

**THE CORPORATION OF THE DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
LOWER CAULFEILD ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
MUNICIPAL HALL ORCA ROOM
THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 2021**

Committee Members: B. Helliwell (Chair), R. Amenyobe, S. Nichols, J. Mahoney; and Councillor Lambur attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities. Absent: None.

Staff: E. Wilhelm, Senior Community Planner; and L. Berg, Senior Community Planner (Committee Clerk), attended the meeting via electronic communication facilities.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:36 p.m.

It was Moved and Seconded:

WHEREAS the March 24, 2021 Order of the Provincial Health Officer on Gatherings and Events (“order”) prohibits members of the public from attending committee meetings in-person until the order is rescinded or replaced;

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver is required to prohibit in-person attendance at committee meetings pursuant to the order; and

WHEREAS the District of West Vancouver has enabled public participation at committee meetings via electronic means to ensure openness, transparency, accessibility and accountability, including via the use of live streaming (video and audio) for public viewing, and electronic communication facilities (videoconferencing software) for public participation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the April 22, 2021 meeting be held without in-person public attendance.

CARRIED

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 22, 2021 Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee meeting agenda be approved as circulated.

CARRIED

3. ELECTIONS

The Committee called for volunteers to the positions of Chair and Vice-Chair.

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT B. Helliwell be elected as Chair of the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT S. Nichols be elected as Vice-Chair of the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee.

CARRIED

4. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the June 20, 2018 Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee meeting minutes be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

REFERRALS

5. **4841 THE DALE (FILE NO. 19-097)** (first appearance)

E. Wilhelm (Senior Community Planner) outlined the procedure for Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee consideration of the referral application and the purpose of the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee. He went on to explain that the applicant will present the proposal including background of the Heritage Alteration Permit (HAP) referral process and guidelines. An outline of the site location and context, existing site conditions, and the proposed new single family dwelling and landscaping was given. A variance to the front yard setback is proposed, as well as required rock breaking and removal.

E. Wilhelm described that the applicant completed the preliminary public consultation process prior to making a formal application.

Applicant Presentation:

A. Voth (Architect), provided an overview of the existing non-conforming dwelling on the site. The house is set back in the rear yard and has challenging access. He described the rationale for the front yard variance request, including aligning the dwelling with similar yard conditions on the street and reduce blasting requirements. The committee began a discussion of the grades and how the floor plans respond. The applicant noted they are proposing natural materials in compliance with the guidelines.

The committee asked where the entrance is in relationship to the elevations. Discussion held on the existing community character and surrounding streets, the two floors are 3000 sq ft plus basement and garage (exempted), but seems to be coming out of the rock. Further discussion on extent of rock removal, applicant

comments that removal will comply with District requirements. Committee questioned how the proposed house compares with surrounding house heights, looking at what the potential impacts are, how does the floor level compare with the next door neighbour? Applicant responded that the existing house is much higher, could be about the same but there is so much tree cover it was difficult to determine. Committee member notes that the new house will give greater privacy. Discussion on primary views. Displays precedent images of materials, colours, stains, rock, etc.

B. Harrison (Landscape Architect), confirms that the landscape fits in nicely and discussed options for plantings for play areas. Looking to retain slopes, not recreate anything. A lot of vegetation around the sides. Very difficult site, but all fits. It is a very private area, this is like a lane and will likely be an improvement to the street.

Comments/Questions from the Committee:

1. What is the advantage with the front yard setback? If complied, it would be higher up. What is influencing this on blasting and window placement? There is a fair amount of elevation buried into the topography. Blasting from sides for windows, etc.? *Applicant: Complying would make a very steep driveway and there would be no connection to the back yard in order to make building heights. Goal to make the house fit on the site and work for the family. Avoiding steep driveway and lots of stairs, and that fits within the community.*
2. Distance from the street is 31.5 ft from the property line and the house staggers as it steps up. *Applicant: The main face of the building starts 30 feet back. Have faced the house with stone to blend into the topography.*
3. Will the large cedar be removed and a plum tree? Will trees along neighbours property – it's bare rock in front of existing house. The garage siting is back than the existing garage? *Applicant: Yes. By how many feet? Applicant: 20 feet, this is 16.72. So it is about 3 to 4 feet further back.*
4. What is the slope of the driveway? *25 feet with a difference of 3, about 12%, on the south corner, the top is better.* Noted that the applicant will need to review elevations to comply with District requirements and improve transitions.
5. Questions were raised from the neighbour regarding the big garage facing the street, does not look like this will be resolved – how can you address this? The guidelines discourage this, even though all the other houses do this. Perhaps the guidelines need to be revised. *Applicant: A side entry garage would not work on this property. Other streets in the area have wider lots or streets, so have enough room to go up and curve in and have landscaping, or garages are sited away from the street. But The Dale is different and quite steeper. The landscaping is character-driving so intent was to avoid a street of garage doors.*
6. Is the requirement to English gardens, why not just good landscaping. Starts with English but becomes naturalized over time. English garden is likely a carry over from the start of the area. Looking for not totally naturalized or formal. Emphasis should be on the natural landscaping, English is one principle should explore other opportunities. *Applicant: The guidelines discuss English, but do call for a naturalistic landscape.*

7. The garage door has various materials used to make it not as conspicuous as a garage door? *Applicant: Faced a garage door with same materials as house (not shingles) but could do siding-like so it blends the door. Attempted with charcoal colour but that is a good idea. Could design driveway to narrow entry to garage and fan out to garage door.*
8. East elevation, have a rock material from garage level up, but main level up it is what? *Applicant: Local basalt from quarry in Squamish. On Upper floor looks like wood or shingle? Applicant: Cedar shaped shingle. Shingles right down to grade will not be effective. There will be an 8-inch concrete line between grade and material. Do not want to excessively blast, trying to work with existing grades. There is existing rock outcrop in the rear, trying to remove as little as possible. Concrete forms will follow natural grade then fall back down.*
9. How are you addressing drainage in this condition? *Applicant: The concrete walls are higher than existing, there is a stormwater management plan (SWMP) for the entire site. Discussion on effective ways to bring water down and away from building. The SWMP at BP will be designed to address these issues.*
10. Cedar on side, sometimes show cedar void, is there a difference? One or the other? *Applicant: It is cedar shake. Called "Blue Label". It is to help blend in.*
11. Great to achieve tiers of landscape at rear, following topography of land and curves, when you get the front (southeast corner) it gets formal, can you consider loosening this up a bit since you will have access to rock, good opportunity to re-introduce it. Could be a good tie in.
12. Roof is tar and gravel? *Applicant: Metal is preferred by owner, so will change to standing seam metal in charcoal gray 16 gauge.*

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee support the application as presented with the following to be further considered by staff:

- Naturalize landscape on the southeast corner.
- Explore options to improve grades from street level to garage level.
- Consider a standing seam metal roof.

CARRIED

PUBLIC QUESTIONS

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

There were no questions provided at the meeting. However, due to technical difficulties, the following comments submitted prior to the meeting regarding 4841 The Dale shall form part of the public feedback and incorporated into the April 22, 2021 LCAC meeting minutes:

Hi Erik I see we have a meeting on this permit today. I'm not sure if you received my concerns in that regard when I submitted the comments below to the applicants website so I'll just copy you in on it today. I hope I can get into the

meeting as Webex is new to me. The comments below reference to their architectural drawings.

My response was as follows:

Totally understand trying to make a more accessible home that suits the topography of our unique area and is built according to the heritage conservation guidelines.

There are a number of issues we have regarding this particular plan. I will address them referencing applicable pages of the architectural plans. L-2 Landscape Plan -overall there seems to be allot of cement involved to tame the natural rock landscape which goes against the heritage guidelines and may dramatically alter the rainwater drainage patterns from the lot. No larger trees are left on the lot and pavers on the south/street side will promote street parking. What look to be retaining walls on south east side are a big issue (more noticeable on: Site plan A2.0 and Lower floor plan A3.0 and Elevation A4.0) and will endanger the root system supporting the two cherished large heritage trees on neighbours property the South west corner of 4839 The Dale's. Context Images page A1.0 - street side images of 4839 The Dale should be east of 4814 and 4851 should be west(are reversed). Site Plan A2.0, Lower Floor Plan A3.0 and particularly Elevation A4.1 - the foundation wall on the east side is climbing a very steep rock outcrop and looks like a very large, high and exposed cement wall that is not at all a soft edge as proposed in the heritage guidelines. We request a better rendering of the east side of the plan in 3d format be provided (without non existent trees obscuring the view) to better understand that part of the plan. Proposed Floor Plans A3.1-3.2 no issues. Roof Plan A3.3 - looks like a very large north-draining roof that will divert an enormous amount of rainwater so drainage must be designed to not harm the neighbouring properties. Elevation A4.0 This image is deceiving and this very high massing of the front of the home might be too modern and hard edged to suit the heritage element of the area. Some softening would be desirable. The east side retaining walls have already been noted above as a major issue regarding the safety of large heritage trees. Elevation A4.1 East Elevation and Section A5.0(an x-ray version of A4.1) - unclear whether any blasting of the granite rock face will be involved in this foundation which would likely have major repercussions for all neighbouring homes as well as drainage. Elevation A4.2 and A4.3 no issue other than address drainage of roof surfaces. #d Perspectives A4.5 please create renderings without trees and with topographical rock faces present if possible. Section A5.0 please superimpose the foundation wall line from A4.1 onto this diagram for greater understanding. Section A5.0 the front side of the building is very high in relation to how close it is to the street - perhaps have the architect superimpose a normal human person standing at the street edge to give some perspective.

I am not trying to be overly critical here just noting my concerns. Note also that most of the other alteration applications in the conservation area faced strong push back when the design didn't match the country cottage English garden if you will vision of Caufeild's original dream, and in the end resulted in better and more appropriate design elements to the joy of both owners and neighbours.

NEXT MEETING

7. NEXT MEETING

Staff confirmed that the next Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee meeting will be scheduled when an item for the Committee requires review.

8. ADJOURNMENT

It was Moved and Seconded:

THAT the April 22, 2021 Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 5:48 p.m.

Certified Correct:

Bottelliwell.
Chair

Lisa Berg
Lisa Berg (Oct 20, 2021 09:52 PDT)
Committee Clerk