

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 28, 2013

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
Clinton Cuddington	AIBC
Erika Gardner	Resident
Michael Kluckner	Vancouver Heritage
Benjamin Ling	AIBC
Lisa MacIntosh	REBGV
Alastair Munro	Resident, SHPOA
Frank Shorrock	Resident, SHPOA
Jennifer Stamp	BCSLA
Kerri-Lee Watson	Resident

CITY STAFF:

Tim Potter	Development Planner
Colin King	Development Planner
Janet Digby	Rezoning Planner

LIAISONS:

George Affleck	City Councillor
----------------	-----------------

REGRETS: Peter Kappel Resident, SHPOA

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Dorothy Kerr

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING	
1.	1037 West King Edward Ave. Rezoning Enquiry
2.	2071 West King Edward - Enquiry
3.	1250 Wolfe Avenue - Enquiry

BUSINESS MEETING

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

Project Updates:

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

1. 1426 Angus Drive - amendment to previously approved retention scheme
2. 3990 Marguerite Street - staff will be seeking Council's approval to place a protection order on this property at the forthcoming council committee meeting.

Business:

The discussion of 3990 Marguerite Street continued and Councillor Affleck discussed the forthcoming staff report on heritage Citywide and invited members to put their names on the speakers list. Item #7 of the report would potentially open up the FS ODP to revision measures discussed at previous FSADP meetings.

Review of Minutes:

The minutes of September 26, 2013 were approved and adopted

The Panel considered no applications and three enquiries for presentation.

The First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel Terms of Reference state:

Purpose

To advise Council, the Development Permit Board or the Director of Planning, as the case may be, regarding all significant development and minor amendment applications in the First Shaughnessy District.

To preserve and protect the heritage and special character of the First Shaughnessy District.

Mandate

The Panel is an advisory body authorized only to make recommendations to Council, the Development Permit Board or the Director of Planning. It does not have the authority to approve or refuse development applications or to make policy decisions.

In light of the above Terms of Reference **the Panel called a vote with members of SHPOA and residents in attendance:**

BE IT RESOLVED:

That the FSADP does not support the implementation of the COV Interim Rezoning Policy for Affordable Housing in its existing terms and conditions in any part of the First Shaughnessy District.

The motion was brought forward by Dallas Brodie and seconded by Kerri-Lee Watson.

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (8 in favor, 3 against, 1 abstention)

1. Address: **1037 West King Edward Avenue**
Description: Pre-application Rezoning Enquiry under the IRP
Review: First
Architect: SHAPE Architects
Delegation: Nick Sully, Shape Architects
Nathaniel Funk, Shape Architects
-

EVALUATION: NON SUPPORT (11 against, 2 in favor)

Planning Comments:

This is a pre-application enquiry for a rezoning proposal comprising 29 market rental units in a courtyard housing format under the citywide Interim Rezoning Policy (IRP). The site is located within the First Shaughnessy District but shares an edge with the Oak St commercial corridor. Based on locational criteria established by the IRP, heights up to six stories can be considered based on the urban design performance the proposal. The key considerations of urban design performance in this instance are with regard to proposed height, expression & materials, neighborliness to adjacent development, and compatibility with the ODP (noting that the multiple dwelling use allowed by the citywide IRP is not directly addressed by the FSD Guidelines). At this stage in the rezoning process, city staff reviews the proposal with a view to offering advice that will inform a future application. The panel is being consulted as a part of the pre-application review, and applicants will be expected to conduct a pre-application open house prior to submitting a formal rezoning application. A future application would be subject of city hosted open house and also be presented to both FSDAP and UDP for commentary prior to completion of the staff report to Council recommending approval or non-approval, which would be discussed at public hearing on the floor of Council. If rezoning is approved, a DE application would follow which would be subject to the normal notification and FSDAP process prior to approval.

Questions to Panel:

1. Staff seeks preliminary feedback from the panel with regard to the contextual fit of the proposed form of development of this 2-4 story courtyard housing scheme.

Staff Introductory Comments:

Colin King introduced this IRP rezoning enquiry which is located at the edge of First Shaughnessy. The proposal is being presented at this stage to initiate the public engagement process for rezoning. The introduction tried to put the panel appearance in the context of the rezoning process (pre-enquiry response) and to explain the nature of the IRP in terms of citywide application: the key consideration of this being that the contextual review of this proposal must consider both the FSD and C zoning contexts of the site.

Regarding the rezoning process, the outline gave a brief description of the rezoning policy by which this enquiry is being considered. Note was made of the fact that in a rezoning situation, the site must be recognized as having a broader city context beyond just the requirements of the FSODP. In this instance, development to the north and west is FSD, but adjacent development along the arterial to the east across the commercial lane is 4 story mixed use development of the Oak St corridor. As such, the proposal needs to respond to both conditions. If the proposal progresses, it will be subject to review by the Urban Design Panel which will focus on the larger urban design and architectural aspects of the scheme in terms of both

contexts. For this review, staff are seeking preliminary advice on how the panel thinks the scheme has responded to the FSD aspect of its context.

The context was summarized as being 4 story typical commercial (C2-zoning) across lane to west and 2 story typical FSD across lane north and adjacent east. The approach to trying to respond to both contexts was briefly described: under the policy consideration of up to 6 stories could be entertained, but given the context the applicant is proposing ground-oriented courtyard housing in 2-4 stories as a transition between detached residential FSD neighbourhood and the Oak St corridor. It was noted that new multiple dwellings are not possible under FS-D base zoning, but multiple occupancy does exist in multiple conversion scenarios within the district. The courtyard house form proposed attempts to balance contextual fit (materials, expression and massing) with the higher density (increased site coverage, alternative open space configurations) in a ground-oriented housing form as per the policy. Setbacks to King Edward and the side and rear lanes are minimized to concentrate higher densities adjacent to C-2 development rather than FSD development, but site coverage and rear and front yards are significantly different to FSD.

Staff requested a focus on the form of development issues of the proposal by panel members, rather than a focus on policy or use aspects: these are derived from a citywide policy regarding use on which the panel has already passed a motion.

Applicant Introductory Comments:

Nick Sully of SHAPE Architecture introduced the project, exploring in further detail how the proposal seeks to respond to both the wider urban context and the rezoning policy, while also recognizing and responding to the unique design conditions imposed by the FS ODP.

Panel Commentary:

It was noted that this project is full market housing. There were many comments about the high density and low quality of materials of this project not complying with the ODP.

There was discussion that the height and massing of this project would cause dark shadowing on neighboring properties.

There were comments about the site coverage being more than 35%, and about the loss of both front and side yard setbacks being in direct contravention of the ODP.

There was discussion that most of the trees on the site would be removed and that with most of the site covered by hardscape very little would grow here. There were comments about the interior courtyards being dark and that over time they would become grungy. There was comment that this project is not a contextual fit for First Shaughnessy.

There was discussion about the greenway space along West King Edward, and how this front yard forms an entrance into First Shaughnessy and is the start of a long uninterrupted stretch of landscaped streetscape as recommended by the ODP.

There was concern about the edges of First Shaughnessy being vulnerable to development rezoning. There is concern about this project setting a precedent for more high density rezoning in First Shaughnessy.

There was significant conversation about the fact this proposal does not comply with the FSODP and Guidelines. There was concern about the damage this project would do to the special character of First Shaughnessy.

Chair Summary:

The Panel does not support the proposal as presented in today's enquiry due to density, the design clashes with the ODP and the relationship to the adjoining properties. This project is not a contextual fit for First Shaughnessy and does not support the FS ODP and Design Guidelines.

2.	Address:	2071 West King Edward Avenue
	Description:	New House on a Post-date Site
	Review:	First (Enquiry)
	Architect:	Farpoint Architects
	Delegation:	John Keen, Architect Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 0 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal to construct a new house on a post-date site. The site has an approximate 18'-0" slope from front to back. The site is located near East Boulevard. A minor relaxation with respect to height and side yard is contemplated in this proposal, the particulars of which will be discussed in the presentation.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the panel have any comment on the location, size, and nature of this site as compared to other sites in Shaughnessy?
2. Does the panel have any preliminary feedback with regard to the proposed massing of the house on the site as it relates to the FS ODP and Guidelines?
3. Does the panel have any preliminary feedback with regard the landscape design as presented having regard for tree retention and any other concerns related to FSD Guidelines?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

This pie-shaped lot is about 9,200 square feet and is small for First Shaughnessy. The lot has a steep gradient and overlooks the old CPR railroad track and as well as a hydro substation and the Arbutus shopping mall. The house proposed to be demolished is a modest bungalow.

The most significant of feature this house will be the roof treatment because the ODP is looking for a strong roof form. The design also presents prominently developed windows and an entrance way which is respectful to the existing topography. With regards to the entrance, it is intended to be presented with a dramatic overhang and cantilever with no support at the corner. The materials proposed are the requisite FSD tripartite development. It is intended to have a stone base at the first floor level. It is intended to have a pebble dash stucco façade with traditional windows which will be in contemporary styling and a horizontal roof with wood soffits.

Depending on how Planning interprets the height for this site, the only portion that actually approaches the 35.1 roof height limit is the pavilion in the center which provides the second story roof access. We are proposing a little roof deck with which Planning has concerns. Where the deck starts there is a plinth around it to shield it from view and to provide a green space. We would like to offer solar panels for the pool for energy conservation.

Landscape Comments:

The landscaping on this site has not been maintained. There are about 25 caliper sized trees and overgrown shrubs. There are two Norway maples which we are trying to see if we can keep. The front yard is a scattering of miscellaneous plums, cypresses, and birches that are declining. The boulevard is overgrown with bamboo. We would like to clear the bamboo and vegetation but we need to work with the City to see what they would allow. The front of the property has a retaining wall that was probably put in around 1959/1960 that we are going to keep but it will have to be rebuilt.

We've kept the driveway into the garage as narrow as possible to try and keep some of the trees. The side yard is a significant element that will be planted with trees, shrubs and ground covers. In the back the owners have asked for a small swimming pool and a hot tub. In the front there is a small sunken patio off the basement level for light and a small water feature to create white noise to mitigate some of the noise from King Edward and Arbutus.

Panel Commentary:

The site planning works well on this unique site that is on a slope and exposed to the street. The landscaping is successfully handled according to the Guidelines. There is a good home and garden relationship.

This design appears to give a nod to Frank Lloyd Wright with the cantilevered roof lines and how it uses the grade changes in the land. It is a dramatic improvement to the existing overgrown site. The architect handles the difficult task of fitting a modern designed house into the context of the FS ODP.

There was discussion that the success of this project really depends on how details and materials are handled. The project needs exquisite detailing and high quality materials for success as outlined in the ODP.

The massing has been well handled, the building location is in the right place and there was positive comment about how the building steps down and meets the site.

Chair Summary:

There is a lot of support for the project and the way the massing on the site is handled. The landscaping is well done. There is support for the contemporary design and how it fits in with the location of the property. The quality of building and landscape materials will make a big difference to this project. This well received project supports the FS ODP and Guidelines.

This enquiry is supported with the desire to see this come back to us as an application with concerns addressed.

-
3. Address: **1250 Wolfe Avenue**
 Description: Renovation and Addition to Pre-Date House
 Review: First (Enquiry)
 Architect: The Airey Group
 Delegation: Howard Airey & Taylor Johnson Architects
 Donna Chomichuk, Landscape Architect
 Paul Sanga, Landscape Architect
 Donald Luxton, Heritage Consultant
-

EVALUATION: SUPPORT (11 in favor, 1 against)

Planning Comments:

This is a proposal to relocate and retain an existing 1922 dwelling, and to construct a lower scale addition to the rear of the property. The site has frontage to both Wolfe Avenue and to Tecumseh Avenue. A Statement of Significance has been provided as part of the presentation materials forwarded to the panel.

Questions to Panel:

1. Does the panel have any preliminary feedback with regard to the proposed relocation of the existing dwelling and the level of retention proposed?
2. Does the panel have any preliminary feedback with regard to the relationship between the proposed addition to the rear and the retained house?
3. Can the panel offer commentary on the proposed living space above the garage and how this relates to the hierarchy of heights created across the site?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

The architects and heritage consultant gave a description of the meritorious features of the existing dwelling, and the proposed moves that would facilitate retention and redevelopment of the property. The design concept is to develop a more contemporary addition to the rear of the house that addresses the Tecumseh frontage without significantly obscuring the view of the upper levels of the retained house. All new additions are secondary in scale and differentiated in expression from the existing dwelling.

Landscape Comments:

The landscape architect described the retention of mature landscaping to the front of the house and the removal of vehicular access from Wolfe Ave. The development of a series of new outdoor rooms that would define the relationship between the original house and additions. Also described was the new vehicular access from Tecumseh.

Panel Commentary:

The panel was very much in favor of the proposal despite the very contemporary style of the new addition.

The basic ideas of moving the existing house and the location of the new addition with frontage to Tecumseh were supported. There was discussion that the project, if executed with care, could win heritage awards and be an example of meaningful retention and high quality design in the district.

There was a lot of positive support for the landscaping for this project which was called “exquisite”. Another phrase used to describe the landscaping is that it would create “magical spaces”. It was noted the landscaping follows the FS ODP and Guidelines.

There were comments this project would reinforce the quality and character of the neighbourhood.

In terms of specific advice, the legibility of the new main entrance was questioned and singled out by a number of panel members as needing more ‘celebration’. Also, the two story height of the living space above the garage was supported and an appeal made to staff that it be allowed if it is necessary to the viability of the retention as proposed.

Chair Summary:

There is much support for this proposal that preserves the heritage of the main house and reinforces the quality and character of the neighbourhood. The enquiry follows the FS ODP and guidelines. It is supported with the desire that the application be brought back to panel with concerns addressed.

Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.