

**University Endowment Lands  
Advisory Design Panel**

Meeting notes from the Regular Meeting of the UEL Advisory Design Panel (ADP) held at **4:30 pm. on Tuesday, September 9, 2008** in Firehall #10, Lower Floor Lecture Room, 2992 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia.

**Professional Members Present:**

Nancy Stern, Architect (Chair)  
Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect  
Bruce Carscadden, Architect  
Shelley Craig, Architect  
Randal Kovacs, Engineer

**Neighbourhood Panellists Present:**

Dave Forsyth (Area A)  
Note: David Tobias was unable to attend, but submitted comments on the agenda items (on file)

**CAC Representatives Present:**

John O'Donnell  
Maria Harris

**UEL Staff Present:**

Greg Yeomans  
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 Stern briefly outlined the structure of the meeting.

**3. Delegations**

**3.1. Agenda Item #1 – Development Permit Application #4/08**

**Westside Christian School – University Chapel  
5375 University Boulevard, Vancouver, BC**

Two CAC Members were in attendance regarding this item.

Lloyd Plishka, representing the applicant, outlined the proposal and indicated that the school would support a time-limited development permit, or a review in five years. Three siting options were presented, including the portables being

located in the front of the building (A), one in the front and one in the rear (B), and both in the rear (C). The applicant preferred option A. Option C presented the most challenges for site design and cost.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

CAC representatives noted that the University Boulevard streetscape was important to the community, and that the two trailers currently on site were in poor condition and detracted from the appeal of the street. They suggested that portables in general should be avoided, but if they prove necessary, consideration should be given to approving them on a time-limited basis. Relocation of the units to the rear of the site was preferable, and the units themselves should be of high quality, purpose-built construction.

The Panel asked for clarification of the current and proposed uses and the siting options presented by the Applicant. The Applicant confirmed that the school site would be lit in the evening, and that purpose-built portable buildings would be used. The Panel asked if the shed in the rear of the property would be improved or demolished. The Applicant indicated that modest improvements to the shed could be done, such as new siding and a better foundation. Discussion continued about safety and security of students under each option. CAC representatives suggested they would support a setback relaxation, so long as no trees were sacrificed, if that facilitated the preferred option.

### **3.2. Agenda Item #2 – Development Permit Application #3/08 5614 Wycliffe Road, Vancouver, BC**

Three meeting attendees identified themselves as area residents with an interest in this project.

The Applicant (Jim Bussey) introduced the owners and outlined the project. He reviewed the proposed setbacks and the yard requirements of the UEL Bylaw.

The Applicant agreed that the Beech tree located on the neighbour's (O'Connor's) property should be protected, and provided an arborist report to the Panel and area residents in attendance showing that the tree would be protected if the garage was moved to a 10 foot rear yard setback, as opposed to the originally proposed 5 foot setback. It was noted that the arborist would be on retainer for the duration of the building process. Ensuing discussion indicated general support for the proposal to protect the tree in question with a 10 foot setback.

The applicant reviewed the site plan and noted there was an agreement with the neighbours that since the existing hedge to the south of the property was dying, it would be removed and replaced with 18 ft cedars to maintain privacy. He explained that a larger garage setback from Wycliffe was considered but dismissed because it was felt it would affect the size of the usable rear yard

and the size of the pool. It was noted that the pool was very important to the owners.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

An area resident (K. Levi) advised the Panel that the proposed setback from Wycliffe was not enough, would detract from neighbourhood character, and is inconsistent with the predominant setback patterns in the area. She disagreed with the UEL's application of the Bylaw regarding yard designations and setbacks.

An area resident and neighbour to the subject site (C. O'Connor) circulated and presented a written submission of his objections (on file). He argued that the method used by the UEL and the Applicant to determine the yards on corner sites was inappropriate, and that the Wycliffe frontage should be the front yard. In that sense, the proposed garage should not be approved. He suggested that locating the garage close to Wycliffe would set a precedent for the neighbourhood and would conflict with established neighbourhood character. He also suggested that the placement of the garage so close to the Wycliffe property line would pose a safety risk to pedestrians who would have inadequate warning of an outbound vehicle.

The Chair asked UEL staff to explain the yard designations. In summary, UEL staff noted that the Applicant has correctly applied UEL yard regulations. The Wycliffe frontage is the exterior side yard, even though the house faces that street. As such, the garage is located in the rear yard. This is the standard approach applied by the UEL and is based on historical yard designations. Changing this for the project would have significant impacts on the setbacks and buildable area of the site, and could result in yard and setback problems for the Knox Road frontage. It would also set a precedent.

The Applicant was asked by the Panel if his clients had considered a two car garage to respond to the setback concerns of residents. The Applicant indicated that this was considered and rejected, as they owners had need of a three car garage for their family.

## **PUBLIC FORUM ADJOURNED: 6:20pm**

### **4. Panel Deliberations**

#### **4.1. Agenda Item #1 – Development Permit Application #4/08 Westside Christian School – University Chapel 5375 University Boulevard, Vancouver, BC**

The Panel asked if the portables would be permitted at the locations depicted in the various options. It was confirmed by UEL staff that they would be considered principal buildings and as such could be located as proposed, as long as the required setbacks were met. Panel members agreed that it would

be preferable if the portables were located in the rear of the site, and that they should be of high quality and not temporary in appearance. The Panel asked UEL staff if a time-limited (eg. 5 year) permit could be issued. Staff indicated that a neighbourhood review of the project could be initiated after five years, but that the DP itself could not be time-limited. This would be more for good will, and the results could not be enforced.

Discussion ensued about placement of the portables in various areas of the property. The Panel strongly supported placement of both portables in the rear of the site, as the other two configurations were unsightly and presented emergency access and safety challenges.

The Panel agreed that the shed at the rear of the property should either be upgraded or removed. The existing covered play shelter was supported as is.

### **Resolution of the UEL Advisory Design Panel regarding Development Permit Application #4/08 – Westside Christian School – University Chapel**

The Advisory Design Panel recommends that the Manager of the UEL not approve Development Permit Application #4/08 on the grounds that the proposed location of the portable buildings does not adequately respond to the character and quality of the existing streetscape along University Boulevard, raises safety and security concerns for the intended users, and may provide inadequate emergency access to the buildings.

The Panel recommends that the applicant consider revisions to the proposal that would:

- Consolidate both portable buildings in the rear of the site;
- Utilize high quality, purpose-built buildings appropriate to the intended use; and
- Incorporate landscaping, sight lines, lighting and/or other features that will reduce the risk of crime and promote the safety of users of the buildings and play areas during the daytime and evening hours.

The Panel supports retention of the covered, open-sided play shelter.

The Panel recommends that the storage shed identified in the development permit application either be removed or substantially upgraded with new siding, sturdy foundations and/or other elements that would make it safe, durable and visually attractive given its prominent location on the site.

The Panel also recommends that the owner commit to a review of the approved development permit every five years to ensure there is public support for retention of the portable structures.”

#### **4.2. Agenda Item #2 – Development Permit Application #3/08 5614 Wycliffe Road, Vancouver, BC**

The Panel noted the neighbourhood concerns regarding the location of the garage relative to Wycliffe, but did not agree with the suggestion that it presented a safety problem for pedestrians, since there was no sidewalk at that location and sight lines into the auto court appeared to be adequate. It was noted that the question of whether or not the applicant would consider constructing a smaller 2 car garage was raised during the Manager's Meeting, and that this option was set aside by the Applicant.

The Panel accepted the UEL's approach to designating the yards in these situations.

Panel members agreed that every effort should be made to set the garage back as far as practical from Wycliffe without unduly impacting the proposed development.

#### **Resolution of the UEL Advisory Design Panel regarding Development Permit Application #3/08 – 5614 Wycliffe Road**

The Advisory Design Panel recommends that the Manager of the UEL not approve Development Permit Application #3/08 on the grounds that the proposed accessory building (garage) does not adequately respond to: (a) the predominant pattern of garage locations relative to principle dwellings in this area; and (b) the intent of the single family dwelling district and design guidelines to maintain the character of the neighbourhood and streetscape.

The Panel recommends that the applicant consider revisions to the proposal that would:

- Increase the setback of the garage relative to the property line along Wycliffe Road to respond to the above concerns;
- Increase the setback of the garage relative to the rear property line to 10 feet, as proposed by the applicant, in order to better protect the health of the neighbouring Beech tree;

The Panel recommends that the applicant follow the recommendations of the arborist report, prepared on behalf of the applicant, to ensure that construction activity does not have an adverse effect on the Beech tree.

The Panel accepts the UEL Administration's application of the Land Use, Building, and Community Administration Bylaw with regards to the establishment of yards on corner lots in Area A.

**Meeting was adjourned at 7:05pm**