UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes
2013
1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda
The Chair called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The Agenda was adopted.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the October 29, 2012 Meeting
The Minutes from the October 29, 2012 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application
3.1 DP 13002: Wesbrook Place Lot 22
Karen Russell introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot 22 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. A previous submission for a 4-storey building was approved for this lot by the Development Permit Board in 2010 but was put on hold pending the completion of the Housing Action Plan. With the adoption of the Housing Action Plan and the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood amendments, the project has been revised to a 6-storey Faculty/Staff Rental Building. Karen introduced Chadwick Choy, UBC Properties Trust who introduced the project team. Ray Letkeman, Raymond Letkeman Architects, presented the architectural plans and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, provided the landscape design.

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

Design
- Courtyard is accessible and was modified for easier access in response to DRC comments.
• The front entrance pole is decorative and not needed structurally.
  o The pole is 24” in diameter. It does not obstruct the entranceway.
  o The Development Permit Board had mixed views on the aesthetics of the pole.
• Open up stairwell transparency to the interior.

Sustainability:
• The building will be district energy ready. The boilers will be converted.
• It will be LEED Gold
• Recommend reviewing points and energy performance to achieve REAP Platinum level.

Parking:
• One member was concerned that there was insufficient parking. 1 stall is available for each unit.
• Parking fees are extra on top of rent for Village Gate Homes rental buildings. Fees for renting second and third parking stalls increase significantly for tenants.
• UNA is going to start charging for the use of on-street parking by residents.
• 90% of parking stalls are rented in the buildings, although not all are used.

Overall:
• 6-storey building – one member believed that density is too low for neighbourhood. Land use needs to be developed more economically.
  o Response: 6-storey woodframe balances affordability with density.
  o Also need to balance academic and residential land uses. Research areas in South Campus don’t support overlook from residential areas.

The following motion for Lot 22 in Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the rental residential development on Lot 22 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following condition:

a. That a covenant be registered on the property to allow public access to the encroaching sidewalk (0.9m) on the Wesbrook Mall frontage.

3.2 DP 12017: Wesbrook Community Centre – Daycare Addition

Karen Russell introduced the project and summarized the background and status of the Development Permit application for the Wesbrook Community Centre in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. The daycare addition was to be a Phase 2 expansion to the Community Centre but the daycare project proceeded faster due to funding availability and demand. Walter Francl, Francl Architecture Inc., presented the design and layout for the daycare. The detailed plans will not be finalized until a specific daycare operator is chosen.

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

Overall:
• The UNA Board is responsible for selecting the daycare operator.
• Further daycare spaces are being planned in the neighbourhood.
• There’s a glass canopy from the Community Centre to the daycare entrance. There is also a canopy over each of the daycare entrances.
• Internal room layout not finalized until daycare operator determines it. Current layout is to demonstrate that everything fits.
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 and attached daycare on Part of Lot F, Plan BCP35352 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A) incorporating the Development Permit conditions previously noted in the October 29, 2012 Board resolution (and shown in bold below).

4.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma
minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday April 10, 2013
Time: 5:00 – 6:15 p.m.
Place: Policy Lab, CIRS, 2260 West Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
Jim Taylor (Vice Chair)
Stanley Hamilton
Ellen Wardell
John Metras
Nancy Knight (ex officio)

Members regret: Jim Taylor (Vice Chair)
Stanley Hamilton

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

Presenters: Bruno Wall, Wall Financial; Gwyn Vose and Martin Bruckner, IBI Group; and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership

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 February 14, 2013 Meeting
The Minutes from the February 14, 2013 DP Board meeting was adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application
3.1 DP 13005: Wesbrook Place Lot 6
Karen Russell introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot 6 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. Karen summarized the open house feedback and the updated recommendation for the report. Karen introduced Martin Bruckner, IBI Group who introduced the project team and presented the architectural plans, and Bruce Hemstock, PWL Partnership, who provided the landscape design.

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

Overall:
  • Building, including amenities, is oriented towards Binning Road. Building is not linked directly to the pedestrian pathway or greenway to the village. Pedestrians need to work around the highrise to enter the building at the main entrance.
    o One member suggested a secondary pedestrian entrance connecting the greenway to the tower should be added.
• Building is sold through a 99 year lease with UBC. After the lease expires, it will be the leaseholders decision whether to extend the lease or UBC will buy back the land value at fair market value.
• Ensure walls are acoustically sound.

Sustainability
• Building will be district energy ready.
• REAP score needs to be improved.
  o Currently REAP score is at 145 (updated from 140 points at DP submission)
• Energy Modeling still needs to be completed.
  o Will be complete prior to Building Permit issuance; expect that REAP score will improve but applicants only wanted to submit a target they could guarantee.
  o One member was disappointed that the model hasn’t been complete prior to review by the Development Permit Board.
• This project should meet the 25% below Model National Energy Code for Buildings (MNECB) at a minimum. Most UBC projects have met this level.
• There are more points that can be easily achieved and should be included to improve the REAP score.

The following motion for Lot 6 in Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the market-lease residential development, comprising 206 apartments and 11 townhouses on Lot 6 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by IBI Group and PWL Partnership (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

1. That, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, that the location of the required Class II bicycle parking installation be concluded to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning; and,
2. That, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, that the sustainability requirements be accepted by the Director of Operational Sustainability and a minimum of 145 REAP points be achieved.
3. That prior to the issuance of the Development Permit that revisions related to the architectural issues raised by the Advisory Urban Design Panel be resolved to the satisfaction of the University Architect.
4. That prior to the issuance of the Development Permit that a pedestrian connection to the tower from the greenway be added to the satisfaction of the University Architect.

4.0 Other Business
None

5.0 Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Deborah Mac Donald
minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday May 8th, 2013
Time: 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Place: Classroom, Tapestry, 3338 Wesbrook Mall

Members present: Harold Kalke (Chair)
                  Jim Taylor (Vice Chair)
                  Stanley Hamilton
                  John Metras

Staff: Joe Stott, Director, Campus Planning and Deborah Mac Donald (Recorder)

Presenters: Craig Knight, UBCPT and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates

Guests: Jan Fialkowski, 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 April 10th, 2013 Meeting
The Minutes from the April 10th, 2013 DP Board meeting was adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application
3.1 DP 13012: Mundell Park, Lot 39 Wesbrook Place
Joe Stott introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot 39 Mundell Park in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. It is the last component of the park and green street network in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. Joe summarized the open house feedback and the updated recommendation for the report. Joe introduced Craig Knight, UBC Properties Trust and Michael Patterson, Perry & Associates who provided the landscape, playground design and lighting plan for the Park.

Mundell Park is a 5000 square meter neighbourhood park located south of the Community Centre. The main components of the park and the overall community plan are for a stormwater strategy for the neighbourhood as well as a play area.

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

- The park/green street system water feature has a channel that runs down to Nobel Park. The water will be pumped and recycled.
- The detention pond is part of the stormwater system for the west side of Wesbrook. The water source is from the playing fields and potentially the community centre’s spray park.
The water system is not closed. It ties into the water system to the north for the artificial turf field and storm drains.

- There is a spray park, part of the Community Centre, which has potable water and will also be connected. We are trying to eliminate any storm water coming from the roads.
  - The overall capacity of the stormwater system is based on a 100 year event but the actual detention can be tweaked based on how much water will be let out. It is a valve system where you can open or close the valve. All of the pond water will overflow from Mundell Park down to Nobel Park into the detention tank.
  
- The width of the channel is about 8 feet from the property edge to the liner. The depth varies with a maximum of 6 inches of moving water. Some of the channels will have plantings. This side of Wesbrook has a more organic feel by changing the visual appearance of the channel by introducing plants.
  - The water feature is more of an organic water feature.
    - The water feature is not meant for children to play in it but they probably will.
  
- The replacement trees will be a mixture of native conifers.

- Two pump locations will be added one in Mundell Park and one in Nobel Park. The pumps will circulate and agitate the pond surface. The pumps in each pond will have 2 dry pumps in the pump chamber.
  - There are 4 pumps. Each station has a redundancy for timing so they will come on at different stages. The pumps are off the shelf so the applicant did not know the specific horsepower. The horsepower for the pump is to drive the water back up to the station from Nobel to Mundell Park to get the water circulated again.
  
- At night the pumps will be turned off to have the water come down so there is no noise to disrupt the residents.
  - One member was concerned with the energy consumption of the pumps.
    - It would be less intensive - since the size of the pond is smaller and the well is connected to the aquifer. The pump is an off the shelf commercial grade pump about the size needed for a pool.
    
- One member expressed concerns regarding the sustainability features that the applicant is trying to create with the pumping of the water.
  - The pumps run during the day and then turned off in the evening. The streetlights and bollards would consume more energy. The philosophy behind the detention pond is that the post-development flow would be restricted to the pre-development flow level.

- One member commented that the CPTED principles that should be followed for lighting.
  - There are some parks that don’t light large open spaces. The lighting at night is at a level that will not conflict with neighbourhood residences.

- The trees have already been removed. The site was the old Animal Care Facility. There was a parking lot that was at a higher grade and to the west were some fish ponds so the area had already been deforested.
  - The University’s policy for tree replacement in the neighbourhood is one for one. More trees will be planted on this particular site.

- One member suggested that that playground should not be developed until the residents have moved in to see what kind of play equipment they would want.
  - The concept behind the design for the series of all the parks was to create an active play area for local resident’s kids. The design team was looking at how they could create a play area that kids could migrate along the parks on the west side to experience a different play experience.
  - Joe Stott suggested that after issuing the Development Permit it could be amended if the residents find that the play equipment in Mundell Park does not meet the needs of their children. If the playground equipment is not installed at all, it creates more of a problem.
  
- One member asked what the demand was for play equipment in the overall neighbourhood and is the specific area intended to serve these specific areas or the wider community.
  - Each area has its own identity and diversity with their own unique features and while still being connected it would be a missed opportunity not to install play equipment. It is a distance from Nobel Park to the Community Centre. This park would have the more naturalized structure than the water play park.
- This gives children an alternative to traditional play equipment and gets them back into nature and climbing trees.
- The accessible route is along the greenway to get around the stairs through the park.
- The total capital cost for the project is about one million dollars. The operating costs would be covered by the UNA. The park is an acre in size.
- One member asked about the addition of bike racks.
  - Bike racks seem to be underutilized at the parks. Two sets of 3 UBC standard bike racks have been installed for a total of 12.
- The covered seating in the plaza area has been structurally designed to withstand weather conditions. It is an opportunity for parents to get out of the rain while watching their kids play. An outdoor covered space for the broader community to bring the community out and have a place within the neighbourhood to gather.

The following motion for Mundell Park, Lot 39 Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for Mundell Park, the Useable Neighbourhood Open Space (UNOS) located on Lot 39, and connecting green streets (Webber Land and Scholars’ Greenway) in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings (Attachment A), subject to the following condition:

- It was noted that one member did not approve the play area and suggested that sand should be placed in the area until a consultation with the direct neighbors is held.

4.0 Other Business

None

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Deborah Mac Donald
minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday October 9, 2013
Time: 5:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Place: Gardenia Room, 2210 West Mall

Members present: Stanley Hamilton
John Metras
Erin Rennie

Members absent: Harold Kalke
Jim Taylor
Lisa Colby

Staff: Joe Stott, Karen Russell and Rachel Wiersma (Recorder), Campus Planning

Presenters: Penelope Martyn and Orion Henderson, Campus Sustainability Office

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

As both the Chair and Vice-Chair were absent, Joe Stott, Director, Campus + Community Planning, called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. The Agenda was adopted.

Joe introduced and welcomed the new student representative on the Development Permit Board, Erin Rennie.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the May 8th, 2013 Meeting

Adoption of the Minutes was deferred to the next meeting.

3.0 Information Report

3.1 Residential Environment Assessment Program (REAP) Version 3.0

Penny Martyn, Green Building Manager, Campus Sustainability Office, introduced the updated Version 3.0 of the Residential Environment Assessment Program (REAP). The revisions include the new standards for residential concrete high rise buildings, upgraded performance targets, code compliance requirements, and general housekeeping.

DP Board members discussed the following:

- Life Cycle Assessment
  - Baseline is determined by the project team.
  - It measures how to lessen the impact of the building on the environment
- Energy Data Sharing
  - Disclosure statement to be included in the strata agreement so that the strata corporation has the ability to share data.
Additional Comments:
  o Include a general statement that when the BC Building Code is updated to a REAP target equivalency, the applicable REAP points would no longer be valid.
    ▪ BC Building code gets updated every six years. There is the potential that REAP is not updated in time.
  o Projects would be grandfathered if they applied when the previous version of REAP was in effect.
  o Developers of wood frame and concrete buildings were consulted as part of this process.

The Development Permit Board received the REAP update for information.

4.0 Other Business

None

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm

Minutes submitted by Rachel Wiersma
minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date: Wednesday, December 18, 2013
Time: 5:00 – 7:00 p.m.
Place: Classroom, Tapestry, 3338 Wesbrook Mall

Members present: Andrew Irvine (Chair)
Stanley Hamilton
John Metras

Members absent: Erin Rennie
Jim Taylor
Lisa Colby

Staff: Joe Stott, Karen Russell and Stefani Lu (Recorder), Campus and Community Planning

Presenters: Brad Jones, Adera
Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hamphill Architects
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda
The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:10pm. The Agenda was adopted. The Chair stated that Erin Rennie sent her regrets but provided feedback via email.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the May 8th and October 9th, 2013 meetings
The Minutes from the May 8th and October 9th, 2013 DP Board meetings were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application
3.1 DP13031: Wesbrook Place Lot 32 (Prodigy)
Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot 32 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. KR stated the recommendation with conditions outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board and introduced Brad Jones from Adera who introduced the project team Bryce Rositch, Rositch Hamphill Architects, who presented the architectural plans and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates, who presented the landscape design.

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

Design
• The requested variances for projections into the setbacks are supported to enable the success of the architectural design and livability of the project.
• 6-storeys with 2.8 FSR - the Development Handbook will be updated in 2014 to conform with the new maximum building height and FSR which were approved in 2011 as amendments to the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood Plan.
• There are 59 3-bedroom units among the total of 188 units.
• The path with water features from the building to Mundell Park was done deliberately to provide privacy for the building residents and to prevent park users from using the path as a short cut to the park.

Sustainability:
• The building will be District Energy ready.
• The project will be REAP Gold with an intent to try to achieve REAP Platinum. The ability to achieve a higher REAP rating is limited due to the requirement for a District Energy System.
• The building will have an in-floor hydronic heating system rather than a baseboard heating system to improve energy efficiency.
• Reduced outdoor bike spaces are compensated by the availability of bicycle racks in the adjacent Mundell Park. The outdoor bike spaces are for visitors to use as the residents have a generous number of indoor residential bike spaces which are in excess of the requirements.

Public Consultation + Advisory Body Review
• Campus and Community Planning commented that the open house attendance is considered typical for a project of this type.
• All conditions in the Advisory Urban Design Panel resolution have been resolved to the satisfaction of the University Architect.

The following motion for Lot 32 in Wesbrook Place was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the market-lease residential development, comprising 188 units on Lot 32 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by Rositch Hemphill Architects and Perry + Associates (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

1. Variances be accepted for projections into the 2.5 m minimum setback in various locations identified on sheet A0.09 including:
   • Up to 0.5 M for TH entries
   • Up to 1.2 M for balcony columns
   • Up to 1.4 M for cantilevered balconies
   • Up to 2.0 M for balcony roof projections
   • Up to 1.0 M for Architectural Feature wall

2. A variance be accepted to reduce Class II (outdoor visitor racks) Bicycle Parking from 86 to 62 spaces as documented on Sheet A0.09

4.0 Other Business

The Chair acknowledged and thanked Harold Kalke, the previous Chair, for his ten-year volunteer services to the Development Permit Board.

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm

Minutes submitted by Stefani Lu