



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Campus + Community Planning

UBC Development Permit Board (DPB)

Meeting Minutes
2015



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

- Date:** Wednesday, January 21, 2015
- Time:** 5:00 – 7:30 p.m.
- Place:** Policy Lab A+B, Centre for Interactive Research on Sustainability (CIRS), 2260 West Mall
- Members present:** Andrew Irvine (Chair)
John Metras (Vice Chair)
Andre Gravelle
Qiuning Wang
Victor Ngo
Michael White (ex-officio)
- Members absent:**
- Staff:** Joe Stott and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
- Guests:** 9 Guests/Observers
- Presenters:** Doug Ramsay, Ramsay Worden Architects
Richard Findlay, Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc.
Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

2.0 Welcome to new and returning DP Board Members

Introduction of new members of the DP Board:

- Andre Gravelle, Member of General Academic Community
- Qiuning Wang, Resident Member
- Victor Ngo, Student Member.

3.0 Approval of Minutes from the June 11th, 2014 meeting.

The Minutes from the June 11th, 2014 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

4.0 Development Permit Application

4.1 DP14027: University Boulevard Site B

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Site B in the University Boulevard Neighbourhood. KR stated the recommendation with conditions outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board and introduced Michelle Paquet from UBC Properties Trust and the Project Architect, Doug Ramsay, of Ramsay Worden Architects who

presented the architectural plans. Richard Findlay Landscape Architect presented the landscape design.

The project is a 6-storey mixed use non-market rental residential and commercial building totaling 78,530 sq. ft. with 90 dwelling units on the upper floors and 5 commercial units at grade.

KR presented the four proposed relaxations stated in the report and added a fifth recommendation for consideration:

- THAT the applicants continue to work with Campus and Community Planning on design development to clarify a distinctive landscape feature adjacent to the west entry, while recognizing the project's role to enhance the stature and focus of the larger Academic Precinct, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Paul Young (PY), UBC Properties Trust provided a rationale to the Board for the relaxation of parking standards which included the following:

- An expectation that the majority of residents will not require parking.
- The availability of spaces on-street and in parking structures.
- The narrow lot size making it difficult to expand underground parking.
- Opportunities to add additional parking on subsequent developments in the neighbourhood should there be demand.

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

- Impact on War Memorial Gymnasium:
 - The Western entrance of the War Memorial Gymnasium will be formalized once the new MacInnes Field is built. While the views to the gym will be blocked on the south side, they will be opened up on the west and north. There will be opportunities to open up the site further on the East side when the GSAB site is developed.
- Pedestrian Circulation/Accessibility:
 - The North/South Service corridor is being designed as a mews. It's a short route to underground parking from University Boulevard. Visual cues are expected to minimize conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. It will function similarly to other shared pathways on campus. The transportation engineer will be consulted regarding all pathways and temporary routes during construction.
 - Access along the north side of University Boulevard is to be maintained during construction. The GSAB site is expected to be used as a staging area.
- Height/Massing:
 - Proposed height (6-storey) exceeds the maximum outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan (5-storey) but conforms with the Land Use Plan which prevails over the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Parking Variances:
 - Buildings in the academic core are typically served by centralized parking structures. A high level of demand for the residential spaces on Site B is not anticipated.
 - The Knockout wall in the underground parking level will provide access to parking on the adjacent future Site D development. There is no desire for additional curb cuts for vehicular access off of University Boulevard.
 - There is currently capacity at the David Strangway building to accommodate additional short term parking.

- There is an intent to review parking needs when the GSAB site is redeveloped.
 - University Boulevard and the Alumni Centre provide some short-term parking spaces.
 - Questions related to parking, circulation and interactions between sites will be part of upcoming precinct-level discussions.
- Drop-off Areas:
 - Drop-off areas for Site B + D can be designated by the University as required on University Boulevard.
- Bicycle Parking:
 - Bicycle parking is consistent with campus requirements.
 - Rough-in for security cameras in the bicycle parking areas will be provided so they can be added at a future date if required.
- Noise:
 - Residents may demand that noise from campus student activities be kept low.
 - The people who choose to live in this neighbourhood will likely be different than those who choose to live in Westbrook Place. There are other housing options around campus for those who seek a quieter environment.
 - Noise impact of late night events and future restaurants on residents in Site B
 - Addressed through design: orientation of units; window glazing strategies; heat recovery ventilators (HRV)
- Landscape:
 - Open space south of War Memorial Gymnasium will be in shadow all the time. How will the space be used by building occupants? Programming for the space includes:
 - Bike/workshop amenity access for the building.
 - Bike Sculpture/mounting rack.
 - Two of the CRUs are double-fronted.
 - Passive activities.
 - Plant species will be carefully chosen for shade; there will be a rain garden. The role of landscape is important at this location as it's one of the significant gateways to the campus.
 - Resolution of landscape features on the west side of the development will be resolved with the applicant team prior to Building Permit issuance.
- Overall Context:
 - The vision for the precinct is a mixed-use complete community concept and an arrival/social hub for the University. Adding housing is a key contributor to vibrancy and community.
 - There is a need to balance academic gateway vs features typically found in a residential area.
- Sustainability:
 - Hydronic heating is planned for within the suites.
 - REAP Innovation Credits:
 - Innovation credits will be confirmed with the consultant team. Options discussed include: hybrid wall construction with an R-Value of 25; HRVs in all units; and water storage.

- o Energy modelling:
 - The commercial retail units are not included in the REAP energy calculation.
 - Individual hydronic heating meters are not cost effective.
 - Expectations will be high in terms of building performance.
 - Encourage applicant to explore options to improve efficiency of the envelope.

The following motion for Site B in University Boulevard Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director of Planning issue a Development Permit for the 6-storey mixed use non-market rental residential and commercial development on Site B in the University Boulevard neighbourhood comprising 90 residential units and 5 at-grade commercial units as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by Ramsay Worden Architects and Richard Findlay Landscape Architect Inc. (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

- 1. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project to permit the number of required on-site parking stalls for people with disabilities to be reduced from a minimum of 9 to 4;**
- 2. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to reduce the minimum number of required on-site visitor parking stalls serving the residential units from 9 to 2;**
- 3. That Section 7.5 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to waive the requirement for on-site parking stalls serving the commercial units which can be served with on-street parking; and**
- 4. THAT Section 7.6 of the Development Handbook be relaxed to permit a portion of the Class 1 bicycle spaces to be reduced in length from 1.8m to 1.2m to allow for vertically mounted racks**
- 5. THAT the applicants continue to work with Campus and Community Planning on design development to clarify a distinctive landscape feature adjacent to the west entry, while recognizing the project's role to enhance the stature and focus of the larger Academic Precinct, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.**

5.0 DP Board Information Report - Various Application Updates

Karen Russell (KR) presented an information report on various neighbourhood DP application updates.

6.0 Other Business

6.1 Election of Vice Chair

John Metras was unanimously elected as Vice Chair.

7.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

Date:	Wednesday, June 10, 2015
Time:	5:00 – 6:30 p.m.
Place:	Commons Room, MBA House, 3385 Wesbrook Mall
Members present:	Andrew Irvine (Chair) John Metras (Vice Chair) Andre Gravelle Qiuning Wang Victor Ngo Michael White (ex-officio)
Members absent:	
Staff:	Joe Stott and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
Guests:	10 Guests/Observers
Presenters:	Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the January 21, 2015 meeting.

The Minutes from the January 21, 2015 DP Board meeting were adopted as circulated.

3.0 Development Permit Application

3.1 DP15013: Lot E

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Lot E in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. KR stated the recommendation with conditions outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board and introduced Michelle Paquet from UBC Properties Trust and the Project Architect, Bob Worden, of Ramsay Worden Architects who presented the architectural plans. Michael Patterson, of P+A Landscape Architecture Site Planning presented the landscape design.

The project is a 6-storey mixed use market rental residential and commercial building totaling 110,646 sq. ft. with 93 dwelling units on all six levels and eight(8) commercial retail units on the north and east sides of the first two floors.

KR presented the four relaxations requested by the applicants as explained in the report. Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, provided an overview of the development within the Village Centre; a review of existing commercial demand; and a rationale for the requested variance for reduced commercial parking stalls for the Lot E development. Bob Worden, Ramsay Worden Architects and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates presented the design rationale to the Board

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

- Quantity of Class 1 bike storage provided is appreciated
- Lounge space will encourage interaction between residents. Will amenity spaces similar to the lounge be a feature in future market rental and market buildings?
 - There is certainly a demand from current tenants and will be considered for future UBC Properties Trust projects. Can't comment on what other developers will do.
- For a six storey project the massing is good; great use of terraces.
- Service entry treatment has been a challenge and will hopefully look okay.
- Mixed use developments are a great achievement on campus.
- Elaborate on type of retail tenants expected.
 - No leases are in place but intend to consult with residents to review demand.
 - East end of building would be best suited for food uses to interact with the existing ones around Norman Mackenzie Square.
 - Upper office floor: North west side would lend itself to office.e.g, health services (physio/chiropractors) and service providers (notaries, lawyers, accountants, etc...)
 - Large ground floor CRU would be best suited for a pharmacy, filling a need in the neighbourhood.
- Identify impacts between residential and food services.
 - There will be a complete separation between commercial and residential uses on floors, with separate entries, lobbies and vertical circulation. Food CRUs will be vented from the roof to reduce impacts on residential tenants.
- Parking variances: A number of projects with parking variances have appeared before the Board recently requesting nominal reductions in parking. Is there an issue with the model used for calculating the parking? The variances suggest that the standards are not reasonable.
 - In F/S housing there is not a great demand for parking for people with disabilities.
 - Prefer to limit the amount of people accessing visitor stalls in the underground area as a safety measure for our residents.
 - For this project, there are 300+ parking spots available in the immediate area.
- What is the process for looking at the parking regulations in the Development Handbook, and what kind of review cycle are we in?
 - We are open to looking at the regulations that we have. Our parking regulations were modelled on Vancouver West Side parking regulations. We took the minimum amount that the city uses and used it as the maximum to discourage car use. Most market condominiums provide the max, F/S rental housing utilization is lower. Generally, the development at UBC generates less demand for parking than in a normal municipal setting. This project is part of a mixed use village and adjacent to ample surface and underground parking and C+CP supports the relaxations. The last site the Board saw was University Boulevard Site B. It was highly transit oriented and C+CP relaxed the parking regulations that are geared for a more conventional residential area. C+CP would be happy, to review the parking regulations in greater detail and amend the Development Handbook accordingly.

- Retail: What will be the impact of varying the maximum size of the unit?
 - The 350m², max CRU size is a metric that was inherited through the OCP, the precursor to the Land Use Plan. A number of retail studies found that the original retail entitlement was a bit low and the Land Use Plan was amended to adjust the cap on the ground floor so it was more geared to population growth. The Neighbourhood Plan and Development Handbook still contain the 350m² metric. The Land Use Plan prevails for interpretation purposes. There is a good supply of small units so the rationale for having another anchor tenant is justified.
- What will happen to current community events held on Lot E?
 - Events happening on site will be moved to the Save-On surface parking lot, which was designed to accommodate such events.
- AUDP note on cladding changes
 - Fine tuning cladding choices. At the last design panel there was a fair level of comfort with the direction of the design. Our interpretation of the note is that the design team will follow through on their direction.
- Retail: Was the community involved in advising what kinds of uses are needed in the neighbourhood.
 - Properties Trust has an ongoing dialogue with UNA and their leasing team interfaces with the community, but there is no formal process in place.
- Removable wall to Save On underground parking. What is the level of security anticipated?
 - Gates will be down for the residential portion of this parking and cameras will be installed.
- The 2-3 bedroom suites shown are smaller than those seen elsewhere.
 - In faculty/staff housing, families spend more time on campus. We plan larger units where it makes sense. There is a fine balance between size and price point for these units. We look at the market every time we design a new building. Our property management groups look at demand and maintain waiting lists that ask pertinent questions to help tailor the buildings. A survey is being developed for existing tenants.
- An FSR of 3.66 is noted for this building, does this conflict with the typical 3.5 FSR max.
 - The 3.5 FSR applies to the residential units in neighbourhood area. Mixed use areas do not have a max FSR; instead the metrics are maximum height (6 storeys) and ground floor retail.
- Public Notification Process: Started May 7 and concluded 15 days later. In light of the small feedback sample, is time for feedback sufficient for the community? Given the academic year, does one size fit all for notification?
 - Typically we allow up to 10 days' notice for the Open House, but we allow for a greater amount of time for online comment after the open house. Our basic notification is based on municipal standards (site signage). This is augmented with email mail-outs, dialogue with the UNA executive; notification at UNA monthly meetings, and letters of notification to residents within a 30m buffer. The DP drawing submissions are posted online upon receipt and online feedback forms have been set-up to collect online responses. Increasingly, more residents opt to submit an online form rather than attend the open house. Additionally, C+CP has recently been posting our responses to all feedback received on the project webpage.
 - Chair Note: Review public notification procedures to see if one size fits all.
- Has there been a large outreach with the Yu residents? Based on the comments received there seems to be strong opposition to the building.
 - It's not surprising that we have a high level of feedback from the immediate neighbours. Residents of the Yu received a letter of notification prior to the open house. Unfortunately the realtors don't always disclose future development sites as best they should. Information regarding future development on Lot E was included on the disclosure statement on Yu leases.

- Loading Bay/Ramp Safety
 - Limited options for placement. North-west corner was best for access, visibility and safety. We are aware of the challenges in the neighbourhood and will ensure adequate signage/safety measures are in place.
- Extra setbacks appreciated.
- Design panel has been satisfied.
- Public consultation focuses on the exterior of the building. Can interior design be incorporated into the consultation process in the future?
 - C+CP does not regulate interior finishes, which is up to the discretion of the developer. Consumers should ensure they receive the finishes that they want when making a purchase. Implementation of a post-occupancy survey might be a good idea going forward.
- Comment from Jan Fialkowski, Executive Director of the UNA. Re: Ramp safety along Webber Lane. In the near future a child care facility will be built adjacent to the Community Centre. The entrance is anticipated to come off of Webber and the parking bays on both sides of Webber will be needed for short term drop-off parking for parents bringing children to the centre. It is critical that the ramp safety be nailed down.
 - These points are known to C+CP and will be factored in when the child care centre is designed. The streets in the neighbourhood are intentionally narrow to keep speeds down.
 - Include the following recommendation in the permit to articulate the safety concerns of the Board:

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

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the mixed use residential/commercial development comprising 93 residential units and 8 commercial retail units on Lot E in Wesbrook Place as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by Ramsay Worden Architects and Perry + Associates (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

1) That the following sections of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project:

- a. Section SC4.5(g) that sets 350 m2 as the maximum floor area for each retail unit other than the neighbourhood grocery store to allow one ground floor retail unit at 934 m2.
- b. Section 7.5 to allow the following variances to vehicular parking stall requirements:
 - a. Visitor residential: to reduce the number required from 10 to 9
 - b. Disabled residential: to reduce the number required from 10 to 8
 - c. Commercial: to reduce the number required from 16 to 11
- c. Section 7.6 to allow the commercial Class II bicycle parking requirements to be reduced from 52 to 42

2) That a legal instrument be prepared between UBC and UBC Properties Trust to allow access from the parking ramp to Webber Lane.

3) That appropriate safety measures will be implemented in the design of the parking ramp, connection to Webber Lane and installation of appropriate safety signage on the street.

4.0 DP Board Information Report - Various Application Updates

The Chair asked the board members if they had any questions for staff. There were none. The Report was adopted as circulated.

5.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq



minutes

UBC Development Permit Board Meeting

- Date:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015
- Time:** 5:00 – 6:30 p.m.
- Place:** Classroom, Tapestry, 3338 Wesbrook Mall
- Members present:** Andrew Irvine (Chair)
John Metras (Vice Chair)
Andre Gravelle
Qiuning Wang
Victor Ngo
Michael White (ex-officio)
- Members absent:**
- Staff:** Joe Stott, Grant Miller and Karen Russell, Campus and Community Planning
- Guests:** 7 Guests/Observers
- Presenters:** Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc.
Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates
Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust

1.0 Call to Order by Chair and Approval of Agenda

The Chair declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm. The Agenda was adopted as circulated.

2.0 Approval of Minutes from the January 21, 2015 meeting.

The minutes from the June 10, 2015 DP Board meeting were discussed. Quining Wang, UBC Resident Member, suggested an amendment to Campus and Community Planning's response to interior finishes feedback on DP15013 Wesbrook Place Lot E project. All feedback on interior finishes received during the Development Permit consultation process should be passed along to the applicant. Karen Russell has updated the response as follows:

- *C+CP provides input on but does not regulate interior finishes, which is up to the discretion of the developer. **All feedback on interior finishes received during the Development Permit consultation process will be passed along to the applicant for their consideration.** Consumers should ensure they receive the finishes that they want when making a purchase. Implementation of a post-occupancy survey might be a good idea going forward.*

Motion to approve the minutes was approved subject to the revision of the wording. All were in favor.

3.0 Introduction of Grant Miller.

Joe Stott introduced Grant Miller as the incoming Director of Planning, Development Services. Joe Stott will retain signing authority on all Development Permits until sometime in early 2016.

4.0 Development Permit Application

4.1 DP15001: Wesbrook Place Lots 27/29 Faculty/Staff Rental Housing

Karen Russell (KR) introduced the project, presenting the context for Lots 27/29 in the Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood. KR stated the recommendation with conditions outlined in the report to the Development Permit Board and introduced Michelle Paquet from UBC Properties Trust and the Project Architect, Greg Voute, of Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. who presented the architectural plans. Michael Patterson, of P+A Landscape Architecture Site Planning presented the landscape design.

The project includes two- 6-storey wood-framed faculty/staff rental residential buildings totaling 15,316m² (164,861 sq. ft.) with 175 dwelling units.

Michelle Paquet, UBC Properties Trust, provided an overview of the development and a summary of recent changes incorporated into the project in response to Advisory Urban Design Panel and public consultation recommendations. Greg Voute, Raymond Letkeman Architects Inc. and Michael Patterson, Perry + Associates presented the design rationale to the Board and discussed these recent changes in further detail.

KR presented the three relaxations requested by the applicants as explained in the report.

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

Unit Mix

- *What is the process for determining the unit mix?*
 - *Village Gate Homes, the property management arm of UBC Properties Trust that manages faculty/staff housing, maintains a waitlist for that portfolio based on preferred unit type. The list is reviewed on an ongoing basis and determined the mix for this building. There was significant interest in both smaller and larger units.*
- *There are several units (23- 2-bedroom with 1 bathroom), where one of the bedrooms has no windows. Do you have other buildings on Campus that have no windows in a bedroom? Why are they designed this way?*
 - *Anecdotally, dens/offices with no windows in other buildings have been used as a second bedroom. This provides a more affordable option for the budget conscious. Per the new mechanical code all living spaces in a unit need to be ventilated with fresh air. Glazed panels on the door will provide access to natural light. In lieu of a 2nd bedroom, the space can easily be used as a flex space/den.*

Handicapped Parking Variance.

- *Is there a comfort level to allow the variances on Visitor and Handicapped parking stalls?*
 - *Handicapped stalls can be included in the residential count and don't have to be used by people with disabilities until they are needed. The body of the report references the increased frequency of parking variances. It is timely to conduct a survey of existing usage and update the Development Handbook accordingly.*

- *What is the rationale for the request for variances for handicapped parking spaces?*
 - *Faculty/staff housing is workforce housing and we don't have to take into account "aging-in-place" to the same degree that some of the other market condominiums do in the neighbourhood. Property management feedback shows there is low utilization for its designed purpose.*
 - *Campus and Community Planning confirmed that there is a level of comfort with this approach.*
- *The Board has asked staff to undertake a survey to better understand the utilization of visitor and handicapped stalls and to bring that information forward to a subsequent meeting. This would include reflecting on the experience in Vancouver in parking utilization looking at built-out areas where 50% of residents are within walking distance of downtown.Parking*
- *Parking appears relatively full in existing buildings. A lot of the tenants also park on the street. As the community gets built-out demand for street parking will increase. If we are reducing the number of parking stalls, are we shooting ourselves in the foot in the long term? Is there a long term demand analysis in place?*
 - *There is no minimum parking requirement at UBC. Parking in other Faculty/Staff buildings is between 60-80% capacity. UBC Properties Trust is comfortable with the amount of parking provided.*
- *There are some really tight turns in the proposed layout that is not well suited for larger vehicles. Is this the best you can do?*
 - *We'll take another look at it.*
- *Are there other projects with a shared parking ramp with similar volume?*
 - *Yes. Tapestry and Pathways combined would provide a similar volume.*

Common Rooms

- *What is the capacity of the proposed common room for each building? Will it be sufficient space for 15- 20 people?*
 - *Each room is about 300sf and envisioned as a flexible space to mark exams, read the paper, and informal chats. Details on room layout are to be finalized.*
- *Will sinks, refrigerators, and washrooms be included in these rooms?*
 - *The space will be used as an informal gathering space/quiet study/lounge space area. Those items might take away from the flexibility of that space but will consider including these in future plans.*

Legal Subdivision

- *Was the original subdivision for 2 lots envisioning two smaller buildings?*
 - *Yes, the lots were originally designated for townhouses. When the neighbourhood plan was updated in 2011, the lots were designated as 6-storey wood frame with an FSR of 2.8. By consolidating the lots into one, we were able to incorporate a large courtyard area and the majority of FSR on site.*

Landscape

- *Outdoor space appears to be over designed. Less design achieves more. Is it possible to consider the replacement of stairs with slopes to facilitate access for parents with strollers and children playing?*
 - *Ramps are not feasible throughout the site due to grade changes across the site. Accessible access is provided from the greenway to the common area with 5 feet of grade change.*

- *Walk me through the grade changes on the east-west connection and their impact on accessibility access.*
 - *There is accessibility access to the courtyard areas behind the building on Lot 27 from the greenway to courtyard for the building on Lot 27 and from Gray Avenue for the building on Lot 29.*
- *Was there consideration for any weather protection for the outdoor seating area on Lot 29?*
 - *This has been considered.*
- *What was the rationale for the removal of the water features?*
 - *The water features were removed in response to Open House feedback from residents, recommendations from the Advisory Urban Design Panel and Campus and Community Planning staff.*
- *For staff, are there design guidelines in place for water features in family housing area?*
 - *There are no guidelines.*

Representatives of the University Faculty and Staff Tenants Association (UFASTA) made the following comments:

- *Look at ways to reduce the amount of stairs, to aid accessibility for strollers, children and people with disabilities. Look at grade changes as a safety issue for children and accessibility*
- *Unstructured space is very valuable.*
- *Landscaping as a barrier will not work as people will create their own paths. Reconsider paths to mimic usage/desire lines*
- *Shared parking for all four buildings will create congestion issues during peak times.*
- *Improve sightlines to the existing parking ramps*

Chair Commentary

- *Over the years, we've received more and more feedback online and less from the open houses. Are there any new challenges that we should be aware of?*
 - *The online commentary capability is enriching the process as not everyone can attend the open house or has the time to fill in the comment form at the event. Online comments are accepted until one week after the open house. That being said, it's still important to provide opportunities for a face to face meeting with the design team.*
- *We now have a bit of experience with the larger wood frame buildings. Have there been any surprises?*
 - *Structural is a bit more of a challenge and there have been more coordination issues between disciplines.*
- *We were asked to consider appropriate legal instruments or lot consolidation. Lot consolidation might be better for this situation but which path is recommended?*
 - *Lot consolidation is preferred, and will be done prior to financing.*

The following motion for Lot 27/29 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood was moved, seconded and CARRIED:

That the Development Permit Board recommend that the Director, Campus and Community Planning issue a Development Permit for the faculty/staff rental residential development on Lots 27 & 29 in Wesbrook Place Neighbourhood as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by Ray Letkeman Architects Inc. and Perry + Associates (Attachment A), subject to the following conditions:

1) That the following sections of the Development Handbook be relaxed for this project:

- a. Section SC2A.5(d) to allow the rear yard setback requirement for Lots 27 and 29 to be waived to allow the project to be built on two lots as a single site.
- b. Section 7.5 to allow the following variances to vehicular parking stall requirements:
 - a. Visitor stalls: to reduce the number required from 19 to 17
 - b. Disability stalls: to reduce the number required from 19 to 12

2) That measures be undertaken to permit the construction of the project as a single site on Lots 27 and 29 through appropriate legal instruments and/or lot consolidation; and

3) That measures be undertaken to ensure that appropriate legal instruments are secured to allow access to the underground parking levels on Lots 27 and 29 through Lot 28.

4) In addition, the following recommendations were made by the Board:

- a. Campus and Community Planning staff will arrange for a study on parking utilization in Wesbrook Place and the results reported to the Board at a future meeting.
- b. And that the following measures will be considered by the applicant:
 - UBC Properties will monitor common room utilization and consider the addition of kitchen/washroom.
 - Reconsider tight corners in the parking garage.
 - Ensure landscaping balances grade changes with accessibility and child friendly common space

The project was Moved, Seconded, and passed unanimously.

5.0 DP Board Information Report - Various Application Updates

The Chair asked the board members if they had any questions for staff. There were none. The Report was adopted as circulated.

6.0 Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm

Minutes submitted by Steven Lecocq

Development Permit Board Feedback Form

One (1) comment form was submitted during the Development Permit Board meeting. In summary:

Feedback	C&CP Response
Feedback: <i>Resident</i> 1. Ramp from Gray Avenue into exterior space would be ideal, instead of stairs. 2. Edible landscape - see Todmorden, England.	These ideas have been passed along to the applicant for consideration.