



**University Endowment Lands
Minutes from the
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
Tuesday, April 3, 2012**

Minutes from the University Endowment Lands (UEL) Advisory Design Panel (ADP) meeting held Tuesday, April 3, 2012 at 4:00 pm in the UEL Public Works meeting room, located in the UEL Public Works Yard at 5495 Chancellor Boulevard, Vancouver, BC.

Professional Members Present:

John Keen, Architect
Roberto Pacheco, Architect
Damon Oriente, Landscape Architect
David Grigg, Engineer

Area Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Tamara Knott, Area C
Maciek Kon, Area C

Other Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Dave Forsyth (*As an observer*)
Jaymie Ho (*As an observer*)
Michael Karton (*As an observer*)
Stuart Smith (*As an observer*)

UEL Staff Present:

Marie Engelbert, Manager
Dallas Arcangel, Planning Technician
Pat Kereiff, Office Administrator

Also Present:

Deborah Salahor, Kenorah Construction & Design Ltd.
Stirling McLeod, Kenorah Construction & Design Ltd.
John and Sue Willson, Applicant

1.0 Call to Order

Damon Oriente, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:07 pm.

2.0 Introduction

ADP panel members and UEL staff were introduced.

3.0 Adoption of the Agenda

Moved, Seconded and Carried
That the agenda for the Advisory Design Panel meeting of April 3, 2012 be adopted as presented.

4.0 Adoption of the Minutes

Moved, Seconded and Carried

THAT the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held February 14, 2012 be approved as presented.

5.0 Development Permit Application # 16/11

4954 Queensland Road, Vancouver, BC

ADP Panel Members David Grigg, John Keen, Tamara Knott, Maciek Kon, Damon Oriente, and Roberto Pacheco reviewed Development Permit (DP) #16/11.

5.1 Overview by UEL Administration (5 minutes)

Marie Engelbert, UEL Manager, advised that DP Application #16/11 is for a development permit to construct new 2-storey house with a 2-car detached garage. The house will have above grade floor area of 2,531square feet. Marie advised that no variances have been requested for the proposed dwelling and it is within the maximum allowable limits as follows:

HOUSE	Allowable	Proposed
Site Coverage	2534.35 sf	1980 sf
Floor Space		
- Above Grade Total	2534.35 sf	2531 sf
Setbacks		
- Front	30'	30.16'
- Rear	35'	35.18'
- Left	6.58'	6.74'
- Right	6.58'	19.18'
Building Height	25 ft	24.99'
Number of Stories	2	2
Parking Spaces	5 sp	2 sp

ACCESSORY BUILDING	Allowable	Proposed
Floor Area	500 sf	499 sf
Setbacks:		
- From rear lot line	5 ft (4 ft abutting lane)	5'
- From side lot line	5 ft	5'
Building Height	Mid pt -12 ft Ridge - 15 ft	Mid: 11.64', Ridge: 14.5'

Four letters of objection were received during the public review period, two of which have been withdrawn. Dallas Arcangel, Planning Technician, advised that some minor amendments have been made in response to the objections received. The applicant may wish to speak to this during this presentation.

Dallas explained that the nature of the objections were privacy, sunlight, gardens, height of the proposed building, form of the proposed building (boxy) and massing of the second storey. One objection, regarding the fence, was withdrawn as the applicant has chosen to recess the fence. Another objection, pertaining to the possibility of the applicant accessing the objector's driveway, was withdrawn as the applicant has assured the objector that they will not use the objector's driveway.

- Q. Are the remaining issues light and privacy.
- A. Yes, as well as the boxy massing of the proposed house. Light, privacy and massing are the main issues arising from the two remaining objections.
- A. One of the two remaining objections was withdrawn with stipulations. The UEL cannot enforce agreements/stipulations between neighbours, so this objection is still considered to be current by the Administration.

5.2 Presentation by Applicant (10 minutes)

Deborah Salahor and Stirling McLeod of Kenorah Construction & Design Ltd. and the applicants, John and Sue Willson, were in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Willson advised that they currently reside on Drummond Drive. They wished to move to a smaller place and liked the peace and quiet of this location as well as the proximity to Pacific Spirit Park. They purchased the existing house at 4954 Queensland Road and have been working with Kenorah since May 2011 to design a house that will meet their needs now and into the future. Mr. Willson apologized for their failure to communicate with the neighbours during the development of the house design.

Mr. Willson stated that they chose a Georgian style of house and they feel the resulting proposal is elegant. They regret that, as stated in their letters, the neighbours do not agree. It was perceived that, due to the high trees and dense laurel, the neighbours to the east would be less sensitive to their proposal. The neighbours to the east do not have windows on the west side of their house.

Mr. Willson stated that after purchasing the house and researching the UEL development permit guidelines, the Willsons felt that a two storey house suited their needs better than a rancher and optimized lot capacity. A rancher (single storey house) would have used too much of the lot. The Willsons preferred upstairs / downstairs living to living in a rancher. The Willsons also explored the possibility of reduced massing on the second floor but, this did not allow the upstairs bedroom space that they wish to have.

This proposal does not include requests for any variances. The applicants believe that the design selected correlates well with the value of the lot and they have been careful not to use elements contrary to those in the UEL area.

Mr. Willson described actions taken to mitigate the objections received:

- Neighbour to the North:

The fence in the front yard has been moved back to better conform with the neighbour's fence. The neighbour has been assured that the contractor will try to preserve the trees and laurel hedge as they are now.

- Neighbour to the South:
This objection was withdrawn when the location of the new garage was more precisely explained. The neighbour was happy with the new plan for the garage.
- Neighbour to the West:
We will obscure two of the windows on the east of our house. Existing side yard setbacks will help retain light to the neighbour's property. Light to the neighbour's library will, at times during the year, be blocked by a tree. More light should be reflected of the west face of the proposed house.

5.3 Questions from Panel to Applicant

- Q. How many of the surrounding existing buildings are stucco?
- A. Lots of the buildings in the neighbourhood, including the existing house at 4954 Queensland, are stucco.
- Q. Your proposed house is a big house but, it complies with the UEL bylaw. Will this be the first two storey house on that block?
- A. No. Preponderance is clearly ranchers from the 1950's.
- Q. Requested clarification of the guideline about character in this area.
- A. Marie read aloud wording from Appendix 2, Design Guidelines for University Hill, Single Detached Dwellings, of the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration bylaw:
"There is no attempt to dictate a particular style or type of design for University Hill. The applicant is asked to consider neighbours when deciding on style, materials and colours as an indication of what is commonly accepted. It is also suggested that the applicant take into consideration the environment of the West Coast."
The bylaw refers to fitting in with neighbourhood character which is quite subjective.
- Q. Would you agree that there are no other houses similar to the one proposed in this area? Other houses in the area have a smaller second storey while yours is quite tall and square.
- A. A smaller second storey would not meet our needs. The applicant gave examples of a number of houses in the neighbourhood with 2nd storey massing - some with different elements. These houses are not within the close proximity of 4954 Queensland Road but, are within the general area.
- Q. Are the houses on either side of the proposed house single storey?
- A. Yes. The roof pitch on the proposed house is shallow in order to meet the height restrictions. The eaves are 2' and it has a 4 in 12 roof slope.
- A. Nothing in the proposal seems unreasonable or unneighbourly, other than the proposal is for a two storey home which may be the norm in 20 to 30 years.
- Q. Have you thought about levelling the lot to mitigate the height of the house?
- A. The property will not step as shown on the model. Properties follow a steady profile which runs along the street scape.
- Q. Was any other design considered for the top floor?
- A. Other considerations were made for layout and space. No considerations of volume were given to achieve the design desired by the applicant.
- Q. Has there been consideration of not having the steps up from the ground to the main floor?
- A. The proposed home already has light wells and these are the maximum permitted by the bylaw on the front and west side. If the home is pushed down further, there will be no light into the basement. Also, if the home is pushed down further, the number of steps down to the basement will increase significantly. Pushing the main floor down causes problems with the basement.

- Q. How does a Georgian style of house fit into the neighbourhood?
- A. We took photos of various houses and picked one we liked. The photo selected was similar to this – straight up and down. The house we picked was not in Area C.
- A. Houses in the three areas of the UEL have different characteristics.
- A. The predominant style in Area C is 1950's bungalows. It's difficult to fit into the neighbourhood as, other than being ranchers, existing houses don't necessarily have many common features.
- Q. What will be the nature of the fences?
- A. Old wooden fencing will be removed. The applicant is a keen gardener and would like a fence to maximize what will be grown. The applicant also has dogs. Proposed fencing would be wooden so it's attractive both from the front of the house and from the alley. The proposed fencing would be similar to that at the house to the west and perhaps closer to the house to accommodate the neighbour to the east. The applicant would work with the neighbour regarding her plantings.
- Q. Can you tell me that there is a precedent for this house in the area?
- A. We are not trying to set a precedent. The applicant likes the style.
- Q. Why was stucco siding selected?
- A. As a sealant and stucco like old country cladding. The applicant preferred the homogenous look of the stucco. Stucco looks best with brick or stone and a combination of wood and stucco may detract from the richness and beauty of the stucco.
- Q. What is the difference between the elevations of the proposed and existing buildings?
- A. Following the meeting, it has been confirmed that the difference between the proposed and existing ridges is 11.48'.

Panel comments included:

- The Panel applauded the applicant's consideration of privacy for the neighbours and addressing concerns of the neighbours. The applicant has taken a great deal of effort to ameliorate the neighbours' concerns.
- The small view corridor along one side of the proposed house is nice for the neighbours.
- The bottom floor matches the top floor with no variation.
- The Panel encouraged the designers to spend more time on development to make the proposed house as attractive as possible.
- A recommendation to break up the design, not the structure.
- The Panel would like to see attention given to some of the details to break up the appearance of the proposed house.
- The Panel suggested that further effort be given to amelioration of the side view for the adjacent neighbour by planting appropriate filigree landscaping which could be enjoyed throughout the year.
- An observation that the neighbours to the east have not expressed concerns.

The Chair requested that one of the objectors clarify their objection.

The Objector responded that they would like their privacy protected by installation of something on the windows facing their property from the proposed house. There is no guarantee that the light to their home will not be changed with construction of the proposed house. Why not be willing to change the proposed house?

5.4 Meeting Closed to the Public

The meeting was closed to the Public, with the exception of the applicant and the applicant's representatives, at 5:24 pm.

5.5 Panel Deliberations and Resolution

Development Permit Application # 16/11
4954 Queensland Road, Vancouver, BC

The Panel reviewed and discussed information provided by the applicant, the applicant's representative and UEL staff. Discussion included: other two storey houses in the proximity of 4954 Queensland Road; a development permit recently issued for a two storey house in the neighbourhood where no objections were received; applicant's efforts to satisfy concerns expressed by the neighbours; massing of the proposed house; neighbours' concerns regarding lighting and privacy; recommendation for further work on the design of the sides and rear of the proposed home to enrich the detail of the house; and, compliance with the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw and Design Guidelines.

Recommendation:

Moved, Seconded and Carried.

The Advisory Design Panel unanimously recommends that the Manager of the University Endowment Lands (UEL) approve development permit application #16/11, for 4954 Queensland Road to permit the construction of a new two storey house with a two car detached garage subject to receipt of additional design development addressing architectural integrity and exterior appearance to enrich the proposed design detail. Review of submitted materials shall be by the Manager of the University Endowment Lands and without further review from the Advisory Design Panel.

6.0 The meeting adjourned at 6:29 pm.


Damon Oriente, Chair
Advisory Design Panel


John Keen, Recording Secretary
Advisory Design Panel