



Campus and Community Planning

Technical Advisory Committee for the Neighbourhood Plans

Minutes

Date: Thursday, December 19, 2002
Time: 11:30 AM – 2:00 PM
Venue: Gardenia Room, Campus & Community Planning, 2210 West Mall

Present: Fred Pritchard Director of Planning, Campus & Community Planning
Judy McLeod Assistant Director, Community & Land Use Planning
Thor Kuhlmann Planner, Campus & Community Planning
Gordon Apperley Director of Utilities, Land & Building Services
Kris Nichols Greater Vancouver Regional District
Thomas Llewellyn University Architect/Landscape Architect
Gord Lovegrove Director, Transportation Planning, LBS
Brian Mills GVTA (Translink)
Bruce Stenning Manager, University Endowment Lands
Paul Young Director of Development, UBC Properties Trust
Joe Redmond UBC Properties Trust
Henry Ahking Vancouver School District

Regrets: Jim Carruthers Manager, Development Services, Campus Planning
Les Lavkulich Director, Resources & Environment
Greg Paris Area Planner, GVRD Parks
Al Poettcker President & CEO, UBC Properties Trust
Max Walker Ministry of Transportation & Highways
Geoff Atkins AVP, Land & Building Services

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

Judy McLeod thanked the committee members for attending. Round table introductions followed.

2.0 Status of Work on Neighbourhood Plans/ Plan Issues

JM reported that each of the Advisory Planning Committees in the North Campus, South Campus and east Campus neighbourhood plan areas had completed introductory meetings. The purpose of the present meeting was to update the Technical Advisory Committee on the issues raised by the APCs and to obtain any additional input before proceeding with subsequent APC meetings. A draft of the East Campus plan is now complete; however, the North and South Campus neighbourhoods have involved consultation before a document has been produced.

3.0 East Campus Plan

Paul Young presented the work to date in the East Campus neighbourhood. He described the EC as a small, relatively straightforward area. A draft of the NP was distributed.

3.1 Boundaries of Plan/Density Distribution

The present neighbourhood plan boundary follows that defined by the OCP and CCP. The fraternity and sorority sites are currently partially included in the neighbourhood area. Extending the boundary to include this area may require an OCP amendment. The fraternity and sorority sites currently have a future housing designation on the west half of their sites and an "Existing Housing" designation on the east half. In the event of their inclusion into the NP they would have an impact on neighbourhood density and market housing. Agreements with the GVRD have allowed the fraternity and sorority sites to proceed with development before the NP is complete. The Fraternity site is now under construction and the sorority site is in preliminary discussion stages. Projects being considered in the neighbourhood include a replacement site for the Triumph House that accommodates visiting researchers, a market rental tower and University rental housing for faculty, staff and student families along Wesbrook.

3.2 Mather Building

Sub-group meetings are taking place with University representatives and Mather Building occupants in regards to the possible relocation of the four separate and distinct uses at this site. This would open up a site for potential residential or institutional use; however, an OCP amendment would be required. PY stated that it is unlikely the occupants of Mather will agree to relocate unless a viable alternative is found shortly.

3.3 Realignment of Fairview Crescent

Plans were reviewed that would realign Fairview Crescent by providing for the extension of Agronomy Road across Wesbrook Mall to Western Parkway. These plans are at the stage where a DP for road construction could be submitted. However, the UEL Ratepayers Association has expressed concerns about possible traffic volume and to making decisions with regard to the road realignment in advance of NP completion. **JM requested copies of all the traffic studies and reports completed to date by the UEL and UBC Properties.** The existing servicing along Wesbrook is in need of repair and an increase in capacity. Upgrades will be undertaken in summer 2003.

JR stated that it would make sense to undertake a realignment of the intersection when the road is dug up next summer.

FP stated that if the Olympic bid were awarded to Vancouver/Whistler plans for the realignment of Thunderbird in concert with relocation of the Thunderbird Winter Sports Centre would move ahead quickly.

JM expressed concern about safety issues for motorists and pedestrians based on the current state of the intersection.

GL, referring to the traffic circle east of the Agronomy/Wesbrook intersection, agreed that the realignment would provide for a more desirable solution than a four-way intersection. He was concerned that the driveway for the development on the SE corner of Wesbrook/Agronomy is too close to the intersection, and suggested an entrance to the parkade access from Western Parkway. This would encourage motorists to continue along Wesbrook rather than driving into the. GL also asked whether acoustics along Wesbrook have been considered and specifically the impact of noise on University rental housing. PY recalled that Fleufy did a report in '97 on design guidelines for development along Wesbrook, taking into account the relationship of housing to the street.

GL requested access to the study and resultant design guidelines.

3.4 Woodlot Retention

JM asked if there would be any clearing of the woodlot for safety and security reasons. JR noted the importance of retention of the woodlot to UBC Properties. Further studies and an implementation plan will be required.

3.5 Other Issues

There was discussion regarding the proposed University rental housing for families and the amount and location of open space that may be provided for children. GL suggested rental housing be located on the Mather site if relocation is made possible.

BS identified the potential need for a Public Open House to bring the community information about traffic counts. JM suggested bringing more people such as Acadia and commercial merchants in the area to the discussion. JM and BS feel that the benefits of the road realignment have to be effectively communicated to the UEL residents. JM suggests discussing the road realignment and safety issues in the broader context of CCP and NP plan details.

FP spoke to the issue of the two sets of pedestrian crossing lights proposed for the intersection.

TL asked about whether there was a plan for revised traffic control at the Thunderbird intersection. Will traffic be sufficiently slowed for a residential area? GL reported that there are plans for a signal; however, the slowing of traffic is in question. The issue of traffic calming on Wesbrook needs to be addressed. This would be addressed at the stage of the Thunderbird relocation. GL gave traffic volume information (< 20,000 cars/day into future) that indicates Wesbrook does not need to be an arterial. The extra lane could provide for bike paths and parking.

PY said that the three important issues to be discussed at the next EC APC meeting are the Market Rental Tower, the future of the Mather Building and what happens with the fraternity and sorority sites with respect to NP boundaries.

4.0 North Campus Plan

JM presented to the committee the North Campus area by showing the extent of the area and outlining the main issues.

4.1 OCP Status

Completion of a hydro geological study and a Neighbourhood Plan are prerequisites to any development in this area. The pressure for a NP is coming from the Museum of Anthropology necessity for expansion and renovation.

4.2 Findings and Recommendations of Hydro geological Study

PY summarized the recommendations of the Piteau Associates' study, which is available on compact disk, on the Campus & Community Planning website and in hard copy. Essentially the area is stable over the long term. There is more risk posed from storm water drainage than from seismic activity. Development can proceed behind a 35-degree setback line from the toe of the cliff with very little risk. This line will form the basis for development of the NP. The 35-degree estimate does not take into account drainage mitigation, which further reduces risk and preserves cliff stability. Due to the lack of till at the surface, dewatering wells must be maintained and put into place in coordination with any new development to move water from the upper aquifer in the cliffs, to the lower one, where ultimate discharge is below the level of the cliff face.

FP noted that this underscores the significance of protecting the cliff face for the preservation of the parkland below. Access to the beach is a current concern for both the UBC community and wider public.

JM reported that the next meeting of the APC is in the third week of January. The committee has asked that the University bring forward all of its plans for the area. The idea of density transfer was discussed conceptually.

4.2 Museum of Anthropology

The MOA is waiting for the results of the NP process. Their own plans will take another 8-12 months and will include more fundraising.

5.0 South Campus Plan

PY gave a brief overview of the status of SC. The proposed uses include a mix of residential, commercial and institutional. The CCP outlines the densities and mix of uses. The NP is looking more closely at density and layouts. The current layout sets up the area as a village centre along a U-shaped roadway. Commercial parking is proposed to be half surface and half below grade. The university will own the NRC building, which had not been previously discussed in the NP process, in 3 years. There is potential here for a community centre and school, which would more effectively integrate the site into the neighbourhood. The VSB recommended up to three additional schools for the UBC Campus to handle projected student populations. While the VSB may wish to consider the NRC site as the site of their Secondary School, preliminary discussions have indicated that it is not considered to be a suitable elementary school site due to its location. An elementary school is not seen to be needed in SC until 2012. There are possibilities for sharing open space for school need in SC.

FP noted that another issue is the existing hazardous waste facility, which may be reduced or decommissioned.

The proximity of the transit loop to the school was raised. FP reported on discussion about utilizing some of the road ROW on 16th for a landscape buffer to maximize use of land, given the feasibility of this for traffic flow.

6.0 Next Meeting/Next Steps

The next meeting will take place in mid-February.

JM will follow up on recommendations for bringing the City of Vancouver to the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:08 pm.