

Date: Monday, December 17, 2012
Time: 3:00 p.m.
Place: Town Hall Meeting Room, City Hall

PRESENT:**Board**

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
S. Johnston Deputy City Manager
B. Jackson General Manager of Planning and Development
J. Dobrovlny Director of Transportation

Advisory Panel

D. Grigg Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
S. Chandler Representative of the Development Industry
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
K. Chen Representative of the General Public
D. Wlodarczak Representative of the General Public

Regrets

K. Busby Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
K. Maust Representative of the Vancouver Heritage Commission

ALSO PRESENT:**City Staff:**

J. Greer Assistant Director of Processing Centre - Development
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
S. Black Development Planner
M. Au Project Facilitator
M. D'Agostini Heritage Planner

1860 BARCLAY STREET - DE415926 - ZONE RM-5B

G. Borowski Merrick Architecture
P. McRae Merrick Architecture
G. Abboud Owner
J. Stamp Durante Kreuk Landscape Architects
R. McCulloch Donald Luxton & Associates Inc.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

1. MINUTES

It was moved by Mr. Jackson seconded by Mr. Dobrovolny and was the decision of the Board to approve the minutes of the meeting on December 3, 2012.

2. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

None.

**3. 1860 BARCLAY STREET - DE415926 - ZONE RM-5B
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Merrick Architecture

Request: To retain, rehabilitate the existing house (Mason Residence) and to develop an addition of a 6 storey building at the rear of the site, for a combined total of seven dwelling units with parking accessed from the lane, subject to City Council's approval to designate the Mason Residence as a Municipal Heritage Site.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application for a new 6-storey residential building as infill. The overall form is within the recommended 60 foot height, except for a portion of the elevator core in the centre, which is excludable from the calculation. Also, part of the south end extends into the recommended "angled envelope" that starts 36 feet above the rear property line. However, other portions of the envelope are left open. Mr. Black noted that the proposal is for five new residential units and two units in the heritage Mason Residence plus four parking stalls. He stated that generally the addition makes a number of compromises in maintaining not only the structure of the Mason house but its position, particularly the 28 foot front yard dimension. The side yards beside the Mason Residence are maintained at three and four feet and the new side yards are proposed at 0.16 feet next to the addition. As well there is a fourteen foot separation between the new residential units and the Mason Residence at the second level, not including the elevator. Mr. Black mentioned that the view and shadow analysis indicates that local impacts are limited.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2012. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by Mr. Black:

- Since this is a constrained site, the applicant will be installing a car elevator for access to the underground parking area.
- There aren't any windows overlooking the adjacent property.
- The application is subject to the approval of the Development Permit Board before it goes to Council for approval.
- The front garden is of value to the community and has heritage value as well.
- The permitted FSR is 2.27 and the applicant is proposing 2.50. However staff are asking the applicant to comply with the maximum as per Real Estate Services' proforma evaluation.

- The reduction in the FSR doesn't have to be in the building mass but could be achieved through the addition of an amenity room which would be exempt from the FSR calculation.
- There are some glass blocks in the new building to add natural light.
- On the west elevation there are narrow windows with low sills and staff are asking that some portion of the glass be translucent for more privacy to the neighbours.
- Condition of approval for the application is based on retaining the heritage building.
- The applicant will be providing four parking spaces plus one car share. The car share will be available to the community as well as residents of the building. As well there is a disability parking space.
- The exterior treatment of the elevator could be improved to provide more privacy.
- The nine bike parking spaces are based on the bike parking bylaw of 1.2 spaces per dwelling unit. Since there are seven units, nine bike parking spaces are required.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Borowski said he had no issues with the condition as set out in the Staff Committee Report. He stated that the applicant has a confirmation from Gar to Go to provide two cars in one parking space. As well he noted that the two buildings are in common ownership and the side wall does have glass blocks to allow for light and privacy. He also stated that they are anticipating an amenity room on the ground floor. Mr. Borowski stated that they could add clear glazing on the front of the elevator with translucent glass on the sides to allow for privacy for the units opposite.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- In order to use the car share program, it is not necessary to enter the building as the cars will be parked in the open parking spaces. A statutory right-of-way will be established.
- Bike owners will be able to use the lift or the elevator to get their bikes out of the underground parking area.
- There is an opportunity to have stacked bike parking in the basement.
- It has been designed as a non-combustible building so there are no concerns regarding using glass in the elevator.
- Regarding green building components they are retaining the existing building, using a highly energy efficient heating system and there are green roofs and solar shading. As well the radiant heating system will be extended into the heritage house.
- LEED™ registration is not required under the current zoning.
- They are trying to keep the established garden at the front of the heritage house intact.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Grigg said the Urban Design Panel considered the appearance of the new building and the heritage building and how it will contribute to the community. They felt the project would be a benefit to the neighbourhood with some minor impacts to the adjacent buildings. They felt the impact would have been greater if the existing heritage building was demolished and a new building was added to the site. The Panel supported the proposal to retain the existing heritage building in its current location and they felt there was a benefit to the neighbourhood to retain the garden at the front. Mr. Grigg noted that the Panel was also impressed with the care the applicant had taken to see that the garden survives in the long run and made sure that the new building didn't conflict with the heritage aspects of the current building.

Mr. Chandler complemented the architect and owner for the extensive response that was evident in the documents. He noted that the setbacks and variances would have minimal impact on the neighbours. He also thought there was a sensitive treatment to the windows so as not to impact the neighbours. He suggested that perhaps the applicant could look at adding translucent glazing in the narrow strip windows on the west side of the building. As well he said he was glad to see that the applicant would add translucent glass to the side of the elevator and leave clear glass in the front. Mr. Chandler also suggested that there might be an opportunity to restudy and perhaps improve the entry sequence. He added that it was an excellent project and would be a compliment to the West End.

Mr. Stovell congratulated the applicant for retaining the heritage building. He also congratulated heritage staff for their evolving attitude for allowing a modern building to be added to the site. Mr. Stovell said it was a well done design and a great infill project and thought the side yards had been well handled.

Mr. Rafii noted that the West End is a unique community with a mix of old and new buildings. He said that it was nice to see a project that would keep the heritage building and thought the infill was nicely designed.

Mr. Wlodarczak said he was impressed with the project especially since the heritage building was being retained. He noted that he lives in the neighbourhood and there are issues of affordability. He said he liked that the units are family sized and that there will be a car share program on the site. He added that having designated cars in the West End is important. Mr. Wlodarczak thought there should be more bike parking since families often have more than one bike. He added that staff might want to relook at the minimums especially in buildings with family units. Mr. Wlodarczak recommended support for the application.

Mr. Chen said he loved the design of the new building but wasn't sure it was compatible with the heritage building. As well he was concerned with the width of the side yard. He added that he liked the fact that the applicant approached the neighbours and got their support for the project. Mr. Chen recommended support for the application.

Board Discussion

Mr. Jackson said he thought the design was well conceptualized and hoped it would be well constructed. He added that he was satisfied with the variances and there would be an appropriate separation to the adjacent buildings. Mr. Jackson said he had no hesitation in supporting the application.

Mr. Dobrovolny said he appreciated the retention of the heritage house and though the applicant had done a nice job in making it work with the new building. He added that he was in support of the application.

Mr. Johnson said that the project was a breath of fresh air and said a lot about the owner of the property and the architect. He acknowledged the applicant for getting the neighbours on board in supporting the project and as well saving the front yard garden. Mr. Johnson added that he appreciated the way the applicant had integrated good design with green components and was happy to support the application.

Mr. Johnson suggested that staff needed to revisit the bike parking guidelines. Mr. Dobrovolny said they are launching a comprehensive review in the new year regarding parking and will start with bike parking.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Jackson and seconded by Mr. Johnson, and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE415926, in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated November 21, 2012.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:14 PM

L. Harvey
Assistant to the Board

V. Potter
Chair