

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: January 9, 2014

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room 116, City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Dallas Brodie	Vice-Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
Erika Gardner	Resident
Hakano Amaya	BCSLA
Lori Hodgkinson	Resident
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Michael Kluckner	Vancouver Heritage
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
------------	---------------------

REGRETS: George Affleck City Councillor
Benjamin Ling AIBC
Alastair Munro Resident, SHPOA
David Nelson Resident

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1.	1550 Marpole Ave. - Pre-Application Enquiry (2nd)

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:15 pm and noted the absence of a quorum.

Project Updates:

Staff updated the panel with regard to new or previously presented enquiries at the following addresses:

3998 Granville St	Minor addition to Post Date house to remove second driveway crossing and reorient entry accepted as application.
1054 Balfour Ave.	Minor addition to Pre-Date house locating additional floor area at ground and basement level to rear accepted as application.
3990 Marguerite St.	Temporary protection order extended by 120 days.
1998 Cedar Cres.	Merit Evaluation Process completed: enquiry for new house expected.
3333 Cedar Cres.	Merit Evaluation Process completed: retention proposal expected.
1263 Balfour Ave.	Merit Evaluation Process completed: retention will be required.
1075 Douglas Cres.	Retention enquiry expected.
1126 Wolfe Ave.	Application received.
1626 Laurier Ave.	Retention enquiry to FSDAP February 2014.
3743 Cypress St.	Application to FSDAP January 30th , 2014.
1037 W King Edward	Staff to issue preliminary response Jan 2014.

Business:

The Chair and Panel welcomed new members Lori Hodgkinson and Hakano Amaya.

Staff gave an outline of the terms of reference for the Panel, the development process as it relates to the First Shaughnessy District and general issues of advice, responsibilities and potential conflicts of interest as they relate to Panel business. It was noted that a new AIBC representative has not as yet been appointed.

Staff discussed the upcoming review of the First Shaughnessy ODP scheduled for 2014 and how the panel might contribute once there is more detail as to what the terms of reference and the procedures of this review process will be.

Staff were asked about the decision making process behind the approval of development at 16th Ave & Cypress Avenue and will bring an update to the panel in the future regarding this project.

Review of minutes:

No minutes were reviewed.

The Panel considered no applications and one enquiry for presentation.

-
- | | | |
|----|--------------|---|
| 1. | Address: | 1550 Marpole Avenue |
| | Description: | Renovation to a pre-date Heritage B house |
| | Review: | Second (previous review Sept. 26, 2013) |
| | Architect: | Formwerks |
| | Delegation: | Jim Bussey Architect, Claudia Koerner Landscape Architect |
-

EVALUATION: Supported - Panel to see as an application with concerns addressed

Planning Comments:

This is a pre-application enquiry to retain and renovate an existing Heritage B dwelling at 1550 Marpole Ave. The existing dwelling will be relocated forward of existing siting to allow additions on each wing within required setbacks. Both relocation of the existing dwelling and reconfiguration of driveway access will result in loss of existing trees; however significant trees along the street frontage of the property will be retained.

Questions to Panel:

1. Is the level of retention of the original dwelling improved sufficiently to address previous concerns of the Panel?
2. Can the Panel provide commentary around the relationship of the new additions to the original dwelling?
3. Can the Panel provide commentary around the proposed side yard conditions arising from the relocation of and additions to the existing dwelling?

Staff Introductory Comments:

Colin King presented this enquiry for the retention and renovation of the Heritage B house, focusing on previous Panel concerns and the moves made in the current submission to address these concerns. Previous Panel concerns were around the lack of differentiation between old and new in the first proposal and with regard to the side yards created by moving the house. Most significantly, there was concern that there was not a meaningful level of retention proposed. As a result the Panel did not support the previous enquiry and passed a motion that a statement of significance should be required for any future proposals, and that the Panel would like to see it again as an enquiry with a more meaningful level of retention proposed.

The revised proposal increases the level of retention along the side elevations and preserves the existing roof line to the front. New additions are set back a greater distance from the retained elements and the ridge line is dropped to make new elements subordinate to those retained. A statement of significance is also provided and proposals have been discussed that received broad support from Heritage staff.

Applicant Introductory Comments:

The design team presented the project and answered questions from panel as they related to retention, architectural design and landscape proposals. It was noted that landscape proposals

are in preliminary form, reflecting the pre-application enquiry stage that the project is in, and that more layering and filigree in the landscape would be present in any application.

Panel Commentary:

Generally it was agreed that as it relates to retention of the original, and the scale and differentiation of the additions, the project was much improved.

There was some concern that in terms of the side yards the letter of the ODP was being met but the intent, as it relates to estate like character and privacy, was not. It was noted that there is nothing humble or subordinate in the width of the added wings.

The width of the building was a recurring theme with comments that it was too broad and flat and over glazed. There were comments the building with the wide side additions resembles a hotel or institution.

Significant panel commentary related to the massing of the proposed dwelling, with many members commenting that the proposed double height volumes and the extent of floor area for parking in the basement were contributing to the overwhelming size of the structure. It was noted that this massing in turn leads to some of the issues with form of development.

A number of remedies were proposed, including pulling back the garage to pull the added wings back further from the retained façade, or removing all double height spaces bar the lobby and study to relocate floor space from the east wing into the retained structure thereby pulling back the scale of the east addition to match the west addition, which would have the advantage of improving the aspect of the retained structure as viewed from the NE corner of the site at the street.

Reducing the double height overhead spaces would also add authenticity to retention measures by making the second floor windows authentic and useful.

It was noted that a 3 dimensional model would be helpful, as there is greater articulation of mass in the additions relative to the retained structure shown in the plans than is immediately apparent in the printed elevations.

Chair Summary:

The Panel unanimously supported the enquiry. A motion was carried that the enquiry come back to the panel as an application. Specifically the Panel wants to see the following concerns addressed: the institutional look and size of the building overwhelming the property rather than fitting into the neighbourhood, more generous side yard setbacks further allowing the building to visually blend in with the neighbourhood from the street view, and a reduction of double height ceilings which would improve the authenticity of the heritage presentation.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm.