



**University Endowment Lands
Minutes from the
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
Tuesday, February 14, 2012**

Minutes from the University Endowment Lands (UEL) Advisory Design Panel (ADP) meeting held Tuesday, February 14, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. 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
Nancy Stern, Architect
James Jarvis, Landscape Architect
Damon Oriente, Landscape Architect
David Grigg, Engineer

Area Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Dave Forsyth, Area A
Stuart Smith, Area A

Other Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Jaymie Ho (*As an observer, except for elections*)
Tamara Knott (*As an observer, except for elections*)
Cameron Thorn (*As an observer, except for elections*)

UEL Staff Present:

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

Also Present:

Dan Funaro, Raffaele & Associates
Monika Kadzielska, Raffaele & Associates
Li Bin Wang, Applicant
James Liu, Interpreter for the Applicant

1.0 Call to Order

Nancy Stern, Acting-Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:04 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 February 14, 2012 be adopted as presented.

4.0 Elections of Advisory Design Panel Chair, Vice-Chair and Recording Secretary for the term of February 14, 2012 to January 31, 2013.

Pursuant to Section 4.1(b) of the UEL Official Community Plan, and Section 62 of the UEL Community Advisory Council Bylaw, the Advisory Design Panel Chair, Vice-Chair and Recording Secretary shall be elected annually from among the Professional ADP Panellists.

Damon Oriente was nominated as Chair, Nancy Stern was nominated as Vice-Chair; and, John Keen was nominated as Recording Secretary for the term of February 14, 2012 to January 31, 2013. All nominations were accepted by the nominees.

Moved, seconded and Carried.

That Damon Oriente be appointed to the office of Chair; Nancy Stern be appointed to the office of Vice-Chair; and John Keen be appointed to the office of Recording Secretary of the University Endowment Lands Advisory Design Panel for the term of February 14, 2012 to January 31, 2013.

Damon Oriente assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

5.0 Adoption of the Minutes

Moved, Seconded and Carried

THAT the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meeting held December 6, 2011 be approved following amendment to Section 4.5 to include the sentence "*The panel discussed whether approving the roof deck would set a precedent in the neighborhood for third stories and the opinion of the panel was that it would not as each case would be judged on its individual merits.*" at the end of the second paragraph.

6.0 Development Permit Application # 11/11 5529 Wycliffe Road, Vancouver, BC

ADP Panel Members Dave Forsyth, David Grigg, James Jarvis, John Keen, Damon Oriente, Roberto Pacheco, Stuart Smith and Nancy Stern reviewed Development Permit (DP) #11/11.

6.1 Overview by Planning Technician (5 minutes)

Dallas Arcangel, Planning Technician, advised that Application #11/11, to construct a two storey single family dwelling and detached 4-car garage. Dallas advised that the proposed dwelling is within the maximum allowable limits as follows:

	Proposed	Allowable
Site Coverage	3,409.50 sq ft	3,409.40 sq ft
Above Grade Floor Area	3,672.10 sq ft	3,682.26 sq ft
Setbacks:		
Front	40 ft	40 ft
Rear	70 ft	70 ft
Left	15.28 ft	15 ft
Right	15 ft	15 ft
Building Height	24.91 ft	25 ft
Parking Spaces	4	9

In addition the proposed dwelling has a maximum area of 10% for a flat roof. A new driveway will not be created. The garage (accessory building) will meet all allowable limits for floor area, setbacks and building height. No variances have been requested for this proposed dwelling.

Q. Does the objection pertain to height of the proposed dwelling?

A. Yes.

Q. Does the objector resided on the far side of the road?

A. Yes, directly across the street.

Q. How much higher is the proposed dwelling than the existing house?

A. The ridge of the proposed dwelling would be at 383.5 feet above sea level and the existing house is 378.6 feet above sea level.

Q. All elements of the proposed dwelling are with allowable limits?

A. Yes.

6.2 Presentation by Applicant

Dan Funaro and Monika Kadzielska of Raffaele & Associates presented details of this development permit application. Dan Funaro showed photos of the planned dwelling and the house from which the objection was received. Photos depicted the view from the roadway between the two homes.

6.3 Questions from Panel to Applicant

Q. The objection is about the view from the objector's deck. To lower the height of the proposed dwelling, the main floor would have to go underground. The proposed dwelling is approximately 5 feet higher than the existing house.

Q. What is the elevation difference on the south side?

A. The objector's house is higher than the proposed dwelling.

Q. The clear height on the main floor is 10 feet and the clear height on the second floor is 9 feet?

A. Yes.

Q. Unfortunately, photos of the affected view have not been provided. The UEL Zoning, Community and Administration Bylaw design guidelines refer to view and view retention; however, without photos there is not sufficient information to determine if the objection is valid. Perhaps installation of a mock-up, as is done in Area B, would be helpful?

Marie Engelbert, UEL Manager, advised that it is helpful to draw attention to the design guidelines; however, they are an appendix to the bylaw. UEL administration is tasked with ensuring adherence to bylaw regulations and in order to remain objective, do not approach objectors to assist them with building their case. In the past, objectors have provided photos and other information with their letter of objection and without prompting from UEL staff.

The objectors to development permit #11/11 have clarified that they would not be able to attend the ADP meeting scheduled for March 6, 2012.

In the past, mock-ups have only been implemented in Area B and this was due to the steep slopes. To Marie's knowledge mock-ups have not been utilized in Area A; however, this could be done if requested by the panel.

Q. Is the height of the proposed dwelling to provide a view above the garage?

A. No. There may be a view from the second floor. Typically, most newer homes today are requesting 10 foot ceilings on the main floor and this has been requested by the home owner.

A. Research of UEL files indicated that the elevation of the second floor of the objector's house is 365 feet. The elevation of the second floor of the proposed dwelling is 368 feet.

Q. The owner is at the meeting?

- A. The owner was introduced. The owner has bought the home to live in.
- Q. What is the roof slope? 8 in 12?
- A. Yes, 8 in 12. The highest part of the house is narrower and there will be more view at the sides of the roof.
- Q. Will any of the existing trees be removed?
- A. At this time it is not anticipated that any trees will be removed; however, there has been some discussion about removing one tree at the side of the proposed dwelling to allow a more open outdoor space. The majority of the existing hedge will be retained with the exception of a small section to permit construction of the garage.
- Q. What are the ridges of the existing houses?
- A. Ridges of existing houses are:
- 5549 Wycliffe Road (to the west of the proposed dwelling) is 385.4 feet
 - 5503 Wycliffe Road (to the east of the proposed dwelling) is 377.1 feet
 - 5529 Wycliffe Road (proposed dwelling) would be 383.5 feet
- Q. Please provide details of materials for proposed house?
- A. Limestone tiles will be used on the front exterior of the house with black concrete roof tiles on the roof.
- Q. Will a structural engineer be reviewing this development proposal?
- A. Yes, CLP Engineering, structural engineers, has been reviewing the proposal and will be stamping the drawings.
- Q. What percentage of the lot is hard surface?
- A. Total permeable and impermeable site coverage of the existing building is 3,850 square feet and total site coverage of the proposed buildings would be 3,409.40 square feet. Permitted site coverage is 3,409.50 square feet.
- A. Concrete pavers would be used for the area designate as the driveway to the garage. The width of the driveway is predetermined by the four car garage and access to the garage bays. Cutting the driveway width to 10 would result in vehicles driving too close to the house.
- Q. What is the style of this house?
- A. The proposed house is a classic style which we believe fits in with the existing neighbourhood.
- Q. Is it a wood frame with an exterior stone rain screen?
- A. Yes.
- Q. There is a variety of styles and elements on the exterior of the proposed house. The UEL does not have style guidelines. To simplify some of the proposed elements, without loss of FSR, is there an opportunity to find a position of compromise by dropping 6" from the 10 foot main floor ceiling height and 3" from the 9' second floor ceiling height. The proposed roof is an 8 in 12 slope. Would it be possible to have a 7 in 12 roof slope?
- Q. Would removal of existing trees enhance the objector's view?
- A. We are not certain without knowing what the view from the deck of the objector is. Is it fair to the applicants to request modifications without knowing whether the home as proposed will make a difference.
- Q. Would have liked to see the landscape architect present to provide more information.
- Q. Would prefer that trees would not be removed; however, understand that removal of trees would open up the rear yard and improve the view from the upper windows.

6.4 Panel Deliberations and Resolution

Development Permit Application # 11/11
5529 Wycliffe Road, Vancouver, BC

The Panel reviewed and discussed information provided by the applicant and UEL staff. Discussion included: height of the existing home compared to height of proposed home; impermeable surfaces; proposed four car garage; choice of materials and possibility of better balance and consistency with other properties in the neighbourhood; roof line and massing; and, compliance with the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw and Design Guidelines.

The panel provided suggestions to the applicant regarding design of the home, materials selected and use of such materials, permeable surfaces, the scale of the main house entry, elevations and landscape design, advising that further consideration of these features may result in better balance and consistency with other properties in the neighbourhood. In particular, recommendations were made to:

- Consider changing the roof material
- Better utilization of stone tile to feature sections of the facade and to create more consistency with other materials used. Reduction in the extent of tile and consideration of a base, middle and top approach to facade materials.
- Unify the architectural features, such as the entry portico, cupola style roof, bay window roof, into a more cohesive and consistent overall style.
- Propose alternate hard landscaping materials that would reduce the amount of impermeable surfaces. It was noted that the proposed removal of large trees from the centre of the lot might have the advantage of increasing the usability of the lot and of potentially improving the view from the objector's home; but the case was also made for retaining trees when removal was not necessitated by the development. A specific request was made that the landscape architect should attend the next Panel meeting.

It was noted that the proposed home meets the requirements of the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw and no variances have been requested. The applicant will therefore wish to consider the points made in discussion and whether they are compatible with the owner's personal preferences in designing their dream home.

In respect of roof height, it was noted that the proposed height is at a higher elevation than that of the house to the east, and lower than the current elevation of the house to the west. Without photos of the objector's current view, and further information describing or depicting the loss thereof, it may not be appropriate to request the applicant to reduce the height of the proposed home as doing so may not improve the view for the objector. Panellists felt that more information pertaining to the view would be helpful, particularly in order to determine whether design modifications such as lower ceilings and change of roof line by decreasing roof slope with a potential downward height adjustment of up to two feet, would have any impact in retaining the objector's view. Obtaining this additional information was distinguished from making the case for the objector and therefore consistent with maintaining panel objectivity.

Recommendation:

Moved, seconded and Carried.

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) recommends that the Manager of the University Endowment Lands (UEL) request that the applicant put in place a mock up of the proposed roof height, that the objector be notified of this and given the opportunity to provide further evidence, photographs and any other relevant information, on the impact of the proposed development on their view. This and any further information to support the objection should be provided prior to February 28, 2012 to allow distribution to ADP members and applicant for consideration at the March 6, 2012 ADP meeting.

Further, that if the objector does not provide additional information as requested, the Manager of the UEL approve development permit application #11/11, for 5529 Wycliffe Road to construct a two storey single family dwelling and detached four car garage as presented. In this instance, this development permit application will not appear on the agenda for the March 6, 2012 ADP meeting.

Additionally, it is recommended that the applicant be asked to consider the advice offered by the Panel in respect of the design choices considered in discussion and, that the applicant consider any modifications to their design resulting from this. Any design modifications should be brought to the March 6 meeting of the Panel.

7.0 The meeting adjourned at 5:21 pm.


Damon Oriente, Chair
Advisory Design Panel


John Keen, Recording Secretary
Advisory Design Panel