

University Endowment Lands Focus Group Meeting Notes

Area A - May 12, 2010

- Accessory suites: open to consideration of accessory suites as long as they are located in the principal building and are included in the overall FSR.
- Home occupations: okay
- Bed & Breakfasts: remove as an outright use
- Development Permit (DP) process: agree that all DP applications should go to ADP; no major concerns with proposed process
- DP Guidelines: “consistent with overall character” is challenging since there is a lot of diversity; guidelines should focus on quality, standards and goals of community; one suggestion that we add a principal of respect for “neighbours” – not generally supported; suggestion that guidelines encourage planting of native species; some concerns with tear downs and resulting construction debris and waste
- Other concerns: interested in reducing the maximum allowable for accessory buildings by 50% (to 750 square feet)
- Green guidelines: great in principle but too restrictive eg. 15° orientation; solar thermal-obtrusive
- Concern for applicant razing existing trees prior to starting DP process
- Energy efficiency being rolled out in BC Building Code; should not be in a zoning bylaw
- Want to come back together in the fall; some interest in having all focus groups meet at the same time

Area B - May 13, 2010

- Accessory suites: open to consideration as long as they are located in the principal building and are included in the overall FSR.
- Home occupations: some concerns about nature of home occupations that might be permitted (e.g. those that are noisy or would have other unpleasant effects); concern about home occupations not located in principal building; some concern about including family daycare (mitigated somewhat when 5 child maximum was pointed out).
- Bed and Breakfasts: remove as an outright use
- DP process: generally fine with the process; suggestion that applicant’s architect be required to document how design meets DP guidelines as part of the application
- DP guidelines: need to strengthen landscaping provisions – e.g. avoid invasive species, consider future growth patterns, deal with light, privacy and views; suggested that add a requirement for a bond or letter of credit to cover estimated cost + of the landscaping plan (to be returned only after a landscape architect had signed off the plan); require a landscape architect to sign off on the plan before a DP is issued
- Other issues:
 - Height of fences/gates in front yards – some feeling that gates could be 6 feet high as long as you could see through them
 - Would consider reduction in maximum allowable for accessory buildings by 50% (to 750 square feet); some concern about impact on owners of accessory buildings that current exceed this amount; they should be allowed to rebuild to original size
 - Accessory building: limit the total number of buildings & size; siting a concern if close to property line on “through” lots
 - Some concern about number of basements allowed
 - Add definition for ‘breezeway’
- Want to come back together in the fall

Area C - May 19, 2010

- Allowable building height in Area C:
 - Pros and cons of one-storey and two-storey buildings was reviewed by the group
 - Conclusion that height was not the real issue; real concerns included: overlook/privacy; fit with unique identity of certain parts of the streetscape; “ugly” design
 - Summarized by one member as concern with respect to the shape and bulk of buildings and where the “bulk” occurs, relative to other houses in the neighbourhood
 - Suggested that zoning provisions and DP guidelines be reviewed and revised in a way that dealt with these issues
- DP guidelines:
 - Support for general direction in DP guidelines
 - Concern that guidelines still do not provide enough prescriptive direction to create certainty and avoid conflicts that have arisen in the Area in the past
 - Suggested approach: revise zoning provisions to set a limit on size of the second storey in the case of a 2-storey home; add a section to design guidelines that clearly indicate considerations for second stories – i.e. tucked into roof; towards back of house; not dominating the front)

Area C - June 2, 2010

- Accessory suites:
 - open to consideration; interested in a size limitation; some interest in allowing suites in accessory buildings (laneway houses); want rules to regulate
 - some discussion about limiting who could live in the suites (i.e. family members, care givers only) but the idea was dropped
- Home based businesses:
 - support for home based businesses
 - like the idea of allowing home based businesses in accessory buildings
 - support for allowing at least one employee
 - concerns about parking and increased traffic that could result from allowing certain kinds of businesses (e.g. massage therapy, hair salon)
- Bed and breakfasts:
 - divided views on this; some support
- Side yard setbacks:
 - it was suggested that these could be reduced to 2 feet in Area C for accessory buildings
- Accessory buildings:
 - using strict application of proposed formula, smallest lot yields about 425 sq. ft. for accessory buildings
 - it was agreed that all properties should be allowed a maximum of 500 sq.ft.
- Height of buildings (revised zoning and DP guidelines for Area C):
 - range of views re restricting upper storey to a percentage of lower: there should be no restriction; 80% is okay; should be 70%
 - range of views regarding the section on Two Storey Houses in the revised DP guidelines; seemed to be a general view that the revised provision would not really help; some felt more prescriptive provisions would be necessary
- Development Permits
 - issue of whether there should be DP's for houses came up; there was a feeling around the table that it would be good to eliminate this requirement for houses that met the

bylaw and did not require variances; this is something that we should seriously consider and put to the larger community

- DP Guidelines – “green provisions”
 - not a lot of support for including these
 - some concerns about feasibility

Area D - May 20, 2010

- Permitted uses:
 - Generally comfortable with permitted uses and elimination of conditional uses
 - add “drive through” to “drive-in” restaurant prohibition
 - allow for accessory (“lock off”) suites on a prospective basis (new construction only)
 - some interest in hotels in commercial areas, but concluded areas were not big enough to accommodate hotels at this time
 - ‘home occupations’ are supported
- Section 406.4 – get rid of 30% maximum lot coverage
- Parking: consider reduction in required number of parking spaces to 1.4 per unit, including .2 per unit for visitors; check what UBC requires in its new areas
- Want to come back together in the fall

Areas A & B - July 12, 2010

- Considered suggestion from Area C Focus Group that:
 - Clear, prescriptive provisions be added to the bylaw to regulate issues of concern to the community; and,
 - The requirement to obtain a Development Permit for houses that met the revised bylaw and did not require variances be eliminated.
- General support for adding clear, prescriptive provisions to the bylaw wherever possible
- Continued support for the DP process as well; seen as a way to avoid “nasty surprises”
- Main areas of concern for residents of Areas A and B related to view preservation, privacy, and landscaping rather than housing style
- Designing prescriptive regulations could be challenging in some of these cases due to the more qualitative rather than quantitative nature of these considerations
- Open to including this option out to the broader community for consideration

Focus Group Members

<p><u>AREA A</u></p> <p>Dave Forsyth Maria Harris Hugh Ho Bob Kasting Ed O'Brien Ron Pears Bernhard Schwab Stuart Smith</p>	<p><u>AREA B</u></p> <p>Steven Drance Hamid Harandi Bob Mair John Norton Margaret Stuart Ronda Tuyp Cooper Walls Alex Yen</p>
<p><u>AREA C</u></p> <p>Karen DeVito Maciek Kon Loy Leland Dan McDonald Dan Mykecey John O'Donnell Nora Stevenson John Turnbull Rhodri Windsor-Liscombe</p>	<p><u>AREA D</u></p> <p>Po Chiang Mark Ellis Benoni Seghers John Stekl Cameron Thorn Howie Charters, Musqueam First Nations</p>