

UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes 2012

UBC

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus and Community Planning www.planning.ubc.ca

UBC Development Permit Board

MINUTES

Date: Wednesday, January 11, 2012

Time: 5:00 - 7:00 p.m.

Venue: Meeting Room, Tapestry, 3348 Wesbrook Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)

Stan Hamilton Ellen Wardell

Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Members absent: Jim Taylor

Staff: Joe Stott, Director of Planning, Karen Russell, Manager Development Services

and Rachel Wiersma (Recorder)

Presenters: Bob Heaslip, Norm Couttie and Brad Jones, Adera; Bryce Rositch, Rositch

Hemphill Architects; and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates

Guests: Paul Young and Michelle Paquet, UBCPT; Ralph Wells, UNA

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 December 14, 2011 Meeting

The Minutes from the December 14, 2011 DP Board meeting were adopted.

4.0 Other Business

Bryce Rositch from Rositch Hemphill Architects presented the "Lessons We Have Learned in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood." The presentation covered the existing greenways, pathways and public realm in Wesbrook Place and a comparison of new 4 and 6 storey buildings define the street edge.

3.0 Development Permit Application

3.1 DP 11041: Wesbrook Lot 31

Karen Russell introduced the project, location, site and the REAP Gold for the new residential development on Lot 31 in Wesbrook Place. Karen summarised the two variances to the Development Handbook, which has not been updated yet to reflect the recent Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan Amendments approved in December 2011. Karen introduced the project team Bob Heaslip, Adera; Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hemphill Architects; and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates, who presented the architectural, landscape and sustainability details for the project.

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

Public Comments:

- UNA staff mentioned that compost service can be coordinated with the UNA to add further REAP points and suggested low flow showers should be included.
 - o The applicant will review the REAP checklist.

Overall Board Comments:

- Applicant was congratulated on design for a 6 storey wood frame building.
- Model National Energy Code for Buildings (MNECB) should be below 25%.
 - Building will be district energy ready and metered.
- Include affordability and more mix of units. Neighbourhood is high-end.
- It was noted that some neighbouring residents raised concerns with the project. Ultima Residents requested greater separation between the two buildings. There will be no public access between the courtyards.
- The applicant noted that the amount of surface bike parking was decreased to allow for more landscaping. Additional bike parking is provided underground.

The following motion for new residential development on Lot 31 in Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

- 1. That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the residential development on Lot 31 in Wesbrook Place as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:
 - That the applicant improve the REAP rating for this project, especially in the Energy and Atmosphere category
- 2. That the following variances to regulations in the Development Handbook be permitted and incorporated into the Development Permit:
 - Sec. 7.6 to be relaxed to permit 50 Class II (outdoor visitor) bicycle spaces instead of 79
 - SC1.5 to be relaxed to permit reductions in minimum setback requirements at various locations for architectural projections.

5.0 DP Board Information Report – Application Updates

The Development Permit Board having reviewed the four Development Permit Amendment updates received the Report for information without any questions.

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma

minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday, April 11, 2012

Time: 5:25 – 6:30 p.m.

Place: Classroom, Tapestry, 3338 Wesbrook Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)

Jim Taylor Ellen Wardell

Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Members absent: Stanley Hamilton

Staff: Karen Russell, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma (Recorder)

Presenters: Michelle Paquet and Mike Redmond, UBC Properties Trust

Guests: Jan Fialkowski, UNA and 6 members of the public

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m. The Agenda was adopted.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the January 11, 2012 Meeting

The Minutes from the January 11, 2012 DP Board meeting were adopted.

- 3.0 Development Permit Application
- 3.1 DP 11042: Wesbrook Lot 13 Beach Volleyball

Karen Russell introduced the project and the location for the use of Lot 13 for a temporary beach volleyball league in Wesbrook Place. Karen summarized the notification and recommendations for the project and introduced the project team. Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, provided the background of UrbanRec, the organization running the beach volleyball league and their belief that this activity would add vibrancy to Wesbrook Village and enhance awareness of the neighbourhood.

The following comments were made in response to questions and comments from the attendees at the meeting:

- UrbanRec held a 1 day tournament in Wesbrook Place last August to bring people in the area. The costs were shared (\$40,000 for the sand and \$50/month for fencing). The sand can be re-used on a future development site.
- In response to comments that the noise could be tolerated for a 1 day tournament but league play for 4 nights a week for 5 months would be too noisy, with the music.
 - o UBCPT would have a license agreement with UrbanRec to ensure full control of noise and parking.
 - o UBC follows the City of Vancouver noise bylaws that allows for 55dbA in a residential neighbourhood.

- A neighbouring resident commented that vibrancy in the community already exists during the summer and she would like to see a community garden on Lot 13 as a temporary use instead.
- One resident mentioned that parking is a concern as Keenleyside has no underground visitor parking, only on-street.
- 1 hour parking is designated on Wesbrook Mall but the rest of the neighbourhood residential parking is only regulated until 5pm. There is a concern as to how parking would be regulated and enforced.
- The UNA Board supported the volleyball project in November 2011 in principle pending resolution of parking and noise concerns.

Overall Board Comments:

- UrbanRec is a for-profit company and has many other leagues on campus. This is a community marketing effort for UBCPT; there is no profit for them.
- Parking is already a concern in the neighbourhood and to add the volleyball league would add more pressure on parking availability.
- Concern that 55dbA levels cannot be met.
- Having port-a-potties for 4 months is a concern.
- One member suggested a cash bond from UrbanRec to UBCPT for any parking or noise violations.
- Concerns with enforcement.
- This provides an excellent opportunity to encourage community involvement and student participation.
- The applicant suggested another site is cleared and could be an alternate location (Lot 21).
- The notification period for the DP Board meeting to the public was 1 day.
 - Staff responded that the application process has been refined over the past 3 months and final plans were received at Campus and Community Planning in mid-March, then notification was sent on March 23 to all neighbours within 30m of the site. The Development Permit Board date was decided on once feedback was received. Notice of the Board meeting was only sent to those who responded.

The following motion for new residential development on Lot 13 in Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

- 1. That the Development Permit Board recommend that an alternative site for the beach volleyball league be found and referred back to Campus and Community Planning to resolve parking and noise concerns. The Development Permit Board further clarified that they would like to review the proposal for an alternate site and that:
 - Parking and noise enforcements be addressed
 - Noise levels be tested to determine if the maximum level of 55dbA will not be exceeded

5.0 DP Board Information Report – Application Updates

The Development Permit Board having reviewed the one Development Permit Amendment update received the Report for information without any questions.

6.0 Other Business

None.

7.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma

minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Monday, May 28, 2012

Time: 5:15 – 6:15 p.m.

Place: Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall

Members present: Jim Taylor (Vice Chair)

Stanley Hamilton Ellen Wardell

Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Members absent: Harold Kalke

Staff: Karen Russell, Manager Development Services; Rachel Wiersma (Recorder)

Presenters: David Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust and Margot Long, PWL Partnership

Guests: Jan Fialkowski and Ralph Wells, UNA and 1 member of the public

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Vice Chair called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m. The Agenda was adopted.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the April 11, 2012 Meeting

The Minutes from the April 11, 2012 DP Board meeting were deferred to the next meeting.

- 3.0 Development Permit Application
- 3.1 DP 12007: East Campus Lot 2 Park

Karen Russell introduced the project and the location for the usable neighbourhood open space (UNOS) on Lot 2 in East Campus. Karen thanked DP Board Members for attending this deferred meeting and summarized the open house and recommendation for the project and introduced the project team. David Poettcker, UBC Properties Trust, provided the background and Margot Long, PWL Partnership presented the detailed plans for the landscape design for the park.

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

- · Exercise bars are set in bark mulch.
- There are no toilets in the park. Closest facilities are in Acadia Commons Block, $\frac{1}{2}$ block from the park.
- Children's play area is visible from the exercise loop as the tree canopy is high and it's not far away.
- Accessibility
 - o Main north/south walkway through park is concrete
 - Secondary walks are crushed granite.
 - o Boardwalk is wide enough for wheelchairs.
 - o Paths through the park with bark mulch would not be accessible.
 - o One member requested staff to review paths for accessibility.

- Applicant responded that they will review paths, but are concerned with adding more concrete as the required sub-grade work adds to the budget and needs more space.
- Play area
 - One member concerned with security in play area that is set amongst the trees. Barbeque area is more open with overlook from Sitka.
 - Applicant responded that the play area is visible from Acadia Housing, Osoyoos Crescent and Thunderbird Boulevard.
 - UNA needs to review security on campus in neighbourhood parks and how to address it,
 e.g. closing parks after hours.
- Lighting
 - o The main north/south walkway is lit and the boardwalk has low lighting.
 - o The north/south route frequented by the fraternities is closed at 10pm.
- Trellis
 - o One member was concerned with people climbing on the trellis.
 - The trellis is 14 feet high.
 - o Review the material under the trellis to ensure it's soft, e.g. bark mulch or grass.
- Bird's Nest Playground Equipment
 - o One member was concerned with safety and longevity.
 - The equipment is designed by an artisan and meets all code requirements. Two similar playgrounds by the same designer have already been installed in Oppenheimer Park and a park in Richmond.
 - o One member requested to review appropriate analysis of the safety of the equipment and for staff and UNA to review the cost of maintenance.

The following comments were made in response to questions and comments from the attendees at the meeting:

- The park is in the University of British Columbia lands, not University Endowment Lands.
- The park is a neighbourhood park which will likely draw from the neighbouring Acadia student family housing, East Campus residents and UEL residents.
- Concern with the safety of the trellis.

The following motion for the park on Lot 2 in East Campus was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

- That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the Useable Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS) park on Lot 2 in East Campus Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A) subject to the following condition:
 - · That staff review the following:
 - o Universal access through the park,
 - o Safety of the kids play area,
 - Safety of the surface beneath the trellis area, and
 - Safety of the bird's nest feature, including safety approvals and consultation with UNA Staff.

6.0 Other Business

- DP 11042 Wesbrook Beach Volleyball project has been approved.
- One member requested staff to review the process of notification of the Development Permit Board regarding the rules around Board members discussing Development Permit projects that are under review.

7.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma

minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Monday, October 29, 2012

Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.

Place: Meeting Room, Tapestry, 3348 Wesbrook Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)

Jim Taylor (Vice Chair) Stanley Hamilton Ellen Wardell John Metras

Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Staff: Joe Stott, Director of Planning, Karen Russell, Manager Development

Services; & Deborah Mac Donald (Recorder)

Presenters: Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Inc.
Julien Leger, Francl Architecture Inc.

Michael Thicke, Public Architecture & Communication

Mike Kamps, Engineer

Karen Kiest, Landscape Architects Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates Richard Drdul, Transportation Consultant

Guests: Jan Fialkowski and Ralph Wells, UNA & 1 UNA resident

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 May 28, 2012 Meeting

The Minutes from the May 28, 2012 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application

3.1 DP 12017: Wesbrook Community Centre

Karen Russell introduced the project to the Development Permit Board, describing the location for the Westbrook Community Centre in the Westbrook Place Neighbourhood. Karen summarized the open house feedback and the report recommendation for the project. She introduced the project team. Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Inc., provided the background and Karen Kiest, Landscape Architects presented the detailed plans for the landscape design.

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

Sustainability:

- o Applicant has been asked to meet high energy criteria of 117/kwh/m²/year and to design and document but not to certify the project.
- The cost to obtain LEED certification would be approximately \$100,000. When presented to the UNA Board, they directed that the resources to be used for certification would be better used by designing more functionality and sustainability in the building.
- o There is an energy model that is nearly complete.
- o A Life Cycle Analysis (LCA) was completed on the building to see if there are better construction materials that can be used on the building. The aim of the design effort is to achieve a high performance building envelope by such things as window placement to ensure that you don't generate solar gain by establishing different installation systems and minimizing the amount of glazing as well as minimizing thermal performances on the roof's surfaces. The theme for the project has been for the user group to document the performance of the building and make it operationally simple and functional.

When asked if there had been any thought given to solar energy heating. The applicant responded that they had looked extensively at both Geothermal and solar and from a cost standpoint and the sustainability standpoint the decision was made to spend more of the money on the wood technology.

When asked if any consideration was given to the people who are paying for the building and the capital cost of the building which are different than the operational costs, the applicant responded that there is a commitment to understanding what the temperature levels are and to be able to set the limits within the Community Center and to do things such as lowering the building heating temperature.

- There is no payback to the Capital cost in solar energy so instead use the money on heat recapture. Effort made to take the highest value of sustainable ideas & concepts and put into this building
- o Create a LEED Gold Building that has a Platinum Level Energy consumption
 - Nancy Knight-UBC is comfortable with the applicant and the platinum energy goal in achieving the 117/kwh/m2/year level of energy consumption which is reasonably low. It is also important that UNA is able to operate the building. I feel that the applicant has done comprehensive work towards Sustainability
- o Design team is committed to achieving the 117 level-

Play area

- The DP Board asked what area of the park is dedicated to the daycare
 - o The applicant responded that there is a licensing requirement that requires adequate outdoor space needs to be provided per child. The daycare can have access to a larger space but they need to have a fenced protected space.

Café

- There was a concern about the competition for another café in the community centre.
- The café will be leased to an operator. The intent is to service the people that come into the community centre. The seating area around would be open to the public – when café is shut the users could use the areas around.
- o UNA will be the sub licenser for the Café

Design

- One member asked if one could see into the gym at different levels.
 - The applicant responded that you will be able to see into the gym from the north side of the street as well as the westside of the gym. Inside the building we are proposing a set of barn doors that open up the gymnasium from the atrium space.

- o There is a dance studio that is glazed with one sheet of glass- portions of the fitness centre and child care are glazed as well as the café.
- DP Board members expressed the importance of making the front door legible so it was understood when you walked into the building. And one member suggested that the north wall of the building be opened by installing some smaller windows such as punch windows to provide more connection from the upstairs in order to liven up that part of the building and prevent it from becoming a back alley.
- A DP Board member asked where the Tennis Courts will be located.
- o The applicant responded that the Tennis Courts will be temporally located to the East of the elementary school and in good proximity to the Community Centre.

Stormwater Management Plan

There is an extensive storm water management system that has been installed on Campus and a large sistrine area located under Nobel Park which will take and retain all the water that is a part of the neighbourhood wide system.

- o For the building there will be re-use of the water.
- o One member responded that the future plan was to connect this facility into the district energy system.

The following motion for the Wesbrook Community Centre was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the Community Centre in Brockhouse Park (Portion of Lot F, Plan BCP35352 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood) as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A) subject to the following conditions:

- That the applicant work with Campus & Community Planning and the UNA to strive to achieve an energy consumption performance target rate of 117 kwh/m2/year.
- That an operating budget be developed and presented to the UNA based on projected costs for the facility.

3.2 DP 12017: Wesbrook Community Field

The following motion for the Wesbrook Community Field was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the Community Field south of the secondary school in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A).

4.1 Parking in Residential Neighbourhoods

Transportation Consultant, Richard Drdul, gave a Power Point presentation on parking surveys undertaken in UBC's residential neighbourhoods. The surveys show that there is no shortage of either off-street parking or on-street parking. He concluded that there is no need to change the policies applied to neighbourhood development projects. Operationally, there may be a need to alter some signage in the Old Barn Community Centre to address a localized problem.

The following points were discussed following the presentation:

Visitor Parking.

- UNA issues visiting parking permits so the study found people with visitor permits. We didn't find significant levels of abuse of that or any other problems related to visitor parking.
- How unoccupied spaces are used.
- Some owners have decided to use underground spaces for other purposes which could be problematic. The cost should be bored individually and not by the community.

There will be an OPEN HOUSE on November 20th – a number of options will be presented to the UNA about what we can do going forward- suggest that the UNA start implementing a cost for resident permits which would help to establish a mechanism to control & manage the parking on the street.

The presentation was received as information.

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm Minutes submitted by Deborah Mac Donald