



**University Endowment Lands
Minutes from the
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
Tuesday, September 6, 2011**

Minutes from the University Endowment Lands (UEL) Advisory Design Panel meeting held Tuesday, September 6, 2011 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:

Bruce Carscadden, Architect, *Chair*
David Grigg, Engineer
Randall Kovacs, Engineer (*at 4:10 pm*)
Jonathan Losee, Landscape Architect
Nancy Stern, Architect, *Recording Secretary*

Neighbourhood Panellists Present:

Dave Forsyth, Area A
Maciek Kon, Area C
Ben Seghers, Area D
Stuart Smith, Area A (*at 4:14 pm*)
Margaret Stuart, Area B

ADP Panellists Absent:

Shelley Craig, Architect
Damon Oriente, Landscape Architect, *Vice-Chair*

UEL Staff Present:

Steve Butt, Acting Manager
Pat Kereiff, Office Administrator

1.0 Call to Order

Bruce Carscadden, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:03 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 September 6, 2011 be adopted as presented.

**4.0 Development Permit Application # 5/11
5637 McMaster Road, Vancouver, BC**

ADP Panel Members Bruce Carscadden, Dave Forsyth, David Grigg, Randall Kovacs, Jonathan Losee, Stuart Smith and Nancy Stern reviewed DP #5/11.

4.1 Overview by Acting Manager

Acting Manager, Steve Butt, advised that Application #5/11, to construct a two storey single family dwelling and detached 3-car garage, meets all the technical requirements of the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw. One letter of objection, related to the siting of the garage, was received during the public review. The application is referred to the ADP solely for this reason.

4.2 Presentation by Applicant

Raffaele Funaro, of Raffaele and Associates, Design & Planning Consultants, advised that this corner lot was difficult to deal with. The location designated for the garage is the best location to ensure privacy, open space and access to sunshine. The garage is located closer to property line to eliminate the requirement for a big driveway. In my opinion, this is the best location for the garage and it should remain in the location we have proposed.

Fred Liu, of Fred Liu & Associates, Inc. Landscape Architect, advised that the proposed layout was determined based upon consultation with the owner and the architect (to ensure compliance with the bylaw, setbacks, etc.).

As noted by the Acting Manager in his introduction the application meets all the technical requirements of the bylaw including the siting of the garage.

Fred Liu stated that the objector mentioned that she had not been able to look at the plans for the proposed application. Fred stated he believed that, if the objector had viewed the plan, she would not have had a position to object.

The landscape design enhances the building and the neighbourhood. This is a long, deep property and after locating the building on the site, we came up with the sunny and private backyard area, which the owner wanted to preserve. To preserve this outdoor space, the garage is located adjacent to the property line along McMaster Road. We would not like to see the garage moved to the back as this would eliminate two patios and an open space. With the proposed garage location, the paved area from the street entrance to the garage has been minimized and the garage doors are not facing the street. We have also proposed a 6' cedar hedge. The proposed garage is an appealing building and, if residents do not want to see the garage, we could put in a taller hedge. We plan to remove the existing hedge which is very tall.

4.3 Questions from Panel to Applicant

Q. Is there a building behind current hedge?

A. No.

Q. Where is the current garage?

A. Attached to the existing building and current access is straight in. The existing hedge is providing privacy for open space and the current garage opens to the street.

Q. Is this a sustainable design?

A. Some fruit trees and a Japanese maple will be removed – some of the existing trees will remain in the new landscape design.

Q. What is the net outcome?

A. The overall streetscape will be improved. We had to consider water runoff and have minimized impervious area, using pervious material where possible. The proposed plant

material will provide more seasonal interest. Medium to small trees have been selected in order to keep the shape 5 to 10 years down the road.

Q. What are the implications of a higher hedge?

A. The objection is based on an open front. It is not certain that a higher hedge would solve the objection.

A. The Acting Manager noted that the UEL does not have a specific bylaw regarding the height of hedges – only the height of fences.

The Acting Manager noted that increasing the height of the hedges to screen the garage would still be counter to the objector's point of "open and friendly appearance".

Q. What about the row of hedges across the rear of the property?

A. We understand that this existing hedge is shared and pretty much runs along the property line.

Q. This is a large lot and the proposed house will be large. Will more big trees be added? The garage has a nice facade, yet we are suggesting hiding it with a hedge?

A. My preference is to present the garage with the proposed facade and keep the hedge low.

Q. Will there be weather protection between the house and the garage?

A. The owner didn't ask for this and apparently is okay with that.

A. The Acting Manager noted that, if a structure was to be built from the garage to house, it would have to be a trellis supporting plants.

Q. The overlook from the 2nd storey of the proposed house is into a neighbouring 2nd storey. Can you address this issue?

A. We have proposed to have a new cedar hedge along there and it could be taller to block the 2nd floor.

Q. Privacy on the deck at the corner - the deck has a jacuzzi and this is within 5 feet of the property line?

A. Jacuzzi is about 10' minimum from the property line. Perhaps the 5' distance referred to is for the steps?

Comments – Area A Neighbourhood Panellist, Dave Forsyth:

The reason Mrs. Levi is not here is because she broke her hip and is unable to attend.

There have been previous objections in this area where neighbours have stated that they do not want garages on the streets. In one case, this included a petition of 40 signatures against a garage at the street. Neighbours want an open front area. In past cases, garages have been moved back following objections. I'm getting a sense that the neighbourhood does not want garages tight up against the street.

Your plans and the architectural model do not reflect what will happen. (The front of the property here is actually the side of the house.) As an Area A neighbourhood panellist, I reiterate what Mrs. Levi stated – that the garage should be further back from property line and there should be lower fencing along the front of the house.

4.4 Meeting Closed to the Public

The meeting was closed to the Public, with the exception of the applicant's representatives, at 4:32 pm.

4.5 Panel Deliberations and Resolution

Development Permit Application # 5/11
5637 McMaster Road, Vancouver, BC

The Panel reviewed and discussed information provided by the applicant and UEL staff. Discussion included: the location of property lines, setbacks and the boulevard; finishing on

the exterior of the house and garage; the BC Hydro easement; history of previous objections pertaining to placement of a garage in the front yard; existing 10' hedge on corner of property and hedge at rear of property; location of jacuzzi; and, compliance with the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw.

The Acting Manager confirmed that the proposed development complied outright with the UEL Land Use, Building and Community Administration bylaw. That, of the most recent four applications with the same circumstances; one had no objections, one was approved notwithstanding objections and two were amended for different reasons.

The Acting Manager also noted that, if the bylaw had defined the front yard as the yard along McMaster, there would have been no room or area to have built a garage in what would then have been the rear yard. This would likely have resulted in a request for a variance to place the garage in the front yard.

Area A Neighbourhood Panellists, Dave Forsyth, requested that it be noted that both Area A Neighbourhood Panellists were not in favour of the proposed location of the garage.

Recommendation:

Moved, seconded and Carried.

The Advisory Design Panel recommends that the Manager of the University Endowment Lands (UEL) approve development permit application #5/11, subject to the applicant implementing appropriate strategies to protect and maintain the trees along the existing rear property line. Such measures shall be to the satisfaction of the UEL Manager.

5.0 Adoption of the Minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Meeting of

Moved, seconded and Carried.

That the minutes of the Advisory Design Panel meetings held:

- May 3, 2011,
- June 7, 2011, and
- July 5, 2011

be approved as presented.

6.0 The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.



Bruce Carscadden, Chair
Advisory Design Panel



Nancy Stern, Recording Secretary
Advisory Design Panel