

First Shaughnessy Advisory Design Panel

Meeting Minutes: 21st March 2013 4.00 pm Vancouver City Hall

Meeting Called by: Chair, Robert Miranda

Note Taker: Linda Collins

Timekeeper: Chair

Attendees: Chair, Robert Miranda Resident Member-at-Large
Vice-chair, Linda Collins Resident Member-at-Large
Erika Gardner Shaughnessy Heights'
Property Owners Association
Alistair (Ian) Munro Shaughnessy Heights'
Property Owners Association
Katherine Reichert Shaughnessy Heights'
Property Owners Association
Benjamin Ling Architectural Institute of British Columbia
Jennifer Stamp British Columbia Society of
Landscape Architects
Michael Kluckner Vancouver Heritage Foundation Board
Lisa McIntosh Real Estate Board of Greater Vancouver

Liaison: Colin King Development Planner

Regrets / Absent: Kerri-Lee Watson Resident Member-at-Large
Clinton Cuddington Architectural Institute of British Columbia
Michelle Cloghesy British Columbia Society of
Landscape Architects
Tim Potter Development Planner
Cllr. George Affleck Vancouver City Council

The Chair noted that there was a quorum for the meeting.

Discussion:

Recent Project
Updates:

1656 Laurier
3990 Marguerite

has come back as a renovation enquiry
has been requested to provide a
Statement of Significance

1428 Balfour
1203 Matthews

enquiry as a minor renovation to the rear
enquiry to demolish this Heritage C
building

- The Chair requested clarification as to what is meant by a "Statement of Significance" with regard to 3990 Marguerite. Liaison staff remarked that such a statement should summarize the heritage status of the house, the quality and condition of both the exterior and the interior.

The Chair referred to comments he made to the Panel when he became Chair(Spring 2012), that notwithstanding the laudable intentions of the Panel – “to preserve and protect Shaughnessy’s special character through the retention of pre-1940 houses of merit” – the legal rights of property owners cannot be ignored. The Chair noted that the Bulletin *First Shaughnessy District: New House Process (Pre-and Post-1940 Buildings, Effective Date 31st May 2012)* issued under the authority of the Director of Planning was all well and good, but he questioned whether the City’s Legal Department had scrutinized the document. If the Bulletin had no legal authority, then it was just misleading for all concerned.

Regarding the property at 1917 Hosmer, Katherine Reichart remarked that the planting in the front yard had been removed and replaced with gravel. She asked whether this is permitted.

Action: Planning Staff to investigate.

Agenda Item: 1189 Balfour
Applicant: Mr Loy Leyland (Architect), Ms Julie Hicks (Landscape Architect)
Status: Enquiry
Review: First

This project is for the construction of a new house on a Post-1940 site.

The applicant noted that the house is to be in the “craftsman” style of architecture.

The landscape is to take account of the neighbour’s property to the east.

Panel questions and applicants responses:

The location of the storm water retention tank - this is still under consideration, but most likely under the driveway.

Roof material is to be asphalt shingles.

The visibility of the garage doors from the north side - since they do not face the street there should be no great concern. In any event they will be of quality materials, and painted so as to be unobtrusive.

Planning Department’s comments:

The City is generally in support of this project. However, it is seeking general comments from the Panel.

Panel Comments:

On the east elevation the stacked bay windows should perhaps be taken to the ground rather than cantilevering out at the base above grade.

The roof material should be of a higher quality than asphalt shingles.

The location of the garage is appropriate.

Perhaps at the rear the house should open up more to the garden.

The lot is asking for “something quiet”, but particularly on the south elevation there are too many windows, pointing to a sense that the design is buzzing with too much detail.

The porch trapezoidal shaped posts are attractive.

On the east elevation perhaps there are too few windows.

The landscaping would benefit from more groupings of trees, in more asymmetrical arrangements, and more layering on the south and west sides.

The sunken patio at basement level does not allow for a strong connection to the garden.

Chair’s Summary:

The Chair noted the salient comments made by the Panel:

- The elevations, particularly the south and west, could perhaps be calmed down a little.
- The basement sunken patio could be made a little larger.
- The landscape trees should be arranged in groups, and more layering was needed.

The Chair added his own plea for a little more “surprise and delight” in the design, that the design satisfied all the Design Guidelines, but was a bit uninspiring.

The Chair remarked that the Panel seemed in general support of the project and that the applicant should proceed to the DP stage of the process, with Panel comments addressed. Since this was an enquiry the Panel need not take a vote on the project.

The meeting ended at 4.50 pm.