



**University Endowment Lands
MINUTES OF THE
ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MEETING
Tuesday, April, 08, 2025**

A meeting of the UEL Advisory Design Panel was held on **April, 08, 2025 at 4:00 pm** and was hosted virtually via Microsoft Teams from the UEL Administration Office at 5495 Chancellor Boulevard, Vancouver, BC.

Professional Members Present:

Tom Schroeder, Architect - Chair
Kevin Wurmlinger, Engineer - Secretary
Neil Prakash, Architect
Milana Malesevich, Landscape Architect
Marc Winer, Engineer

Area Neighbourhood Panelists Present:

Katerina Wong, Area A
Maciek Kon, Area C
Claire Huxtable, Area D
Alice Wang, Area D

Applicant and Consultant(s) Present:

Development Permit Application #4/23

John Ross - Applicant
Veronica Ross - Applicant
Brian Billingsley, b Squared Architecture Inc. - Architect

Development Permit Application #8/24

Joseph Bros, Musqueam Capital Corp - Applicant
Christopher Chan, Musqueam Capital Corp - Applicant
Babu Kadiyala, Musqueam Capital Corp - Applicant
Charlotte Mearns, Musqueam Capital Corp - Applicant
Ross Moore, Townline - Developer
Korbin da Silva, Townline - Developer
Sena Gao, Townline - Developer
Robert Duke, Chris Dikeakos Architects, Inc. - Architect
Elvis Lin, Chris Dikeakos Architects, Inc. - Architect
Dylan Chernoff, dk/Durante Kreuk Ltd. - Landscape Architect

Staff Present:

William Emo, UEL Manager
Heather Shay, Director of Development Services
Hannah Walsh, Planning Technician
Mark Leung, Corporate Administrative Clerk

Members of the Public Present

Donald Leung - Objector, Development Permit Application #4/23

James Cheng - Objector's Architect, Development Permit Application #4/23

1.0 Territorial Acknowledgement

A territorial acknowledgement was given at 4:09 pm by Mark Leung.

2.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 pm by Thomas Schroeder.

3.0 Introduction of ADP Members and UEL Staff

4.0 Adoption of the Agenda

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Marc Winer:

That the Agenda, as presented, be adopted. None opposed.

CARRIED

5.0 Adoption of the Minutes

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Neil Prakash:

That the Advisory Design Panel meeting minutes of the Advisory Design Panel Meeting of March 11, 2025, as presented, be adopted. None opposed.

CARRIED

6.0 Development Permit Application #4/23

5938 Newton Wynd - Area B

4:16 pm

A memorandum dated April 01, 2025, from Hannah Walsh, Planning Technician, was attached to the agenda package.

6.1 Overview by Planning Technician

4:16 pm

The Planning Technician presented a brief summary of the memorandum on this application.

6.2 Presentation by Applicant

4:21 pm

In summary, the applicant represented by their architect presented on the following:

- Development's context and design components
 - Bedrooms have decks, access to natural light
 - Building overlook and height
 - Height 6 to 7 feet lower than the existing house (*NB: the new build is just under 3 feet lower than the existing house*)
 - Family housing project
 - Multi-generational; care section for parent of applicant
 - Upper floor: Bedrooms and home office
 - 'H' pattern with a connected centre piece
 - Landscaping
 - Property circulation maintained so as not to disturb existing trees, especially those in the east side yard
 - Gardens and shrubbery
 - Minimal side yard glazing
 - Passive house strategy
 - maximization of solar gain, low energy use

- Social/private amenity spaces located mostly in the (rear) SW corner to maintain privacy/reduce exposure
 - BBQ area, swimming pool, trellis
 - Walls: robust, 14-inch thick, with reverse-batten pattern
 - Window views
 - Ocean view to the north critical
- Comparison to neighbouring property to the east, 5912 Newton Wynd
 - Distance between windows of respective houses are between 57 to 65 feet
 - Window alignment, side-by-side, vertically
 - Slope and vegetation (e.g. 7 to 8-foot high hedge) in between properties yields less exposure
- Grudging context of neighbour's objection and neighbourly living philosophy in nearby Kitsilano

6.3 Questions from Panel to Applicant

4:44 pm

In summary the Panel and the Applicant discussed:

- Building massing
- Hedges
 - Non-encroachment of BC Hydro statutory right of way re: electrical conduit
 - Secondary hedge (evergreen) on neighbouring property at 5912 Newton Wynd
 - Shared hedging
- Height mock-up applicability: No mock-up due to lower, proposed building height; mock ups are not a policy or bylaw requirement
- Passive house design strategy/tree canopy
 - Winter/solar gain, use of larger deciduous trees
 - Glazing of proposed house is centralized
- Swimming pool
 - Enclosure consideration and poly-wall around for winter swimming
- View and privacy regarding view consideration
 - Requirements of the UEL *Land Use, Building and Administration Bylaw*

7.0 Meeting Closed to the Public

(Except for Applicant and/or Applicant's Representatives)

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Milana Malesevich:

That the meeting be closed to the public, with only the Professional Members, Applicant, Area Neighbourhood Panelists, and UEL staff remaining; all members of the public otherwise departed at 5:01 pm.

8.0 Panel Deliberations and Resolution

Development Permit Application #4/23

5938 Newton Wynd - Area B

5:01 pm

In summary the Panel discussed:

- Hedging
- View and privacy
 - according to the UEL *Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw*
- 40 percent UEL *Tree Management, Protection, and Removal for SF-1 and SF-2 Lots* policy target
 - Trees/canopy
- Driveway damage/tree protection

Having considered the design as presented and the *Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw*, the Advisory Design Panel recommends that the applicant, and UEL staff where indicated, consider the following for Development Permit Application #4/23 at 5938 Newton Wynd :

Recommendation 1:

The Panel has considered the importance of privacy views as noted in Appendix 2 of the UEL *Design Guidelines for University Hill Single Detached Dwellings*. It is our recommendation that the proposed design does not unduly compromise the privacy of the adjacent neighbours. Windows are not directly overlooking, and the proposed deck is adequately screened by vegetation. The Panel recommends that the existing hedges be allowed to grow as tall as possible to provide additional screening.

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Neil:

That the above recommendation(s) be adopted. 5 in favour; none opposed.

CARRIED

Recommendation 2:

Encourage the applicant to explore providing larger shade trees placed further from the south and west façades to allow seasonal performance and meet the 40 percent UEL *Tree Management, Protection, and Removal for SF-1 and SF-2 Lots* policy target.

During construction, be very mindful of damaging the existing hedge along the east property line; have a tree protection plan for the hedge in between the two properties; and, ensure a project arborist is present for any and all construction around or near the tree protection zone.

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Milana Malesevich:

That the above recommendation(s) be adopted. 5 in favour; none opposed.

CARRIED

9.0 Short Recess (5 - 10 minutes as required)

This item was skipped by general agreement.

10.0 Meeting Reopened to the Public

(And for next Applicant and/or next Applicant's Representatives)

5:20 pm

11.0 Development Permit Application #8/24

Lots H & I, Block F - Area D

5:21 pm

A revised memorandum dated April 03, 2025, from Hannah Walsh, Planning Technician, was attached to the agenda package.

11.1 Overview by Planning Technician

5:21 pm

The Planning Technician presented a brief summary of the memorandum on this application.

11.2 Presentation by Applicant

5:27 pm

In summary, the applicant presented on the following:

- Applicant introductions and land acknowledgement
- Context of proposed development
 - 100% rental apartments and townhomes
 - BC Energy Step Code 3
 - Building permit has been applied for
 - Connection to Block F district energy system
 - 26-storey and 25-storey towers
- Design elements, incorporating Musqueam culture
 - Colour palette
 - Ochre clay, copper, cedar/wood grain
 - Baskets/weaving and traditional carving
 - Job opportunities for Musqueam community
 - Louver screen for elevator overrun and mechanical noise on rooftop
- Landscaping
 - Bike share, mainly along Crooked Branch Road
 - Bioswales linked to pathways on site
 - Bird-field with extensive tree canopy
 - Children's play area relocation
 - Garden plots designed to take advantage of sunlight
 - Greenway activation along townhouses, connection to Ortona Road from main plaza area
 - Outdoor Spaces for lingering
 - Lighting, paving, and outdoor seating on site conforms to palette
 - Small and large outdoor amenity, and flex, spaces
 - Common rooftop terrace
 - Storm water detention on site
 - Plantings: Musqueam and some non-native plants
- Public (Musqueam) artwork in the public realm, artist selection
- Site plan
 - Amenity spaces
 - Bouldering/yoga, club room, communal outdoor BBQ, community lounge, co-work lounge, dining/meeting room with connection to a patio, games room, gym, mail room, theatre, storytelling wall/children's playroom
 - Ortona trail to Crooked Branch Road statutory right of way
 - Day and night lighting
 - Pedestrian access
 - Emergency, utility (garbage), and loading vehicle access
 - Parkade
 - 2-levels central parkade
 - Bike rooms
 - Central stair with lantern design allowing daylight penetration
 - Electric vehicle charging availability: 100% potential with 5% initial activation slated
 - Stalls for carshare, car washing, moving/changing residences
 - Residential units
 - 1- and 2-bedroom
 - All units feature air-conditioning, balcony, full bathroom and kitchen
 - Porte-cochère

11.3 Questions from Panel to Applicant

5:52 PM

In summary the Panel and the Applicant discussed:

- BC Energy Step Code 3
 - LEED goal as yardstick versus actual certification
- Building components, elevations, hat-like design
 - House - post entry at the ground level
 - Building height and decorative roof
 - Louver screen dimensions re: mechanical room and elevator run
 - Height versus floor space ratio
 - Density/height per new Provincial housing legislation
- Building manager availability: during working hours
- Car share calculation: Initial implementation of two stalls is based on Modo Carsharing Co-op use at adjacent Ieləṁ Village parkade, with potential for increase as needed
- Charging for electric bikes
- Community centre amenity contribution: \$40.00 per unit from building owner
- Design changes re: community comments from previous ADP meeting
 - Existing community centre plus additional amenity spaces
- Ground level walkway relationship with the landscape
- Ground level amenity spaces: resident accessibility, access to building manager's office
- Housing types and affordability
 - 100% rental, including townhomes
 - 23 3-bedroom and some 4-bedroom units, mostly in the townhomes
 - Market rentals
 - Minimum unit size
- Irrigation for site landscaping
- Landscape plantings: allergens
- Definition of liveable closet space: accommodates a tenant's entire wardrobe
- Location of children's play area, re: proximity to family dwelling units
- Off-street parking space allowance re: congestion and available on-street parking
 - Pay parking on Crooked Branch Road and Acadia Road
 - Allowance based on historical parking demand at Ieləṁ Village
- Parkade entrance and alternate parkade entrance locations
- Passive shading and cooling
 - Energy modelling and targets confirmed at BC Energy Step Code 3
 - Connection to existing Block F district energy system
- Pedestrian access
 - Paving pattern and bollard use
- Preferential access to units
 - Priority to Musqueam Indian Band members
- Public art
- Rooftop design
 - Creativity, noise buffering by louver screen, wind loading
- Unit sizes, in square feet
 - Studio: 401, 426; 1-bedroom: 539, 540, 550, 555; 2-bedroom: 795; 3-bedroom: 937, 1,000, 1,009, 1,017, 1081; 4-bedroom: 1,350, 1,528 (764 x 2 levels)
- Road congestion/transportation re: increased density
 - Less parking demand
 - Traffic impact assessment indicated no increased demand on surrounding roads

12.0 Meeting Closed to the Public

(Except for Applicant and/or Applicant's Representatives)

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Neil Prakash:

That the meeting be closed to the public, with only the Professional Members, Applicant, Area Neighbourhood Panelists, and UEL staff remaining; all members of the public otherwise departed at 6:37 pm; no members of the public were present.

**13.0 Panel Deliberations and Resolution
Development Permit Application #4/234
Lots H & I, Block F - Area D**

6:37 pm

In summary the Panel discussed:

- Parking capacity
- BC Energy Step Code
- Impact of ground level parkade entry on adjacent townhouse unit
- Decorative rooftop screen

Having considered the design as presented and the *Land Use, Building and Community Administration Bylaw*, the Advisory Design Panel recommends that the applicant, and UEL staff where indicated, consider the following for Development Permit Application #8/24 at Lots H & I, Block F:

Recommendation 1:

The Panel agrees with the applicant that the decorative screen is an important opportunity for a unique identity for the buildings and development. The Panel encourages the applicant to develop the design of the screen with the same rigor and prudence that they are using to develop the Musqueam artwork on site.

Recommendation 2:

Consider relocating the pedestrian entry pavilion to the parkade. Its current location directly in front of a townhouse unit may adversely affect residential privacy and livability. An alternative entry point that does not interface directly with primary living spaces should be explored to enhance both functionality and resident comfort.

Recommendation 3:

The applicant should consider boosting the proportion of family-friendly 3 bedroom plus units and below-market rentals given prior community concerns.

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Neil Prakash:

That the above three recommendations for Development Permit Application #8/24 be adopted. 7 in favour; none opposed.

CARRIED

14.0 Adjournment

It was moved by Thomas Schroeder, and seconded by Claire Huxtable:

That the meeting be adjourned; panelists left the meeting at 6:59 pm.



**Thomas Schroeder, Chair
Advisory Design Panel**

**Kevin Wurmlinger, Secretary
Advisory Design Panel**