

Meeting Minutes

UBC DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BOARD (DP BOARD)

Date: February 4, 2020
Time: 5:00 pm – 6:00 pm
Place: Social Room, Wesbrook Community Centre, 3335 Webber Lane

Members in Attendance:

Bryce Rositch	Chair/Former Board of Governors
John Metras	Vice-Chair/Member of UBC Administration
Jason Adle	UBC Vancouver Student
Andre Gravelle	General UBC Academic Community
Michael White	Ex-Officio - Associate Vice-President, Campus + Community Planning
Kyle Bruce	UBC Resident

Applicant:

Hugh Ker	Polygon Homes
----------	---------------

Presenters:

Colin Shrubb	DYS Architecture
Bruce Hemstock	PWL Partnership

Staff:

Grant Miller	Director of Planning, Development Services
Karen Russell	Manager, Development Services
Paul Cloutier	(Recorder) Planning Assistant, Development Services

1. **Call to Order by the Chair and Approval of the Agenda**

The Chair brings the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.

A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously for the approval of the Agenda.

2. **Approval of Previous Minutes**

A motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously for the approval of the Minutes of the July 17 and October 9, 2019 Development Permit Board Meetings.

3. **Development Permit Applications**

3.1. DP19036 - The Conservatory

Development Services introduced the site and project. The project was evaluated against planning documents and found compliant with the majority of policies, except for one requested variance:

- i) That SC3A.4 (d) of the *Development Handbook* that requires building heights of no greater than 59.0 m be varied to allow a tower height of 61.16 m.

A correction to tower height calculation, addressing the base plane specified by the *Development Handbook*, is made verbally to the Board:

- i) The height of the building height is corrected from 59.54 m to 61.16 m, due to the sloping site, with the corresponding variance increasing from 0.54 m to 2.16 m.

A clarification was made in regard to raptor nests being protected by provincial legislation. No nests were identified in the consulting biologist's report.

The applicant design team presented the building and landscape designs as well as configuration of amenity spaces and the underground parkade. The building was designed to respond to the adjacent park and ocean. The courtyard is to draw inspiration from the existing Wesbrook Place neighbourhood and includes proposed exterior artwork.

Questions and Comments from the Board:

What is the market demand for 2-3 bedrooms? How did this inform the unit split of the project?

- What makes this different from past projects is that the units are smaller, less expensive, with a larger number per square foot. The project targets students and people wanting to get homes for students at UBC.

There does not appear to be a staging area for trash on Binning Road.

There appears to be a lot of above ground bicycle parking. There is a tendency for a lot of bicycles to get abandoned when students move out. Also, there does not appear space in the underground parkade for bicycle washing or trailers.

- The amount of bike parking is specified by UBC's *Development Handbook*.

How much backyard do the townhouses have?

- There is a backyard area separated from the central courtyard by planting. The strata will be responsible for the planting from building front to building front.

What are you doing to reach BC Step Code 2? I notice the north-south orientation is not ideal for winter heat and summer shading and the west façade is mostly glazing. Those units will be cooking in the summer and fall with all that glazing. Also, there are extensive concrete balconies – are those thermally broken? How will the project meet the energy code?

- The glazing is about 42% and will be using Toro or Starline window wall systems that have significantly better thermal performance than what has been used up until recently. Starline is on some buildings now and it can have better than a 0.35 u-value. On the west face there will be a double low-e coating. There will also be some shading from the balconies. There was also a concern about providing views

The drawings don't have section markers and are at different scales. This makes it somewhat difficult to understand.

To clarify the tree issue: none of the trees on the site are to be retained? If none are to be retained it should be communicated early on to avoid having to address it later on.

- Development Services: None of the trees on-site will be retained

The shadow studies show fall and spring, but not for winter. I recommend that the guidelines be changed to show winter.

- The shadow studies provided are those required in the application.

Will there be opportunities for charging electric bicycles? Will there be stalls? Is there a capacity requirement? If not, there seems to be an opportunity that can be considered in the future.

- There will be bicycle charging outlets in the bicycle locker room. The number has not been determined.
- Development Services: There is not a specific requirement in the *Development Handbook*.

Has there been any consideration of on-street electric vehicle charging? This project has two street fronts that could provide that opportunity.

- The UNA is responsible for the public realm in the neighbourhoods and are rolling out opportunities but they are limited. It would be good to have a report to the Board in the future on this.

What is the rationale for the rooftop solar?

- The project was originally going to have a bunch of panels, but it was realized that only a limited amount power would be provided. Now, the solar will be powering the make-up air unit.

In a previous project there was solar but was a passive house project where the cost was covered by a grant. Here it is displacing already available renewable energy and the cost passed on to the tenants – is this a good use of dollars as opposed to increased insulation, or green roofs? The planning documents are vague on this and more guidelines on what is the best use of green energy dollars would be helpful.

The AUDP minutes in the report note that the dialogue between the tower and the city homes was lacking. What has been done about this?

- The tower was closer to the homes, but the tower has been moved towards to Binning Road to create more of a space there. The tower was moved 13 m to the east.

More accommodation for bicycle sharing would be appreciated as it is a service used by residents and students.

Is the timber from the site to be used in the design? There is almost a 2:1 planting for trees so that is good.

- There will be artwork by Brent Comber using wood for the site and Properties Trust will be using some understory plants for replanting at another site. There is going to be a dialogue with Musqueam to see if they want to use timber from the lot.

The raptor nesting report notes there are no identified nests. What happens when the development permit is issued? Is there another verification step after that? What happens in the unlikely event a nest is found?

- Development Services: The report notes the nesting period begins around March 1st to August 31st, but that it could begin before then. The applicant will need to undertake another nesting survey before the trees are removed prior to March 1. In the event nests are found, provincial acts come into play that have protective requirements for raptor nests that will need to be addressed. C&CP has some experience working with the Province on other sites, such as providing alternative nesting sites.

As Brent Comber is from the North Shore it would be a prudent gesture to accelerate the conversation with the Musqueam, as the timber is in their territory.

In regard to the garbage issue, is there not a policy with UBC or UNA regarding a staging area to be maintained for garbage pickup?

- The intent is that the garbage truck will come into the parkade to retrieve it.

Further to what was mentioned earlier, the gates that are within the courtyard area which is meant to be a common area. It doesn't make sense to have them there.

- They can easily be shifted back to create the perception that the semi-private space is included as part of the public area.

The Chair opened the floor to questions and comments from the public.

Questions and Comments from the Public:

District Energy Service is being used for this project?

- Yes, the project is obligated to connect to the Corix DES.

How do you define semi-public and how to you balance the privacy of the residents with the public space?

- We try to use as few fences or built elements as possible, as they aren't seen as particularly enjoyable visual elements. There should be some expectation at the ground level when you go outside that you will be seen. There will be hedges and plants placed to create screening for the ground level bedroom windows and patios without creating a pen. Also, the location of the walkways and what can be seen was examined. The landscape is intended to be enjoyed by all but create privacy for the ground floor units.

Will there be any water features in the landscape?

- In response to commentary from the Design Panel, and recognizing climate change, it was seen that including potable water in a water feature was not a good direction to go. This is a new direction for PWL Partnership and for Polygon developments. During stage 3 water restrictions, water features get turned off and drained. It was recognized this seems to be the new reality for the Lower Mainland, so visual interest is created through the landscape and not a water feature.
- Development Services: From a broader neighbourhood perspective there was a design review of this neighbourhood, and there was clear communication from residents that use of potable water was a shared concern. Polygon is following guidance that was communicated by a cross-section of the community.

Summary by the Chair:

Recommendations to Campus & Community Planning to report back to the Board on the following:

- i) Electric vehicle charging on streets
- ii) Electric bicycle charging on-site
- iii) Renewable energy – guidelines for best options concerning REAP and Step Code
- iv) Policy for reuse of on-site timber

And the need for clear communication to public regarding tree retention or loss

Recommendations to University Neighborhood Association:

- i) To be thoughtful about how to deal with abandoned bikes.

Recommendations to the Applicant:

- i) Explore options for bike wash and trailer storage in the bike storage areas.

With no additional questions or comments from the Board, the Chair motions for approval of the amended recommendation to the Director of Planning, Development Services:

That the Development Permit Board endorse the recommendation that the Director of Planning, Development Services issue a Development Permit DP19036 for a market resident high-rise and townhouse develop on Lot 5 in Wesbook Place. The project comprises 211 dwelling units in a 20-storey apartment tower and 3-storey townhouse building, as detailed in the attached drawings prepared by DYS Architecture, subject to the following variances:

1. That SC3A.4 (d) of the *Development Handbook* that requires a height no greater than 59.0 m be varied for this project to allow a building height of 61.16 m.

And that the following additional recommendations be addressed:

2. That C+CP report back to the Board on the following:
 - i. Electric vehicle charging on streets;
 - ii. Electric bicycle charging on-site;
 - iii. Renewable energy – guidelines for best options concerning REAP and Step Code;
 - iv. Policy for reuse of on-site timber;
3. That clear communications be made to the public about tree loss from the outset of the project;
4. That C+CP follow up with the UNA about abandoned bicycles in the landscape.
5. Explore options for bike wash and trailer storage in the bike storage areas.

The motion is seconded and carried unanimously to **APPROVE** the recommendation.

4. **Information Items**

Item 4.1. Various Development Permit Applications Update Report

Development Services presented an update report on minor development projects.

The report is accepted by the Board.

5. **Other Business**

No other businesses.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 6:04 pm.

Minutes prepared by Paul Cloutier, Development Services