen introduced Steve Forrest, Adera Development, who presented the vision and context for the four-storey apartment building located on Lot 30 in South Campus. Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects, and Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect described the details for the project.

The following comments were made by the applicants in response to questions from the DP Board:

Sustainability

- Energy Section of REAP has only 20 out 50 points. The applicant did not know the details of the breakdown for the section.
- The applicant will review the submission as there have been design changes that would result in more points for the section.
- Cost factor with materials is the main reason for not pursuing more points under energy.
• The applicant did not know what the kilowatt hour/square metre use was for the building. This is how academic buildings are measured.
• REAP and LEED Gold are comparable systems.
• Ensure that the central boiler with storage tanks for hot water is well insulated. Include measures to ensure PH of water is balanced otherwise the copper will corrode sooner.

Landscape
• The roof gardens will not be integrated with the water feature.
• The roof gardens consist of large planters on concrete pavers to prevent penetration with the roof membrane.
• The water feature was not designed as a storm water feature as the water levels need to be maintained and the level is too shallow to allow for fluctuations. An onsite tank for stormwater retention is provided.
• Stormwater management for Wesbrook Place has only been completed on the east side; the west side still needs to be installed.

Architecture
• All ground oriented units have direct access to street, including sliding locking doors and gates from the patio.
• There’s a hydro kiosk in the corner of the plan.
• The stairwell to the parkade has an alarm and light for security.
• “UBCish” design is more institutional and robust compared to a similar structure built in Kitsilano.
• Acoustic performance between units is in the high 50s.
• Storage space is listed on the Statistics sheet as it is excluded from the building area.

Parking
• Electrical charge stations are being built 1 at every 5\textsuperscript{th} stall. They will be metered separately for monitoring.
• 1 stall per unit is being provided and meets requirements. No one wishes to pay for a second stall.

The Chair acknowledged the comments from the AUDP.

The following motions for the residential development on Lot 30 (Ultima) in the South Campus Neighbourhood were moved, seconded and CARRIED:

A. That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the residential development known as Ultima on Lot 30 in Wesbrook Place as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:
• That a REAP Gold rating be achieved for the project consistent with the commitment put forth by the applicant in the REAP checklist.
• That the applicant pursue substantial improvement to the energy section of the REAP checklist.

B. That the following variances to the regulations in the Development Handbook be permitted and incorporated in the Development Permit:
• S. SC2.5.(b) south side yard setback to be relaxed to allow the underground parking garage, cantilevered balconies and balcony columns, and the roof to project into the 2.5 m setback requirement by varying amounts to a maximum of 1.20 m for balcony roof projections (See plan sheet SK-1 in Attachment A).
• S. SC2.5.(d) maximum building height of 14 m (45.9 ft) is relaxed to allow a height of 16.7 m (54.8 ft) to allow stair penthouses and living room roofs.
• S. SC2.5.(f) maximum site coverage is relaxed from 50% to 54.5%.
4.0 Information Items

4.1 DP Amendments
Joe Stott summarised the report on the amendments to Development Permit DP 06012: Coast and DP 07010: UNOS Parks.

5.0 Other Business
The Development Permit Board discussed the implication of Bill 20 on development and plan approval processes at UBC.

Nancy Knight suggested the Development Permit Board go on a tour of neighbourhoods on campus.

Harold Kalke mentioned the innovative practices of a Japanese housing company for the DP Board’s information: http://www.ichijo.co.jp/index.shtml

6.0 Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma
1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The Agenda was adopted as amended to move forward Other Business to 3.0.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the June 10, 2010 Meeting

The Minutes from the June 10, 2010 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Other Business

Nancy Knight provided an update on Bill 20, the legislation affecting governance on campus and the subsequent amendments to the Land Use Plan.

Bill 20 passed in cabinet in June 2010 and relieves Metro Vancouver of their governmental responsibilities for UBC. The Bill transfers land use planning responsibility to the Province, specifically the Minister of Community and Rural Development, in consultation with the Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. The current Official Community Plan becomes a Land Use Plan, including one change in the Thunderbird area from Future Housing to Academic. Metro Vancouver’s regional responsibilities towards other activities such as waste management will continue.

The Board of Governors is fully responsible for preparing a new Land Use Plan and amendments for the Vancouver campus. The Minister of Community and Rural Development has final approval. The Ministry can set additional process or content requirements by Order and is responsible for determining the fit of the Land Use Plan with Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy.

Updates to the Land Use Plan are necessary to support UBC’s vision of creating a model university community that is vibrant, livable and sustainable, and to support the University’s academic mission.

During the Vancouver Campus Plan Review process, and in consultation with the UBC community, several barriers to realizing that vision of a model university community were identified. Amendments to the Land Use Plan will address these barriers by:
• Creating more affordable housing and a more sustainable community;
• Changing the land use designation of the UBC Farm from “Future Housing Reserve” to “Green Academic” to support sustainability teaching, research and Innovation (see Cultivating Place; The South Campus Academic Plan); and to also transfer housing density from the farm
• Regularizing academic land use designations to better align with UBC’s academic vision.

A Public Open House will be held on July 15 in the SUB Ballroom.

4.0 New Application
4.1 DP 10021: South Campus Lot 28 (Rental)

Karen Russell summarised the project, presented the revised plans as a result of the applicants changing the massing in response to AUDP comments and the resulting recommendations. Karen introduced Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, who presented the rationale for the design changes and the REAP submission for the two four-storey rental apartment buildings located on Lot 28 in South Campus. Keith Hemphill, Rositch Hemphill Architects, and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates described the details for the project.

The following comments were made by the applicants and/or staff in response to questions from the DP Board:

Massing
• AUDP raised valid concerns with the design and the revised massing is a better solution for the site.
• Site coverage was reduced from 50% to 45% and from 111 to 106 units for both buildings combined.
• In response to DP Board Member’s concerns with the decrease in density as a result of the design changes, it was noted that the density can be captured on other sites in Wesbrook Place.
• Ensure the buildings on adjacent Lots are designed to respond to the proposal.

Architecture
• Sloped roof design really stands out. The architect designed this building to be different from the others along Wesbrook.

Landscape
• Courtyard is semi-private. Landscape designed to be a visual barrier, but there is no gate to the courtyard on plans. If there is a security concern in the future, a gate could be added between the two buildings.
• There is no green street to connect to between Lot 28 and Lots 27 and 29 (3-storey townhouse sites to the west).
• The courtyard space and potential adjacent courtyard space on Lots 27 and 29 would be a large amenity that wouldn’t be public.
• Revised design creates a much more useable open space for both buildings.
• Roads and green streets are the primary and secondary routes. The courtyard is a tertiary/semi-private route to access ground oriented units from the outside.
• Street trees are too young and should be larger.

Sustainability
• REAP rating needs to be improved.
• Ensure no problems with rain screen wall.
• Should include smart meters to ensure accountability by residents.

Other
• Building 2 is a non-market Faculty/Staff Rental Building. One member was concerned with the term Faculty/Staff and recommended it be termed Live/Work.
Gerry McGeough, University Architect, updated the DP Board with regard to the AUDP resolution. Changes to the design have been made and satisfactorily address the concerns AUDP raised in three ways:

- European street wall – pedestrian experience is enhanced
- Site is long and thin and revised massing provides more views and improves the quality of life for both buildings with more useable space
- The change is more sustainable with the south orientation as there is more cross ventilation in the units.

The DP Board made the following comments on the proposal:

Given the overarching and appropriate ‘UBC’ concerns about issues relating to the durability, efficiency and liveability of these two buildings, the DP Board considers the Applicant’s responses to the AUDP’s concerns adequately and sufficiently address UBC’s mandate for these residential buildings.

It is noted that the AUDP’s Motion to support the project was subject to certain design changes to the building and landscape elements, and on balance the DP Board deems the Applicant’s proposed amendments to the design adequately address the AUDP’s concerns.

The following motions for the residential development on Lot 28 (Rental) in the South Campus Neighbourhood were moved, seconded and CARRIED:

A. That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the rental residential development on Lot 28 in Wesbrook Place as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:
   - That a covenant be registered on the property to allow public access to the encroaching sidewalk (0.9m) on the Wesbrook Mall frontage.
   - Improvement of the REAP checklist submission to upgrade the energy performance of the project prior to Development Permit issuance.

B. That the following variances to the regulations in the Development Handbook be permitted and incorporated in the Development Permit:
   - S.SC2.5(b) minimum side yard setback to be relaxed from 2.5m to 2.19m for a portion of the west facing side of Building 1 (See drawing A1.1 in Attachment A).
   - S.SC2.5(c) minimum rear yard setback to be relaxed from 2.5m to 1.67m for a portion of the west facing side of Building 2 (See drawing A1.1 in Attachment A).

5.0 Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma
UBC Development Permit Board

MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2010
Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Maple Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
Stan Hamilton
David Woodson
Jim Taylor
Josh von Loon

Members absent: Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Staff: Karen Russell, Manager Development Services; Joe Stott, Director of Planning; and Stefani Lu (Recorder)

Presenters: Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust; Cynthia Melosky, Polygon Homes; Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Architects; and Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative.

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda
The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The Agenda was adopted.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the July 14, 2010 Meeting
The Minutes from the July 14, 2010 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 New Application
3.1 DP 10024: East Campus Lot 1 (rental)
Karen Russell summarised the project, the surrounding land uses, and road changes to the area. Karen introduced Cynthia Melosky, Polygon Homes, who presented the rationale for the design and the REAP submission for the fourteen-storey condominium building located on Lot 1 in East Campus. Gwyn Vose, IBI/HB Architects and Joseph Fry, Hapa Collaborative presented the architectural and landscape details for the project.

The following comments were made by the applicants and/or staff in response to questions from the DP Board:

Architecture
- In response to the DP Board’s concerns with the need for an accessible washroom for the meeting room on the ground floor and the DRC’s request of adding one, C+CP staff noted an accessible washroom is needed to be in compliance with building code accessibility provisions. The Applicant noted that the meeting room is utilized by the residents of the building only. Thus, the floor plan does not include an accessible washroom because the residents can use their own washroom.

Parking
- In response to the DP Board’s concerns with the handicapped parking stalls being available to persons with needs, it was noted that a provision is in place in the UBC land lease document that resolves availability issues.
Landscape

- Trees highlighted in grey, as shown on Sheet A4.04, will be saved and re-planted at the eastern corner of the property. The applicant will work with an arborist on saving more trees for re-planting.
- The DP Board recommended that the trees planted on the property should be larger in scale.
- Water-feature pool is a decorative feature which has 6 to 8 inches depth of water. Handrail will be installed along the edge of the feature to curb accessibility.
- Courtyard is semi-private with timber bench seating on the edge and decorative paving and planters.

Sustainability

- In response to the DRC’s recommendation on improving the energy performance rating within the REAP checklist, the developer has made changes to achieve a “Gold” level rating from the earlier submission for a “Silver” level rating.
- The developer is interested in receiving information on how to purchase a Green Power Certificate from BC Hydro. C+CP staff will assist the Developer on obtaining this information.

The DP Board made the following comments on the proposal:

The Chair advised the Developer to be super cautious and proactive on security issues. The Chair noted property/bike theft crimes are widespread, and as such it would be wise and prudent to address the issue now.

The Board is pleased with the architecture, plans, and siting of the project.

The following motion for the residential development on Lot 1 in the East Campus Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

A. That the DRC’s request to add an accessible washroom for the meeting room on the ground floor was deemed unnecessary by the Development Permit Board. The project is approved without the accessible washroom on the ground floor.

4.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm

Minutes submitted by Stefani Lu
UBC Development Permit Board

MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, November 10, 2010
Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Venue: Maple Room, Ponderosa Centre, 2071 West Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
Stan Hamilton
David Woodson
Jim Taylor
Josh von Loon
Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Staff: Karen Russell, Manager Development Services; Joe Stott, Director of Planning; and Rachel Wiersma (Recorder)

Presenters: Michelle Paquet, Chadwick Choy, Paul Young and Mike Redmond, UBC Properties Trust; Ray Letkeman and Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.; and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates.

Guests: 4 members of the public

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

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

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the August 11, 2010 Meeting

The Minutes from the August 11, 2010 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 New Application

3.1 DP 10022: South Campus Lot 22 (Co-Development)

Karen Russell introduced the project and summarised the review process and the resulting design changes to include more 3-bedroom units for a total of 73 units: 27 1-bedroom, 24 2-bedroom and 22 3-bedroom. REAP was updated to 145 points (Gold level). Karen introduced Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, who summarised the conditions for the four-storey co-development building located on Lot 22 in Wesbrook Place. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc., and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, presented the architectural and landscape details for the project.

The following comments were by the applicants/staff in response to questions from the DP Board:

Co-development Housing
- Affordable housing for Faculty/Staff. Savings come from no developer or marketing costs and owners participate in the design and development of the project.
  - Less parking also helps with affordability with the cost at $35,000/stall. Parking will also be a separate purchase for each unit.
- Screening of purchasers does occur to ensure eligibility criteria are met but there is no ratio for allocation between Faculty and Staff.
- Building will have a strata corporation.
- Re-sales are controlled during the first 5 years and can be sold to anyone but at a reduced profit for the owner. After 5 years individual units can be sold at market rates.
  - There is no control over the future UBC job tenure of an owner.
• Co-development contributes to the 50% work/study target in the Land Use Plan.
  o Hampton Place did not have these targets when it was developed and has a 40% work/study ratio but does not have any rental, co-development or policy guidelines.
• One member commented that there should be a longer-term commitment to ensure 100% Faculty/Staff remaining in the building.
• Another issue is the maintenance of 50% target over the long term.
• Owners must be a resident for this development.
• Construction will start in the spring 2011 and completion is expected in 15 months.

Landscape
• Grade change along Ross Drive is 3 feet.
• Patios on south side of building have a good view of Nobel Park.
• Addition of stairs for access takes up space and exposes more concrete wall.
• An ESA was done and the TRIUMF abandoned line identified on the utilities plan is safe.
• 0.9m easement is a result of changes to the road design widening after the initial survey was done to accommodate transit.

Parking
• Bike parking will include 28 Class 2 stalls.
• Ramp is in line with the ramp for the rental building on Lot 28 across Ross Drive.
• The parking ratio is less than 1 stall/unit: there are 50 stalls for a total of 73 units.
  o All 2 and 3 bedroom units are assigned 1 parking stall.
  o The Faculty/Staff Rental buildings parking lot is never full and more bicycle storage is needed. In market housing, there are more parking stalls and fewer bicycles.
  o Save-on Foods parking lot is too far for visitors and residents to park.
  o One member was concerned with having all visitor parking on-street, especially with the Nobel Park next door and parking requirements for park visitors. The reduction to underground parking ratios will continue to put pressure on parking for the commercial components of South Campus. In addition residential parking at grade will further impact parking for visitors and commercial components.

Sustainability
• Geoexchange is not included for this building. Consider studying the costs.
• Cold and Hot water to each residential unit will be metered and charged to the occupant.
• Members made the following comments on the REAP checklist:
  o Contribution to Community Car Sharing should be based on number of bedrooms not units.
  o Ensure low-flush toilets are of good quality with sufficient flows to avoid blocked sewage lines.
  o Ensure sufficient space for recycling bin pick-up once/week.
  o “Formaldehyde-free” products should be mandatory versus optional.
  o Academic linkages have a potential for 5 points in REAP which seems high for a category that is not directly related to the building itself.
• Encourage developers to work with UNA Sustainability Coordinator to achieve more points in REAP, eg. compost pick-up for buildings.

The following motion for the co-development residential development on Lot 22 in the South Campus Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:
• That a covenant be registered on the property to allow public access to the encroaching sidewalk (0.9m) on the Wesbrook Mall frontage.
• Improvement of the REAP checklist submission to Gold or better prior to Development Permit issuance.

4.0 Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma