



**University Endowment Lands
MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL SPECIAL MEETING
Tuesday, May 17, 2016**

A meeting of the UEL Advisory Design Panel was held in the Westpoint Meeting Room, located in the University Golf Course at 5185 University Boulevard, Vancouver, BC.

MINUTES

Professional Members Present:

David Eaton, Architect - Chair
Jason King, Architect – Vice Chair
Nancy Paul, Landscape Architect - Secretary
Edward Smith, Engineer
Saba Farmand, Landscape Architect

Area Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Kent Mullinix, Area D
Hong Chen, Area D

UEL Staff & Consultants Present

Jonn Braman, Manager
Natalie Coburn, Planning Technician
Lori Foster, Corporate Administrative Officer
Hugh Kellas, Planning Consultant
Gwyn Symmons, City Spaces
Brent Elliott, City Spaces
Spencer Andres, City Spaces
Nancy Hill, AECOM

Applicant & Consultants Present

Stephen Lee, CEO, Musqueam Capital Corporation
Doug Avis, Musqueam Capital Corporation
Bruno Thielmann, Musqueam Capital Corporation Consultant
Jason Wegman, PWL Partnership Landscape Architects Ltd.
Gordon Easton, Colliers International
Peter Joyce, Bunt & Associates

Members of the Public

There were approximately six (6) members of the public present

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 by David Eaton.

2.0 Introduction of ADP Members and UEL Staff

David Eaton introduced the Advisory Design Panel (ADP).

3.0 Adoption of the Agenda (5 Minutes)

Moved, Seconded and Carried

That the agenda for the Advisory Design Panel Meeting of May 17, 2016 be adopted as presented.

3.1 Length of Meeting is 2 hours

4.0 Adoption of the Minutes

Moved, Seconded and Carried

That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Meeting held February 9, 2016 be approved as presented.

Moved, Seconded and Carried

That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Electronic Meeting held March 8, 2016 be approved as presented.

Moved, Seconded and Carried

That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Electronic Meeting held March 29, 2016 be approved as presented.

5.0 Purpose of Meeting

Jonn Braman, UEL Manager, introduced himself, the consulting team from City Spaces, AECOM, and the Applicant. He stated the purpose of this meeting was to introduce draft bylaws to the ADP seeking their comment by June 14th, 2016. He gave a brief overview of the rezoning application and the public meeting process.

6.0 Block F Rezoning Application

Colliers International has applied on behalf of the Musqueam Block F Lands Ltd. to amend the UEL Official Community Plan and Land Use Bylaw to permit a comprehensive mixed-use development on Block F, a 22-acre site bounded by University Boulevard, Toronto Road, Acadia Road and Ortona Road. The proposed development would include:

- A total floor area of 1,246,684 sq., increasing the permitted floor space.
- A range of ownership and rental residential buildings, including townhomes, low-rise and 18 storey high-rise apartments.
- A local commercial village.
- A new UEL park and community recreation facility.
- A childcare facility.
- A publicly accessible system of trails and open spaces.

This was an initial informal discussion of the proposed bylaw amendments and legal documents. A second discussion for formal comment will be scheduled for the next regular ADP meeting in June.

6.1 Overview of Legal Documents by UEL Staff

Gwyn Symmons presented a PowerPoint reviewing the application to date and spoke on the following points:

- The Official Community Plan (OCP) - how the draft bylaws fit with the OCP;
- Changes from the original application submission to the current amendments;
- Key elements of the proposal including the commercial village, high-rises, community centre, daycare, primary trails, affordable workforce housing and other amenities ;
- The proposed bylaws legal framework starting with amendments to the OCP and *The Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw*, including the proposed Comprehensive Development Zone (CD-2) and Design Guidelines, followed by a new Housing Agreement Bylaw and Phased Development Agreement Bylaw, ending with the amendment to the new Works and Services Bylaw and a Restrictive Covenant that will be registered on title.

Gwyn Symmons emphasized that the Design Guidelines are a critical tool for evaluating and approving the draft bylaws - that the guidelines include precedents and examples to guide future development applications in Block F. He commented on the Applicant's guiding principles, next steps in the process of the review, good planning practice, community input and the May 31st scheduled public meeting.

6.2 Presentation by Applicant

Stephen Lee introduced himself and his team. He spoke to the guiding principles of the application and the time frame involved getting to this point.

On behalf of the Applicant, Jason Wegman presented the proposal via a Power Point slide show and spoke to the following points:

- The initial design concept and changes made from last year;
- Tall evergreens which would remain untouched;
- The original December 2013 application including guiding and planning principles;
- June 23, 2015 changes including a community centre/community green as the village centre and village heart;
- Lowered high-rises from 22 to 18 stories;
- Integrated storm water settings creating a natural community;
- Making the community universally accessible for aging in place;
- Wildlife in the community and the habitat for them;
- Urban gardens - a space that connects the whole community.

He commented that the ADP last year was comfortable with the proposed density, form and character of the site but felt the Design Guidelines needed to be strengthened.

ADP members and panelists joined Mr. Wegman at the scale model for further discussion where he highlighted the following:

- Model is to scale for the significant trees with tree height to buildings;
- Public accessibility through the wetlands which bring people into nature;
- Parks, trails and storm water management features;
- Wildlife corridor features;
- Phased development;
- Location of rental units that replaced the previously proposed hotel.

David Eaton asked a question regarding parking in the commercial area.

Jason Wegman responded that there would be designated on-street and underground parking.

Mr. Wegman returned to the podium where he spoke on the following:

- Building height within the open spaces;
- Diversity of housing types and amenities;
- Amount of open green space, with over 9 acres combined committed to public use;
- Habitat creation and connecting people back to nature not just creating an urban context;
- Four phases of the project defined and controlled with the proposed bylaws which state when these amenities are delivered;
- Design Guidelines that enshrine key features of the project including, the vision of the proposal, building massing and character, separate community centre and daycare, and noise guidelines.

Mr. Wegman summarized the proposal as a rich and diverse place people will call home.

6.3 Questions from Panel

Q. Edward Smith asked about distinct energy systems.

A. Bruno Thielmann responded all buildings need to be adaptable for future connections.

A. Nancy Hill spoke about alternate energy systems, utilizing UBC's system, requirements are contained in the Works and Services bylaw.

Q. Nancy Paul asked about the density and how this compares with UBC. Who is the target market or user group for this proposal?

A. Gordon Easton commented that current zoning is 1.45 floor space ratio (FSR) and they are proposing 1.75 FSR. Through the application, the increase of density was addressed but he did not have the UBC numbers to compare. This project is not meant as student accommodation but for downsizers, families, entry-level workers.

Q. Saba Farmand asked if there will be one developer or will these (properties) be sold off to other developers?

A. Doug Avis replied that it hasn't been determined yet and the Musqueam will not be developing out. The Musqueam want to have an ownership role for parcels that will generate income.

Q. Kent Mullinix asked which non-profit society will operate the workforce housing, and what noise mitigation measures were taken?

A. Stephen Lee answered that the non-profit group has not been determined.

A. Gordon Easton answered the noise mitigation standards are contained within the Design Guidelines, which are stricter than the City of Vancouver.

Q. Dave Eaton questioned how the draft bylaws are considered to become law.


- A. Jonn Braman spoke to the process of how bylaw amendments become law and how the Design Guidelines would be entrenched into the bylaw.
- Q. Dave Eaton said reading through the design guidelines should give an idea of what this community is about. He asked what created this opportunity.
- A. Stephen Lee responded that rezoning would create a true mixed-use development. He introduced Jason Wegman to speak to why this development was proposed in this way.
- A. Jason Wegman continued. He said that the Musqueam wanted to create a true community. The UEL does not have its own place compared to UBC. Developed more for the UEL residents' desires and wishes and wanted to entrench the connection to nature. He noted that this development is based on sustainability, economic, and community development, which could not be achieved without rezoning.
- A. Gwyn Symmons commented that the project provides a variety of housing options (i.e. townhouses, condominiums, rental) and that the village square provides opportunities for a variety of events.
- Q. David Eaton asked what would make this different from Wesbrook Village.
- A. Jonn Braman commented on the four areas of the UEL, Block F and the properties adjacent to it. He noted this development would change the face and population of the UEL as the most significant development to date. He said there were two Area D panelists here and that they could give an idea about what it is currently like in this area.
- Q. Edward Smith asked about the phasing of the development and if each could stand on its own.
- A. Doug Avis responded that the Musqueam have commitments to build out Phase 1 which is almost half the site. This consists of building out the wetlands, central park, commercial, and various housing types including the daycare and community centre.
- A. Brent Elliot directed the panel to look to the Restrictive Covenant for the requirements of each phase stating sequencing has been set up regarding infrastructure.
- Q. Edward Smith asked what is the time frame for the phased build out?
- A. Bruno Thielmann said the build out would be about 10 years. Addressing legal requirements to build out Phase 1. Commercial goes in first and then a broad range of housing types. The variety of housing types mitigate risk on the retail area.
- Q. Hong Chen asked about the hotel and tower heights.
- A. Gordon Easton answered that the hotel is no longer in the plan. The height of the towers has decreased from 185 ft. to 175 ft. but still 18 stories.
- Q. Kent Mullinix asked about apartment/unit size noting that the Liberta development has now become a student residence.
- A. Bruno Thielmann mentioned the minimum size requirement of units and that there would be no micro suites.

- Q. David Eaton asked about the keeping of other deciduous trees and gateway elements of the development.
- A. Jason Wegman spoke to standard practices from a third party arborist. They will retain the forest area and a few select wind-firm trees, the rest would be gone. There will be gateway elements at key intersections on Roads A and B that incorporate water features with pedestrian walkways.
- Q. Edward Smith asked why neighbours (to Block F) would want to see the project developed. What would be the top three reasons?
- A. Gwyn Symmons responded with the following amenities: a new community centre, as there is not one currently; parks and trails with active recreational areas, the new commercial village with mixed retail which all creates a desired destination. Comparable to the Olympic Village and its amenities. He also noted this was a mid-scale recreation centre for the public.
- Q. Edward Smith further stated he would want to buy there but how would a neighbour view the development. He commented that sometimes the developer builds it, but no one populates the space. He was concerned about "private" gyms.
- Q. Kent Mullinix wondered if the UEL would manage the community centre and the park. The UEL currently does not have the ability to manage them now. He further noted that what would excite him would be if the project were higher than LEED Gold (Green Building Council) standards with focus on sustainability and the spirit of the park.
- A. Jonn Braman stated that the UEL under the Ministry will maintain the public park and Gwyn Symmons added the centre would be set up then transferred to the public domain.
- A. Doug Avis noted that sustainability is important to the Musqueam. This is the first development the Musqueam have taken on and they want to take an ownership perspective, get it done right. Branding has not taken place yet, but it will be considerate of Musqueam values. We have an interest in making the commercial centre successful.
- Q. Hong Chen asked how much would the community centre cost to build?
- A. Stephen Lee replied that they have extrapolated construction numbers from other centres but do not have any numbers right now.
- A. Hugh Kellas directed Ms. Chen to the standards in the legal documents. The building will cost roughly 8 million dollars.
- Q. Hong Chen suggested that 10 million dollars be put aside (in the bylaw) for the operation of the centre.
- Q. David Eaton noted if not set up properly, this could create a hole. Cost of building is not the issue; it is the staffing and operation.
- A. Bruno Thielmann replied that increased taxes would come with this development and highlighted key features that differentiate themselves from UBC's Westbrook Village. The amount of open space exceeding the 3 acre requirement, the village retail plaza creating animation, and the private daycare next to the community centre, all with the community in mind and the preservation of the spirit.

7.0 Meeting Adjournment

David Eaton closed the meeting by saying what hit him was the possibility that this could be just four stories over the whole site. He called for any further questions – there were none. He acknowledged that this is daunting material to absorb with lots of homework, and thanked the presenters, saying it was good to see the vision.

The meeting was adjourned 5:43 pm



David Eaton, Chair
Advisory Design Panel



Nancy Paul, Secretary
Advisory Design Panel