

University Endowment Lands Advisory Design Panel

Meeting notes from the Regular Meeting of the UEL Advisory Design Panel (ADP) held at **4:00pm on Tuesday, June 3, 2008** in the UEL meeting room, located in the UEL Public Works Yard at 5495 Chancellor Blvd, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Professional Members Present:

Nancy Stern, Architect (Chair)
Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect
Ronald Myers, Landscape Architect

Neighbourhood Panelists Present:

Nora Stevenson (Area C)

UEL Staff Present:

Greg Yeomans
Steve Butt
John Dobbs
Trina Rundgren

1. Introduction of ADP members and UEL staff

2. Adoption of Agenda

- 2.1. Greg Yeomans reviewed the items on the agenda. Chair Nancy Stern Briefly outlined the structure of the meeting.

3. Delegations

3.1. Agenda Item #1 – Development Permit Application #1/08 1851 Adelaide Road, Vancouver, BC

Three residents were in attendance regarding this item.

Loy Leyland, representing the owner, outlined the design changes made to address the May 6, 2008 recommendations of the Advisory Design Panel. He used illustrations to compare the original and revised application. The owner believes he has adequately responded to the community's concerns, and that the proposal is fully compliant with the UEL bylaws.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

A neighbourhood resident and objector argued that no substantive changes were made to the design to make it conform to the neighbourhood's character. He felt that the proposal does not comply with the intent of the Bylaw and will compromise the area's distinct character and reduce property values.

Another speaker felt that the revised proposal responds to concerns about shadowing, but that the design is still not in keeping with predominant character of the area.

A member of the Panel noted that neighbourhoods change and evolve, and that this house is in keeping with other recent new developments in Area C. However, keeping the streetscape consistent over time is a concern for some area residents.

Loy Leyland described the materials and colours to be used, noting that all materials would be of high quality.

Discussions about the future of the neighbourhood ensued, and it was noted that most new owners will likely choose to build new, two-storey homes, since most of the values in this area are in the land and not the original houses. This was not accepted by some area residents, who argued that the intent of the Bylaw was to preserve the existing scale and character of the area. They noted that many owners invest in renovations rather than rebuilding.

Panel members noted that there are no specific design guidelines for Little Australia at this time, and that it would be inappropriate to comment on possible future directions of the community.

PUBLIC FORUM ADJOURNED: 4:50pm

4. Panel Deliberations

4.1. Agenda Item #1 – Development Permit Application #1/08 1851 Adelaide Road, Vancouver, BC

Panel members were advised that Shelley Craig had reviewed the amended application prior to the meeting and recommended that it be approved. In summary, the Panel discussion addressed the following:

It was noted that neighbourhoods evolve and communities change, and that the Panel cannot dictate taste if the Bylaws are complied with. It was observed that this particular development is not setting precedent, as there are other two-storey homes in the community, and the Bylaw has allowed them since it was first introduced. The major community concern, based on those who objected and attended the meetings, appears to be the second storey form and the impacts on the streetscape.

UEL staff noted that the project is before the Panel only because it received objections – otherwise it would have been approved. The objections focused on the project's second storey and the impact it was felt to have on the character of the area. The objections did not specifically raise the style of the proposed house.

Resolution of the UEL Advisory Design Panel regarding Development Permit Application #1/08 - 1851 Adelaide Road

After giving due consideration to submissions of the Applicant and Objectors, and the discussion at the meeting, the Advisory Design Panel concluded that the Applicant has adequately responded to the Advisory Design Panel's recommendation of May 6, 2008 regarding reducing the visual impact of the second storey and considering a more horizontal treatment of the roof. Accordingly, the Panel made the following recommendation to the Manager of the UEL:

"The Advisory Design Panel recommends that the Manager of the UEL approve Development Permit Application #1/08 as revised on May 28, 2008."

4.2. Agenda Item #2 – ADP Meeting Schedule

The meeting schedule was circulated and reviewed. It was suggested to move back the meeting dates in July and September by one week in order to avoid holidays. Some panellists expressed interest in not holding a meeting in August. An updated schedule would be circulated for confirmation by the full Panel.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm